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Abstract

Problem Statement: In modern society, schools, just as other institutions, are required to be innovative organizations. For this purpose, they must not only be learning organizations, they must also be innovative. In this sense, the purpose of this study is to discover the relationship between organizational learning mechanisms at schools and innovation management skills of school administrators.

Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this study is to determine high school teachers’ opinions of the innovation management skills of school administrators and organizational learning mechanisms at high schools.

Method: The research was conducted with the relational survey model, and 272 teachers were sampled with the random sampling method. To collect the research data, the Organizational Learning Mechanisms Scale and Scale of Innovation Management in Schools were used. The data was analyzed with frequency, percentage, standard deviation, mean, and Spearman’s rho correlation analyses.

Findings and Results: According to the results of the research, teachers’ opinions of both the organizational learning mechanisms of their schools
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and their administrators’ innovation management skills were medium level in total and at sub-dimensions; and there is a high-level, positive, and significant relationship between teachers’ opinions of organizational learning mechanisms and the innovation management skills of school administrators.
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**Introduction**

The changes that a society, from which resources are obtained and to which output is given, goes under also continuously change the functions, responsibilities, and definitions of schools. In order for schools to respond to society’s changing structure, they need to change and innovate themselves. In order to become institutions that execute learning throughout the schooling process, it is crucial for schools to make innovative attempts and effectively manage these attempts. In an information society, schools not only have to teach, but also have to learn (Banoglu & Peker, 2012). In this study, organizational learning and innovation management was discussed institutionally; then the present condition of high schools was determined and suggestions were put forward.

**Organizational Learning Mechanisms at Schools**

Organizational learning, which was introduced by Cyert and March (1963) in the 1960s, has been discussed variously and put under the spotlight of management and organizational science studies. Many new models were created, and organizational learning was discussed from different viewpoints after Argyris and Schon introduced the first organizational learning model in 1978. In the literature, the term is defined as: determining mistakes and correcting them (Argyris & Schon, 1978); past experiences and their efficacy and insight, knowledge, and relationships with future experiences (Fiol & Lyles, 1985); continuously enhancing required skills in order to reach desired results (Senge, 1990); and reacting against the uncertainty and complexity of the environment to enhance the idea of making a difference in organizational functions (Toremens, 2011).

Although there have been many ideas on how organizational learning is practiced, most of them have emerged from Argyris and Schon’s (1978) single loop and double loop learning method. Single loop learning is defined as learning to adapt or lower the learning level (Argyris, 1976; Senge, 1990; Fiol & Lyles, 1985). This learning type emerged in order to correct organizational mistakes, and organizations incorporated this into their goals and policies (Toremens, 2011). Single loop learning is short-term, superficial, temporary, a repetition of past behaviors, and at the routine level of organization (Fiol & Lyles, 1985). Accordingly, it can be said that the goal of the single loop method is to optimize the present system and to extinguish all the mistakes.
What differentiates double loop learning from single loop learning is that double loop learning changes the mental models, policies, and assumptions underlying daily routines and actions (Van Grinsven & Visser, 2011). After comparing double loop learning with mistakes, Argyris (1995) defined double loop learning as changing the underlying program, which blames others. Contrary to single loop learning, it not only determines and corrects mistakes, but in order to attain goals, it also involves changing the strategies, norms, and values that lead to wrong actions (Huang & Shih, 2001).

Contrary to the two learning types, triple loop learning helps the organization learn how to learn, and it enables the organization structure to become ready for learning. Snell and Chak (1998) defined triple loop learning as organization members becoming aware of structures (which were present before them and which prevented or supported learning) and eventually creating new structures and strategies. Argyris (1978) defined this type of learning as learning to learn, and Marquardt (2002) defined it as testing whether learning has been achieved or not and executing learning by discussing assumptions with a critical position. Finally, Ameli and Kayes (2011) defined triple loop learning as organizations being able to learn how to practice single loop and double loop learning.

Organizational learning mechanisms—which are referred to as the institutional structures and procedural arrangements that enable organizations to directly gain knowledge by allowing members to collect, analyze, store, and systematically disseminate information related to them and their performance—are abstract and observable systems operated by organization members (Popper & Lipshitz, 1998). The knowledge being analyzed and shared by organization members through shared learning forums that enable distribution (which can make a change in routines and processes); meetings, reviews, and comparison teams are examples of these mechanisms (Schechter & Feldman, 2010; Lipshitz, Friedman & Popper, 2007). These mechanisms also form the basis that allows the disseminated knowledge to become a property of the organization (Schechter & Asher, 2012). Although they have an equivalent role with the nervous system in the individual’s learning process, they do not guarantee that learning will be fruitful and useful (Popper & Lipshitz, 2000).

In order for current school systems to provide a true educational service for students and parents, they should be transformed into learning organizations that utilize collective knowledge (Duffy 1997). It is important for schools to become institutions that execute organizational learning and the extent, in what way, and how organizational learning takes place is also important. Schools, as learning organizations, are institutions where workers from all levels can collaborate, continuously learn, and practice what they have learned (Silins, Mulford & Zarins, 2002). In order to become successful learning organizations, schools have to promote double loop learning, which considers individual and organizational assumptions and goals together with their actions, behaviors, and results and aims at enhancing them (Toremén, 2011). This means information is shared throughout schools, and information gains value as it is shared (Ozen Kutani & Mesci, 2013). In order for schools to keep up with the developments, they have to raise individuals who adapt
themselves to changing trends (Park, 2006); thus, educational institutions have to efficiently manage learning mechanisms and exploit organizational learning.

Innovation Management at Schools

Innovation indicates a positive and intentional change. When considered as an organizational concept, innovation is the promotion of new ideas and developments by the people within the organizational structure (Edwards, 2000). By considering innovation as managing all the processes related to new ideas, technological development, and creating and marketing new or renovated products/services, Trott (2005) focuses on successfully applying new ideas within the organization.

Innovation in organizations is not a process that gives results in a single step. Instead, it requires proper planning and management, begins by creating and selecting ideas, and embodies them into concrete changes (Jacobs and Snijders, 2008; Cited in: Eveleens, 2010). Innovation is an organizational process based on research and the desire to make change, which includes inter- and intra-organizational relationships and which leads to product and process changes (Acaray, 2007). Because innovation does not occur by itself and is a process, innovation is an actual study, and it can and should be managed like a regular organizational function. Yet unlike other organizational functions, innovation is a work of knowledge and requires intelligence and knowledge (Drucker, 2003). Therefore, in order to successfully complete the innovation process, organizations need to focus on innovation results and carry out their practices within this process (Aygen, 2006).

In the Oslo Manual (2005), innovation is classified into product, process, marketing, and organizational innovations. Trott (2005) defined it as management, production, and service innovations; and Durna (2002) classified it into product-process innovation, radical and slow innovations, and operational innovations. Along with the classifications, organizations have strategy, research and technology, and marketing functions throughout the innovation management process. These functions interact with the internal and external elements of the organization. The information collected from these interactions contributes to the organization’s knowledge store and enable developing new products/services and processes (Trott, 2005).

The purpose of innovation in school organizations is to enhance educational results. Educational innovations are evident in product, process, and service strategies of schools that aim at changing the present conditions and create unique features to improve organizational performance (Choul, Shen, Hsiao & Chen, 2010). As educational innovations have started to focus on school-based innovations (Hofman, Boom, Meeuwisse & Hofman, 2012), cultural, individual, and interactive innovations have gained importance over technical-rational innovations (Hofman & Dijkstra, 2010).

There is a two-way interaction between education and innovation: while schools reshape themselves according to social changes, they also pioneer social innovation (Ozdemir, 2013). Therefore, educational organizations, which are responsible for
planning the country’s future human resources, have to predict the future, determine the required change, and enable these changes to become permanent (Beyciglu & Aslan, 2010). According to Argon and Ozcelik (2007), national and international change becomes evident in various ways in social and open educational systems and directly or indirectly affects the individuals who are included or excluded in the process. Everything that emerges without innovation first becomes ordinary due to institutions, ideas, technology, and changes, then loses its functions and becomes less effective (Acikalin, 1998).

Schools have to function with their features that are open to change and to society’s and students’ emotional side, that recognize social diversity, are highly sensitive to technology, protect moral values by enhancing them, cooperate with the workers, teach democracy and practice democracy, prepare for the competitive environment, resist external threats without drifting away from the facts of life, and question themselves while promoting these (Beyciglu & Aslan, 2010). Educational systems, which have expanded due to student diversity, not only face economic competition and demands regarding social cohesion, but also face increasing economic limitations, which have caused an increase in the search for innovation (Stormquist, 1999).

Innovation Management and Organizational Learning Mechanisms

Innovation and constant development depend on the creative and learning skills of organizations (Gol & Bulbul, 2012). Innovation has become more complex due to technology and the rapidly developing environment of customer and social demands (Cavusgil, Calantone & Zhao, 2003). The reason for this is the information that organizations need for innovation has expanded significantly (DuPlesis, 2007). In a setting where there is too much information, organizations have to select the information and hand it in to the organization or create its own information in order to enable new ideas to emerge, turn ideas into innovations, and effectively manage the innovation process. At this point, organizational learning enables the information that promotes innovation to be created, acquired, disseminated, and exploited (Valle, Valencia, Jimenez & Caballero, 2011).

Organizational learning supports knowledge management, helps enhance creative skills throughout the innovation process (Avci, 2009), creates a shared intelligence for workers, and serves as a resource for innovations (Ozdeveciglu & Bickes, 2012). Garcia, Ruiz, and Llorens (2007) underlined that organizational learning supports creativeness, inspires new information and ideas, increases the applicability of these ideas, and hence becomes the basis of innovation. While Therin (2002) states that learning requires the acquisition of new information by integrating new knowledge or matching the present knowledge, McCharen, Song, and Martens (2011) underlined that constant and cooperative organizational learning is crucial for long-term and innovative educational reforms. Lemon and Sahota (2004) claim that organizational learning culture formally or informally scans its environment; therefore, it reaches specific knowledge and assumptions and paves the way for innovations that enable the organization to adapt to its surroundings.
The organizational learning process, which begins by acquiring knowledge, continues as the knowledge is distributed to and interpreted by groups and as a shared understanding is created and passed on to the organizational memory (Ozdevecioğlu & Bickes, 2012). A shared understanding and organization memory gained from organizational learning serve as the resources for new ideas. Koc and Ceylan (2007) underline that new ideas and suggestions carry the value of being the starting point of innovation. The feedback that is gained through innovative ideas resulting from organizational memory enables the organization to enter a new learning process. Accordingly, it can be said that organizational learning and innovation are facts that support and guide each other.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was, after determining the organizational learning mechanisms that educational organizations use and identifying the innovation management skills of school administrators, to determine through teacher opinions whether there are any relationships between the organizational learning mechanisms and innovation management skills of school administrators. The main purpose was to determine teacher opinions of the innovation management skills of school administrators and organizational learning mechanisms at high schools within the city center of Bolu. In accordance with this purpose, answers to the following questions were sought:

Considering the teachers who work in high schools of the center of Bolu;

1. What are their opinions regarding the organizational learning mechanisms and innovation management skills of their administrators?

2. Are there any relationships between their opinions of the innovation management skills of high school administrators and their opinions of the organizational learning mechanisms at schools where they work?

**Method**

**Research Model**

This study was designed with the relational screening model. The relational screening model is used in studies where the relationship between two or more variables is explored without interfering with the variables (Buyukozturk, Çakmak, Akgun, Karadeniz & Demirel, 2012). With this study, the relationships between teacher opinions of the innovation management skills of high school administrators and the organizational learning mechanisms at high schools in Bolu were determined.

**Research Sample**

The population of the study consists of 790 teachers who worked during the 2013–2014 academic year in public high schools in the center of Bolu. Sampling was
done in order to generalize study results in the population, and 272 teachers were contacted with the simple random sampling method. The main characteristic of this method is that each sample has an equal chance of being selected (Buyukozturk, Cakmak, Akgun, Karadeniz & Demirel, 2012). According to Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2007: 104), a sample of 260 people is enough for a population of 790 people.

When demographic distribution of the sample was investigated, it was seen that 115 (57.7%) of the sample was female and 157 (42.3%) was male. The distribution according to teaching experience showed that 75 (27.6%) of the sample had 0–10 years of experience, 125 (46.0%) had 11–20 years of experience, and 72 (26.5%) had 21 years or more of experience. When the sample’s distribution according to teachers’ fields was considered, it was seen that 49 (18.0%) of the teachers were teaching mathematics and science, 87 (32.0%) were teaching social sciences, 28 (10.3%) were teaching foreign languages, 19 (17.0%) were teaching sports and arts, and 89 (32.7%) were teaching vocational subjects.

Data Collection Instrument

To collect the research data, the Organizational Learning Mechanisms Scale and Scale of Innovation Management in Schools were used.

The Organizational Learning Mechanisms in Schools Scale was developed by Schechter (2008) and translated into Turkish by Unal (2014). The scale has a total of 27 items and four sub-dimensions: 1) storing, remembering, using information; 2) acquiring and disseminating information; 3) seeking information; and 4) analyzing information. The Cronbach’s alpha internal consistency coefficients of the scale that Unal (2014) analyzed for validity and reliability were .84, .87, .82, and .67. The Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for the sub-dimensions of the scale were .94, .91, .85, and .83; and the total scale was .97. The options of the 5-point Likert scale ranged from “none” to “totally have.”

The Innovation Management in Schools Scale is a scale of 32 items and four sub-dimensions that was developed by Bulbul (2012) and passed its reliability and validity tests. The sub-dimensions of the scale were: project management, organizational culture and structure, innovation strategy, and input management. The Cronbach’s alpha internal consistency coefficients of the sub-dimensions of the scale were .94, .90, .85, and .85; the total scale was .96. The Cronbach’s alpha internal consistency coefficients of the study scale were .96, .93, .91, and .87; and the total scale was .98. The options of the 5-point Likert scale ranged from “totally disagree” to “totally agree.”

Analysis and Interpretation of Data

The data was analyzed with SPSS 17.0 software. In order to decide what analyses should be conducted on the data, the distribution normality of the data was analyzed with the Kolmogorov Smirnov test, and it was found that the data did not range normally (p<.5). Percentage, frequency, arithmetic mean, standard deviation, and
Spearman’s rho correlation analyses were conducted while analyzing the data. The score interval used on interpreting the scale options are given in Table 1.

Table 1.
The score intervals used to interpret the scale options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Given Score</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Score Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Totally Disagree/None (1)</td>
<td>1.00–1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Agree Less/(2)</td>
<td>1.81–2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reasonably Agree/(3)</td>
<td>2.61–3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree a Lot/(4)</td>
<td>3.41–4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Totally Agree/Totally Have (5)</td>
<td>4.21–5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings

In this section, the findings regarding the research questions are presented. In Table 2, descriptive statistics of teacher opinions of the innovation management skills of school administrators are presented.

Table 2.
Teacher opinions of the innovation management skills of school administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>( \bar{x} )</th>
<th>Sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Culture and Structure</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation Strategy</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input Management</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Scale</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 2, teacher opinions of the innovation management skills of school administrators, organizational culture and structure received the highest score average (\( \bar{x}=3.29 \)), project management received the lowest score average (\( \bar{x}=3.21 \)) among the sub-dimensions, and both sub-dimensions are at the “reasonably agree” level. The average total scale scores of teachers (\( \bar{x}=3.25 \)) are similarly at the “reasonably agree” level.

In Table 3, descriptive statistics regarding teacher opinions of the organizational learning mechanisms at schools are presented.
Table 3.
Teacher opinions of organizational learning mechanisms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Learning Mechanisms</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$\bar{x}$</th>
<th>Sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Storing Information</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acquiring and Disseminating Information</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seeking Information</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analyzing Information</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Scale</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to teacher opinions of the innovation management skills of school administrators on Table 3, seeking information gained the highest score average ($\bar{x} = 3.42$), acquiring and disseminating information gained the lowest score average ($\bar{x} = 3.07$), and both sub-dimensions are at the “reasonably agree” level. The average total scale scores of teachers are similarly at the medium level ($\bar{x} = 3.27$). This indicates that according to the study participants’ opinions, the organizational learning mechanisms used at high schools are at the medium level both for sub-scales and the total scale.

Table 4 below includes the findings regarding the relationship between teacher opinions of the innovation management skills of high school administrators and organizational learning mechanisms at high schools.

Table 4.
Relationship between teacher opinions of the innovation management skills of high school administrators and organizational learning mechanisms at high schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales and Dimensions</th>
<th>Storing Information</th>
<th>Acquiring and Disseminating Information</th>
<th>Seeking Information</th>
<th>Analyzing Information</th>
<th>Learning Mechanisms Total Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>.687*</td>
<td>.740*</td>
<td>.645*</td>
<td>.608*</td>
<td>.744*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Culture and Structure</td>
<td>.617*</td>
<td>.686*</td>
<td>.594*</td>
<td>.558*</td>
<td>.669*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation Strategy</td>
<td>.662*</td>
<td>.695*</td>
<td>.611*</td>
<td>.565*</td>
<td>.703*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input Management</td>
<td>.557*</td>
<td>.642*</td>
<td>.586*</td>
<td>.511*</td>
<td>.626*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Innovation Management Scale</td>
<td>.692*</td>
<td>.745*</td>
<td>.660*</td>
<td>.610*</td>
<td>.771**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05; **p < .01
According the Spearman’s rho correlation analysis, whose results are presented in Table 4, there are several relationships between teacher opinions of the innovation management skills of school administrators and organizational learning mechanisms at high schools at the total scale level and sub-dimension levels. The correlation coefficient absolute value between 0.70 and 1.00 indicated a high relationship, 0.70–0.30 indicated a medium level relationship, and 0.30–0.00 indicated a low-level relationship (Buyukozturk, 2008).

Discussion and Conclusion

High school teacher opinions of organizational learning mechanisms at schools are medium level for the total scale and the sub-dimensions. Similarly, opinions of the innovation management skills of administrators are also at the medium level for the total scale and sub-dimensions. Study findings show that teachers in Bolu find the innovation management skills of administrators at the medium level and recognize high schools at the medium level as organizational learning mechanisms. These indicate that the innovation management skills of administrators are not at a sufficient level and that high schools are not at a satisfactory level to be regarded as organizational learning mechanisms. The results were regarded as negative for the high schools and administrators, and there were institutionally supportive results as well. When we take into account that innovation management and organizational learning are two variables that support each other, it is normal for school administrators to have medium-level innovation management skills and carry out organizational learning at a medium level. Learning and innovation should be considered together in order to enable organizational survival and development. While learning increases new ideas and the creative skills of the school and its staff, innovation provides a competitive advantage for the organization through these skills. Therefore, organizational learning is one of the pioneers of innovation (Ozdevecioğlu & Bickes, 2012). That school administrators are recognized to have insufficient innovation management skills means that teachers find administrators to be incapable of creating an innovative environment that would further foster innovations and of getting the staff to adopt or recognize these innovations. Schools are the center and initiator of innovation, the staff should constantly follow the changes and innovation, and learning teams should be formed in schools. This point should be regarded as a value and vision among schools, the staff should agree on this vision, and school administrators should take on this duty (Simsek & Yıldırım, 2004). Since schools are one of the most important institutions for human resources, school administrators should benefit from this resource in initiating and processing stages, they should create a positive environment through group work and cooperation. However, teachers found school administrators to be at medium level in using the appropriate innovation strategies and benefiting from the resources for innovations at the project management input dimension level. This shows that according to teacher opinions, administrators do not have sufficient knowledge. The reason for these teacher opinions may be due to school administrators not making many initiatives. School administrators should consider the regulations and legislations during all changes. These regulations and legislations limit the radius of
action of administrators and cause them to behave timidly. Schools should be places where the spirit of entrepreneurship and innovation prevails (Balay, 2004), and innovation is an act of taking risk. In order for school administrators to take risks on innovations, their radius of action should be expanded. Although the innovation management skills of administrators were at the medium level, Gol & Bulbul (2012) and Bulbul (2012) observed that school administrators have a sufficient level of innovation management skills. The reason for the differences in the findings may be due to the differences among groups, the culture and structure differences between schools, or the administrators having different levels of innovation management skills.

With respect to learning organizations, teacher opinions of organizational learning mechanisms in high schools are at the medium level. But in a knowledge-based society, the role of the education system is to raise learning individuals, and the role of the education administration is to make the school a learning school (Calik, 2003). It is crucial for high schools to embody this characteristic through its individuals. Graduates from these schools have a small chance to continue with higher education and therefore join society and display every feature they gain from the school in the society. The tendency to learn is a feature of both developed societies and developed organizations (Avci, 2009), and the basis for being a learning society is to have learning individuals. High schools, which have strategic importance in being learning organizations, have to create a learning culture where innovations are experienced and where workers can enhance their competencies (Mohanty & Kar, 2012). The more an organizational culture is open to learning, competition, productivity, performance, etc., the higher productivity it will have (Kathrins, 2007). No matter how much the institutional culture supports learning, some drawbacks of schools prevent them from being learning organizations. Although these drawbacks are unique for each school, in the literature these drawbacks are listed as: not predicting the problems and solutions of schools beforehand, not accepting the problems or ignoring them, insufficient resources, inconsistency with technological developments, strict hierarchy, prioritizing bureaucracy, resistance to changes, inadequate reward system, level of understanding supervision and inspection, lack of communication between workers, lack of participation in the decision making process, unwillingness to undertake responsibilities, blaming others for failure, weak leadership skills of administrators, focusing on duties, refraining from delegation of authority, lack of vision, not sharing information, preventing information to develop, dwelling too much on systems and processes in order to think strategically, expecting results to come too soon, ignoring the results when they come late, connecting people with problems, ignoring unique ideas, etc. (Arat, 1997; Barutcuğil, 2004; Kucukoglu, 2005; Diker, 2007; Yucel, 2007; Yigit, 2013; Turhan, Karabatak & Polat, 2014). In order to create a learning organization environment, administrators should have new ideas that will guide the organization, prepare the staff for learning processes, and be a model for the staff together with their team (Calik, 2003). One other reason why high schools are not regarded as efficient learning mechanisms is because mechanic organizational structures that bureaucracy and strict hierarchy introduce prevail in the public
schools. Bureaucracy and hierarchy can slow learning and in fact negatively affect it. Other studies of the Turkish education system support this finding (Güçlü & Türkoglu, 2003; Unal, 2006; Unal, 2014).

The final important result was a high level, positive, significant relationship for teacher opinions of the innovation management skills of administrators and organizational learning mechanisms at high schools. There are many studies in the literature that support this finding (Avci, 2009; DuPlesis, 2007; García, Ruiz & Llorens, 2007; Kapucu, 2012; Liao & Wu, 2010; Murat & Baki, 2011; Salim & Sulaiman, 2011; Siguaw, Simpson & Enz, 2006; Stata, 1994).

Like the other studies in the literature, this study states that there is a positive connection between organizational learning and innovation management, and one of the crucial components of organizational learning is innovation management. Therefore, a learning school is a school open to innovation and that innovates itself. Innovation encourages learning in order to carry out personal and occupational development, information sharing, and cooperation. The innovation of schools and the sustainability of their developments and success depends on their organizational innovation management skills and their effort to realize the learning organization goal (Kerman, Freundlich, Lee & Brenner, 2012). Being open to innovations depends on seeing the future, learning new techniques and methods related to work, and adapting to changing conditions. This requires schools to cooperate, develop themselves, and constantly apply innovation practices (Saritas, 2001). Schools are the center of information. At this point, all the workers of the school have a responsibility, but school administrators have major roles and responsibilities. In order to create learning organizations, school administrators should participate in creating and sharing information, they should act as leaders, and develop a school culture that will enable the school workers to adopt the school’s visions and missions.
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Özet


sonuçlara ulaşmak için gerekli olan yetenekleri sürekli geliştirmek olarak tanımlanabilmektedir.

Zaman içinde bir çok yazar, örgütsel öğrenmenin nasıl gerçekleştiği konusunda çeşitli fikirlerleri ileri sürmüşlerse de bunların büyük bir kısımı tek döngülü öğrenme ve çift döngülü öğrenme kavramları etrafında toplanmıştır. Tek döngülü öğrenme, adapte olmayı öğrenme veya alt düzey öğrenme olarak tanımlanabilmektedir. ÖrgütSEL hataların düzeltilmesi için kullanılan bu öğrenme şekli, örgütün mevcut amaç ve politikaları dahilinde gerçekleşmektedir. Tek döngülü öğrenmenin genellikle kısa dönemli, yüzeysel ve geçici olduğunu belirtmektedir. Çift döngülü öğrenme ise tek döngülü öğrenmeden farklı olarak günlük eylem ve rutinlerin altında yatan zihinsel modellerin, politikaların ve varsayımların değiştirilmesini öngörür. Çift döngülü öğrenme ise hatalarla karşılaştığında bağımlılıği ve_lotupal en träkileri olan üç döngülü öğrenme ise örgütün mevcut öğrenmesini öğrenmesi, örgüt yapısının öğrenmeye uygun hale getirilmesini anlamına gelmektedir. En azından üç döngülü öğrenme örgüt üyelerinin, kendilerinden önce örgütün mevcut öğrenmeyi engelleyen veya teşvik eden yapıların farklı var ararak öğrenme için yeni yapı ve stratejiler geliştirilmiş olabilir.

Yenilik kavramı ise var olan bir şeyde, öncekinden daha olumlu yönde değişiklikleri yapmak ve ortaya yeni bir seyler koymak olarak tanımlanabilir. Örgüt bağlamında ele alındığında ise yenilik kavramı örgütün çevreye uyum sürecinin kolaylaştırı

cih olarak alınır. Yenilik kavramını tanımlarken göz önünde bulundurulması gereken bir nokta, yeniliğin değişime karşıtılamaması gerektiğidir. Yenilik kavramının önemini artırmak için, bir alanın vurgusuna yapılarla ve geleneksel bir şekilde ürünler ve süreçler üzerine odaklanmış olumlu ve özel bir değişmedir.

Örgütlerde yenilik, tek seferde gerçekleşen bir olgu olmanın aksine bir süreci kapsayan eylemler bütünü olduğu gibi, aynı zamanda belirli prensipler çerçevesinde gerçekleşmesi gereken bir süreç ifade edilir. Örgütlerde yenilik, tek bir hamlede gerçekleşip verim alınabilen bir olgu değil, aksine iyi bir planlama ve yönetim gerektiren bir süreç gerektirmektedir. Bir diğer deyişle yenilikin kendi kendine gerçekleşmediği ve bir süreç kapaşarak gerçekleştiğinden harekete,
yeniliğin de diğer örgütsel süreçler gibi yönetilmesi gerektiğini ifade etmek yanlış olmaz.

Özetlemek gerekirse örgütlerde yenilik, hızlı bir şekilde değişiklik gösteren dünya ve çevre şartlarına uyum sağlama ve hatta bu çabın bir adımlık ve çevrenin bir parçası olarak kabul edilebilecektir. Çünkü sürekli gelişim gösteren bir ortamda yenilik, organizasyonun dünyada ve çevresel süreçlerin sürdürülmesi mümkün değildir. Diğer yandan örgütlerin yenilik girişimlerini ne yönde başlatacaklarını belirlemeleri açısından belirli bir seviyede bilgi toplamaları ve bu bilgiyi işleyerek örgüt açısından anlam ve hale getirmeleri gerekmektedir. Bu noktada da yenilik yönetimi açısından örgütlerin öğrenmesi ve bu öğrenme sürecinde kullanıkları mekanizmalar önem kazanmaktadır.
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