Teachers' Views on What Extent the Primary Schools Have the Characteristics of Learning Organizations and on Blocks

Assoc.Prof.Dr.Ahmet Üstün
Amasya University-Turkey
ahmet.ustun@amasya.edu.tr

Assist.Prof.Dr.Sabit Menteşe
Tunceli University-Turkey
sabitmentese@hotmail.com

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to determine teachers' views on what extent the schools in which they are working have the characteristics of learning organizations and the causes of blocks to becoming a Learning Organization. The research (2010 – 2011) was conducted on 214 teachers in primary schools in provincial centre of Amasya determined by simple random sampling. In this research which is a quantitative descriptive study, a questionnaire named as determination of teachers' views on to what extent the primary schools have the characteristics of learning organizations and blocks was used. As a result of the data analysis, it has been confirmed that teachers' views of primary schools in provincial centre of Amasya on the characteristics of learning organizations of the schools in which they are working are in 'mid –level' (M= 2.61-3.40 range) in three dimensions (individual, team and organizational learning). As required for today, the primary schools have to provide the highest level of the characteristics of learning organizations rather than all the other organizations. Therefore the obtained result 'mid –level' wasn't seen enough in terms of the extent that the primary schools have the characteristics of learning organizations. Likewise it is also noteworthy that there are so many blocks of learning organization. Local institutions and organizations including the Ministry of Education must take the necessary measures by investigating deeply the issues that have been in the primary schools to become a learning organization.

Keywords: Primary Schools, Teachers Organizational learning, learning organization, block of learning organization

INTRODUCTION

The approach that has features of the era of the information society, develops itself continuously, allows its personnel to adapt and is referred to as "learning organizations." In learning organizations, the learning activity is spread over all the channels of the organization. In the face of rapid changes and innovations, it is not enough, that only top managers' learning in an organization want to be successful. Employees of the organization also need continuous learning both in individual dimension and as a team/group (Şimşek, 1999). The concept of 'organization' firstly used by Chris Argyris and Donald Alan Schön from Harvard University in the 1960's, is described as a 'process of detection of errors identified' (Argryris & Schon, 1978, p.78). It was became a contemporary application in which the organizations are interested after a work named 'Fifty Discipline' published by Peter Senge in 1960 and translated into the Turkish language as 'Beşinci Disiplin' in which thinking and practice of learning organization are explained took place in the literature. According to Senge,

learning organizations continuously develop their capacity to create the desired results, and feed new ways of thoughts, not restrain individual aspirations, and how people learn together (Senge, 1993). Naktiyok (2003) defined organizations that start from individual learning then continue with group-level dimension learning and result in ongoing learning organization as the process of the "knowledge creation, sharing this information, and use this information to exchange for new ideas" (Naktiyok, 2003, p. 203).

In their studies, McGill and Slocum (1993) made parallel determinations with the development of management science studies to the development of learning organizations and the development of learning organizations are examined in four steps. These steps are; Knowing Organizations, Understanding Organizations, Thinking Organizations and Learning Organizations (McGill & Slocum, 1993). The following table shows the development stages of the learning organization:

Table 1: The Development Steps of Learning Organizations

Knowing Organizations	There is only one way the best of each place, and circumstances
Understanding Organizations	Understand the value of the organization, provide application and check it.
Thinking Organizations	Repair quickly if it is damaged but don't think for reasons.
Learning Organizations	Learn more at every opportunity

(Source: McGill ve Slocum, 1993; tra: Karahan ve Yılmaz, 2010)

Learning organization is likened to the three-digit pyramid. The base of this pyramid is individual learning, team learning is in the middle, and organizational learning is located on the top (Garvin, 1997).The first of these is to create a learning individual. The second step is to create a learning team and the last step is to create a learning organization. If there is no individual learning, working together, sharing of information or creation of information, it is impossible to say that this organization is a learning organization (Atak & Atik, 2007). Some of the features required of learners working as an individual in organizations:

- Do not see learning as an instantaneous event, see it as a continuing process of continuous and see that life-long learning is necessary and required.
- Ready for the future and be open to new ideas, be sensitive about communication with the environment,
- Continuously improve the capacity of the organization in order to be successful. Share your knowledge and experience with other employees,
- Heed new thoughts,
- Being open to change and being in harmony with other employees,
- Support the courses and seminars in service training and participate in activities.
- Express their thoughts without fear of losing their job and grasp the strategic vision.

Without having these features, neither it is possible to be a learning individual nor could an individual contribute to the organization. A real sense of learning can be achieved with a team / group of employees' learning together. What is important here is

79

people's understanding and knowing each other through the dialogue, not debate (Yalçın & Ay, 2011).

When teams learn, learning organizations develop quickly and they get outstanding results. The discipline of learning as a team starts with dialogue. This, together with team members takes action to suspend assumptions and enter the real thinking capacity (Çam, 2002).

In learning organizations, works are known to be made as a team rather than individually. For this reason, it is important teams being learning in learning organizations (Toprakci, 2013). Team or group work is a set of activities with a certain number of workers that come together for certain purposes and achieve the aims of the organization, solve problems and efforts to change the organization for execution in a certain time of period (Elma, 2000). Teams' becoming learning team and because of these features, in order to contribute organizations to becoming a learning organization, they need to have some features that are as follows:

• In order to become their institutions a learning organization, the team gives the necessary importance to their learning.
• Assumptions and prejudices are set aside in team learning.
• Channels of communication are constantly open in a team.
• A team uses democratic participation until the end.
• Group shows problem-solving, conciliation, decision making, meeting management, conflict management, dialogue, and research and thinking behaviors.
• The team/ group does not hesitate to applying new ideas related to their fields or take risks.
• Share the responsibility.

80

In order to become organizations, organizational learning is also required. Organizational learning refers to a process that begins from the individual level to team / group learning and to learning organization as a whole (Probst & Büchel, 1997). Organizational learning takes place under three titles: one-way learning, two-way learning and learning how to learn. In one way learning, organization members find errors and correct them, react to changes in their environment and they also maintain current organizational norms. This learning level does not stimulate to any thinking or questioning. In single-loop learning, the focus is to solve current problems, problem-generating behaviors or understanding left without investigating (Karabulut, 2012). In two-way learning/ Bi-directional learning, changing the organization's knowledge base, expertise and routines gains importance. Thus, the problem solvers, not only solve the existing problem, but also they examine broadly the causal factors associated with it (Arat, 1997). In learning to learn, members of the organization think about learning or previous examples of learning failures and query them. Focusing on the process of learning, they discover what facilitates or inhibits the learning. They produce new learning strategies (Yazıcı, 2001, p.115). In order to be an organizational learning; the organization must have the following properties:

• It has a common vision.

- Continuous researches are made for Organizational changes and developments; a private team is created specifically for this.
- Staffs are kept sensitive to changes and developments, the necessary measures are taken for this.
- Personnel are subject to constant education related with changes and development.
- Explores change points to resistance, along with reasons.
- Opposing views of the business man are listened to and taken into account.
- All kinds of organizational developments and changes are considered to be an opportunity for success.
- The necessary attention is given to Research & Development surveys.
- Ideas, opinions and information of new attendees who participate in an organization are listened to.

Schools as educational institutions have to be a multi-functional structure that gives confidence to people with teamwork, schools are constantly open to new ideas where knowledge is produced, used and developed and schools are places that new informational needs of society are met; schools have to   develop original and creative thinking of students and they should be available for use at any time of day. Accordingly, the school culture created by the information society, it will be necessary teachers' taking on new roles and tasks. (Numanoğlu, 1999). Schools with the concept of learning organization have engaged in an effort to convert them from the traditional "teaching school," to the "learning school". Learning schools are not places where "teaching activity" is at forefront; on the contrary schools are places where 'learning activity' is at forefront. According to Fındıkçı (1996) and Basaran (2000), the learning school;

- Clearly identifies the expected learning and has vision for the purposes mentioned.
- Creates a culture of change
- Tends to the development of staffs and supports staffs.
- In the process of social change it performs the correct service.
- Collaborates with different groups and refreshes the structure of the organization.
- By taking feedback from the outputs of the production process, works continuously to improve and renew.

First of all, in order for schools to become learning the schools, school's old organizational culture needs to be replaced with a new one. Without changing the traditional school culture, it is not possible to convert the schools into a learning organization. However, it should not be estimated that the school is an important factor that affects the behavior of the culture. For this reason, the culture of a school is also benefited (Erdoğan, 1987). In order to provide transformation of the school and carry out schools becoming a learning place; a structure is created to make the allocation of time to learning and school culture which is based on a case of editing and learning for learning errors and finally to adopt forward-looking rather than retroactive learning, to make learning a rewarding structure . In to convert a school into a learning organization,

81

in-service training activities should take place in different ways, more varied and learning must be provided at the level of the individual, team, and school (Erdoğan, 1987). It can not be expected to a school, teachers and administrators that fail to apply organizational learning be effective. The basic mission of a school is to produce and spread information and administers of schools are obliged to activate these functions. Therefore, creating a learning school and community should be the basic vision of the education system. The school manager has to be a leader manager who designs, forms and creates a learning environment (Yazıcı, 2000).

Schools becoming learning organizations depend on teachers to develop themselves. However, Senge indicates that organizations learn through learned individuals (Senge, 1993). Balay (2004), the organization's reaching a state of organizational learning can take place with three possibilities. The first possibility is individual learning; the second possibility is that individuals' learning together with learning organizations and collective learning takes place in the third probability (Balay, 2004). According to Fındıkçı (1996) self development, in fact, is a learning process. Self-realization is that individuals' being open to new information and making an effort in acquiring them. In addition to this, it is associated with innovation and being open to changing and it takes responsibility of education. According to Çiftçi and Yılmaz (2004), graduated teachers' information remains the same that it is highly in decline, information can wear out and, therefore, it is emphasized that provision of equipment based on new information and developments is important.

It is not different to learn in the school as an educational institution. Schools can become a learning organization but this requires a significant learning environment and conditions, depends on the creation of substructures. It seems possible to become a learning organization by improving technical information, the capacity of teachers, administers and staffs; it can be possible to learn by keeping track of what's new in their fields.

82

In this study, the level of teachers working in primary schools in provincial centre of Amasya and their participation in the characteristics of learning organizations is identified. For this purpose, the following sub-problems are word choice searched to:

1. According to the characteristics of learning organizations of teachers' institutions / schools
    1.1. The individual dimension,
    1.2. Team / Group dimension,
    1.3. Organizational learning-dimension dimension specifications,
    1.4. What is the level of participation in the dimension of reasons that block becoming a learning organization?

2. The level of teachers' participation in characteristics of learning organizations in their institutions and reasons that block to become a learning organization;
    2.1. Gender
    2.2. Branch and
    2.3. Significant difference according to the duration of service

METHOD

Population and Sample

The research was carried out according to a descriptive scanning model. Universe of study is composed in the 2010-2011 academic year, in 18 primary schools in provincial centre of Amasya. And the sample is consisted of randomly selected 214 teachers working in 9 primary schools. According to the sampling rate, the number of schools represents the universe is 50%, number of teachers represent the universe is 42%. The simple random sample (Simple Probability Sampling) is an extraction individuals and objects are not entered the sample (Aziz, 1994).

Data Collection Instrument

Data collection instrument is a questionnaire named as 'determination of teachers' views on what extent the primary schools have the characteristics of learning organizations and blocks' developed by the researchers. Data collection instrument was generated in accordance with measuring instruments used in similar researches and expert opinions and made up of three parts. The first part consist of questions relevant personal variables; the second part consists of three dimensions which are examined the necessary characteristics of teachers representing learning organizations; individuals (25 questions), the team (18 questions) and organizational learning dimensions (20 questions). In the third part (14 questions) are included about reasons that block to becoming a learning organization.

The validity and reliability of the test were analyzed. As well as a specialist's notion, factor analysis is applied in order to determine the structural validity scales used in research. Items which provided load factor value of 0.45 and more than 0.45 were taken to scale. Load factor values of 0.45 and more than 0.45 are a good choice for scale. However, this value can be down till 0.30 in practice (Büyüköztürk, 2006). In the result of factor analysis, it has been retained that in second part, 25 items which are in the first sub-scale, individual dimension, provided load factor value between 0.612 and 0.838 and explained the total variance % 66.207. It has been seen that 18 items which are in the second sub-scale, team dimension, provided load factor value between 0.626 and 0.796 and explained the total variance %68.341. It has been seen that 20 items which are in the third sub-scale, organizational learning dimension, provided load factor value between 0.581 and 0.719 and explained the total variance %66.122. In third part, in 'reasons that block to becoming a learning organization'' dimension, there are 14 items in total. It has been seen that load factor values of these items change between 0.558 and 0.866. They explained the variance %65.186 (Table 2).

Apart from this, the item-test correlation was calculated (item discriminatory power index) (Table 2). In order to calculate reliability, the confidence coefficient of Cronbach's Alpha (internal consistency) was calculated for all of the sub-dimensions of the scale. Accordingly with the dimensions and the items of each dimension Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient are given in table 2. When Table 2 is examined, 25 items of the first sub-dimension: for the characteristics of individual learning organization, Alpha value was calculated .965 in individual dimension, .951 in the team dimension and .953, in organizational learning dimension and .979 for all of the value. For items

(N: 14) that block to becoming learning organisation which are in the third part of the questionnaire Alpha value was calculated .931. According to the results of the factor analysis of the scale, the item which provides lowest load factor value is 0.466 and the item which provides highest load factor value is .0771; the variance that they explained concerning the scale is 75,341%. Accordingly, it has been observed that of the total variance and the majority of variation concerning the scale was explained

Table 2: Reliability of Items; Dimensions of Individual, Team, Organizations and Reasons That Blocks to Becoming a Learning Organization

Dimensions of Learning	The Number of Items	load factor value lowest - highest	Explained variance (%)	Cronbach's Alpha
Individual	25	0.612 - 0.838	66.207	,965
Team/Group	18	0.626 - 0.796	68.341	,951
Organizational Learning	20	0.581 - 0.719	66.122	,953
Individual/Team/Organizational Learning Together	63	0.466-0.771	75.187	,979
Causes of block	14	0.558 - 0.866	65.186'dır	,931

Kaiser-Meler-Olkin (KMO): .890 and Barlett test 16609.003 and sig. .000 was significant.

In this study which determines the level of teachers' participation in characteristics of the learning organization in their schools and reasons that block to be a learning organization the five-point Likert-type scale is used. Rating of the choices consists of "I Agree", "I don't agree", "little Agree",'Agree, 'and "completely agree". In order to do the analysis on these options, respectively, are given numerical values from 1 to 5. Arithmetic average rating for a range; (5-1 = 4) according to the calculated interval coefficient is (4/5 = 0.80) option ranges. Accordingly, the ranges 1.00-1.80 (poor), 1.81-2.60 (low-level), 2.61-3.40 (mid-level), 3:41 to 4:20 (high-level), and 4:21 to 5:00 (top-level) is determined as. Alpha =. 05. is based on in significance tests.

Analysis and Interpretation of data

In this study, major and minor problems with the data obtained for the problem, which has been stated in the descriptive statistics are expressed in tables. In addition, the personal information about the sampling results extractor based on the statistical methods that allow broader generalizations, t-test and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) are performed and interpreted. Cross-group comparisons are based on the Alpha=0.05 significance level.

FINDINGS AND COMMENTS

In Table 3, Teachers in the study group consisted of 53.3% female and 46.7% male. Teachers in the study group (33.6%) consiste of grade (classroom) , 8.4% of Pre-School, 8.4% of Science, 7.9% of Turkish, 7.0% of Social Studies and the rate of the other teachers who participated in the research is 28.5%. Primary school teachers, other branches; Religious culture and Moral knowledge, Art, music, foreign language,

84

professional and technical education, guidance, etc. are those branches. When examined the service duration of the vast majority of teachers participating in the study, it seems that they have a professional between 6-10 years seniority (service times). These are the teachers having significant experience means that they are significantly acquaintances with their institutions. 27.6% of teachers have over 16 years seniority or duration of service, 22.4% of 11-15 year duration of service and 16.4% have 1-5 years duration of service.

Table 3: Distribution of Teachers according to the various Properties within the scope of the Research (*n*=214)

Specifications		Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender	Female	114	53,3
	Male	100	46,7
Branch	Preschool	18	8,4
	Grade Teacher	72	33,6
	Science	18	8,4
	Social Studies	15	7,0
	Turkish	17	7,9
	Math	13	6,1
	Other	61	28,5
Period of Service	6–10 Years	72	33,6
	11–15 Years	48	22,4
	16+Years	59	27,6

1. **The characteristics of learning organizations of the institutions in which Teachers work:**

1.1. The individual dimension,

1.2. Team / Team dimension,

1.3. Organizational learning-dimension specifications,

1.4. What is the level of participation in the dimension of reasons to become a learning organization?

1. 1. **Levels of participation in the dimension of the individual characteristics of a learning organization**

In recent years, continuous learning is spoken and discussed on how to create learning organizations (Money et. al, 2000). Research studies have shown that becoming a learning organization passes through individuals significantly (Bozkurt, 2000). In other words, these intermediate organizations and schools' becoming a learning organization depend on having some features in the individual dimension. In order to turn them into a learning organization, firstly, organizations need to accept that they are organizations that they do not learn (not learning organizations) (Arat, 1997).

Creating a learning organization requires a change in many areas. These are strong leadership, vision, empowering a team-based structure, personnel, information technology, a participatory strategy and organization culture (Lussier, 2006). Tuna and Çakırerk (2008) in their research concluded that individual willingness to have an

important role in the learning organization. "Learning organization that allow all members of the learning organization facilitates and transforms itself continuously" (Balay, 2004, p.15). These organizations should able to solve the problems of the employees who want to take responsibility for themselves as individuals, open to learning and so the organizations encourage them with the necessary learning environment and encourage them about learning (Arat, 1997).

Table 4: Teachers' view on the dimension of characteristics of the learning organizations related to the individual dimension (*n*=214)

Series No	Poll Question Materials / Individual Dimension	M	SD	TotalScore Averages
1	They see learning as an ongoing process, not an instant event	3,53	1,09	
2	They see necessary and mandatory life long learning.	3,11	1,17	
3	They constantly read, argue with their friends and explore.	3,15	1,14	
4	They make preparations for the future and they are open to new ideas.	3,25	1,07	
5	They seriously examine the new developments in the field and they see correcting the shortcomings as an opportunity.	3,28	1,13	
6	They do not reject new developments.	3,41	1,02	
7	They are sensitive to environmental communications.	3,16	1,07	
8	They continuously increase their capacity to become successful.	3,34	1,03	
9	They care about new ideas	3,33	1,09	
10	They share their experiences and knowledge with other personals.	3,30	1,12	
11	They show desire and effort to learn and use new technologies, they do not hesitate to try	3,26	1,10	3,21
12	Employees of the organization believe that it is necessary and obligatory to continuously improve themselves for the future of their organizations	3,38	1,08	
13	They are in harmony with other employees and open to change.	3,26	1,18	
14	They do not find right this view 'It came like this, goes like this'	3,34	1,07	
15	In-service training, they attend courses, seminars, and so, they support the activities.	3,00	1,14	
16	They clearly say their thoughts without fear of losing their job.	3,28	1,14	
17	There is no problem of trust between them and other staff.	3,27	1,07	
18	Staffs help each other about learning.	3,05	1,09	
19	Each individual grasp strategic vision.	3,11	1,15	
20	They volunteer to participate in the new learning events.	3,22	1,04	
21	Personal learning goals are compatible with the purposes of the organization.	3,05	1,13	
22	They track the books on the subject and professional magazines, etc…	3,04	1,01	
23	They talk with other people about what they do and learn.	2,97	1,17	
24	By following trends, they make estimations.	3,07	1,17	
25	Most of the staff believe that there is a certain amount of risk in learning.	3,18	1,18	

In Table 4 teachers' assessments on the dimension of learning are examined. According to the teachers' schools/ institutions in which they work "Individual Dimension" is located in, items / statements according to the average score (total score), they have learning organization characteristics "mid-level" (M = 2.61-3.40) namely , they don't have them in a sufficient level. Schools in which they work "individual learning dimension" (individual dimension) the 25 property (Table 4) are examined every one of the teachers' levels of participation in and M = 3.53 averaging "Learning is not an instantaneous event, acts as a continuous process" has been participated in the highest level of expression. The lowest level, with an average of 2.97" they participated the idea of 'They talk with many people about what they do and learn'.

There are research studies that show levels of private and public organizations' having properties of a learning organization and the dimension of becoming learning organization. This research is an important segment that shows the most of the private business organizations have characteristics of learning organization according to the findings.

However, public organizations do not possess the same level of features of a learning organization. Sedat and Yıldız (2011) works support these findings. This study shows that private schools have the characteristics of a learning organization above the average, whereas the public schools do not have the characteristics of a learning organization in a sufficient level (Yumuşak & Yıldız, 2011). Indeed, Arslantaş and Dikmenli (2007)'s researches on the 47 business is similar direction, too. According to Arslantaş and Dikmenli's findings, 38 (80%) of these organizations carry features of learning organizations (Arslantaş & Dikmenli, 2007). A similar study conducted by Elbeyi (2010) and his friends. Elbeyi and his colleagues in their works concluded that private business organizations' employees see their business as an organization. This is understood from the arithmetic averages of the total also. Indeed, the average value of the total points is over than 4.50 (I completely agree) over (Elbeyi et. al., 2010). This value refers to the level of participation in a high quality according to 5-point likert scale value.

87

1. 2. Levels of Participation in Characteristics of Learning Organization Participation in Team /Group Dimension

Continuous learning is and learning as a team an important aspect of learning that is to be aware of the new changes and the development. In-service training, in order to know and to be informed of these developments and most importantly for the development of human resources is to participate in all educational activities. At the learning organizations, learning is the level of the second-level group/team learning. What is meant here, people who have learned on a personal level share what they have learned, interpret together and get a group? Without group learning, it can not be said that learning is at the level of organizational learning (Koel 2007). According to Willard (1994) for the formation of organizational learning, the organization of a culture of team work is required. To do this, teams need to apply the practices of dialogue and discussion. The research made by Yilmaz (2005), "Working Teams / groups, group

discussions, as a result of collecting information or argue about different ideas" statement is received the highest average, the lowest average has been the same expression in this study.

Table 5: Teachers' Participation to the "Team / Group Dimension Properties in their Institutions (*n*= 214)

Series No	Poll Question Materials / Individual Dimension	*M*	SD	Total Score Averages
1	To become the institution's learning organization, the team gives the necessary importance to their learning in itself	3,14	1,03	
2	Assumptions and prejudices are set aside in team learning.	3,07	1,14	
3	Communication channels are always open in team	3,14	1,16	
4	The team/ group its own uses democratic participation until the end.	3,19	1,02	
5	Team / Group show the behavior of problem solving, mediation, decision-making, meeting management, conflict management, research of dialogue.	3,23	1,06	
6	Team / Group do not hesitate to implementing new ideas related to the fields, take risk.	**3,04**	**1,19**	
7	Shares responsibility.	3,12	1,08	
8	Gives importance to their own individual learning.	3,18	,98	
9	Keeps track of the latest technological developments.	3,14	1,02	
10	Channels of communication are open within the group.	**3,32**	**,96**	
11	Group/Team discussions are seen as an emergence of different perspectives.	3,15	1,04	**3,18**
12	The teams are open to learning other than themselves.	3,08	1,04	
13	Team / Group have a common feeling.	3,12	1,00	
14	It is the formation of new ideas.	3,21	,99	
15	In order to achieve the desired goal, they constantly increase their capacities..	3,21	1,09	
16	Shares the new information in own.	3,21	,98	
17	Team / Group clearly express their opinions and suggestions.	3,31	1,01	
18	They participate in all educational activities related with development of human resources and support them.	3,29	1,09	

Teachers' institutions in which they work levels of school "team / group dimension" participation in a learning organizations' characteristics are given in Table 5. Examined in table 5, the "team/group Dimension", the average score of expressions according to the values of the items/(total Score Averages), teachers carry learning organization characteristics of the schools in which they work, with an average of 3.18 "mid-level" , in other words, (*M* = 2.61-3.40 range) just do not possess enough level of characteristics of a learning organization. When team / group learning organization's 18 characteristics dimension examined, an average of 3.18 with the highest average expression "open channels of communication within the group" appears to be.

Communication is the source of life in the organization; it is like blood that circulates the entire body. Open to every aspect of vertical and horizontal communication channels, in order to work as a team, in addition to exchanging

information and be aware of what is happening is essential. The second-highest level of "human resources is involved in all educational activities and support to develop" statement has been accepted by an average of 3.29.

Team / Team dimensions is the lowest average with 3.04 "Team don't hesitate to implementing new ideas related to the fields, take risk" is stated. Accordingly, teachers state that the lowest level is learning as a team in their fields with respect to the application of the new thoughts. Take the risk of application of new ideas is seen an important input of learning and development. Without taking risk, provision of development is not possible.

1. 3. Participation Levels of Learning Organization Characteristics and the dimension of Organizational Learning.

Organizational learning is not without individual learning, however, individual learning is necessary for organization learning but it is not a sufficient condition (Garvin, 1997). Organizational learning is different from the individual actions. Products which are produced with a detailed division of labor, it can not be said that the product produced by a single person (Yanov, 2000). Similarly, organizational learning is not something that occurs in individual learning. It is a product that results from actions (learning) of members of organization (İpek, 2004). In a learning organization that occurs as a result of organizational learning, everyone makes efforts to identify and solve problems for the continuous development. Therefore, this tour is the foundation of an organization that is based on finding and solving problems and takes the necessary measures to avoid repetition of problems. Therefore, all employees have undertaken task of identifying and resolving problems.

89

Table 6 shows, According to "Organizational Learning Dimension" 's substances / expressions the average score (total score), teachers carry learning organization characteristics of the schools in which they work, with an average of 3.01 "mid-level", in other words, ($M = 2.61$-3.40 range) is not enough lever for learning organization properties. When the expressions in the dimension of "organizational learning" examined, with an average of 2.42 "learning lessons are given to all employees" expression has the highest average. When it is viewed in terms of the Organization's employees, in service courses are a dimension of it. In-service courses are effective in terms of learning new developments. For this reason, institutions subject their personals to in- service training courses.

'A system used to measure the difference between current performance and expected performance.' statement has the lowest average with an average of 1.27 in organizational learning. That is, they use a system which measures the difference between current performance and expected performance. Organizations have purposes such as; to determine the duties and responsibilities in organizations, to measure the performance of employees, to make wage adjustments, to determine the elevations and learning needs, to improve and strengthen communication. As can be seen, performance assessment is to control and make evolution in organizations. It doesn't seem possible to maintain their existence, if organizations don't systematically do control and evolution.

Table 6: Participation Levels of Learning Organization Characteristics in the dimension of Organizational Learning (N=214)

Series No	Poll Question Materials / Individual Dimension	*M*	SD	Total Scores Averages
1	They have a common vision.	3,01	1,12	
2	Continuous researches are made for Organizational changes and developments; a private team is created specifically for this.	2,95	1,11	
3	Staff is kept sensitive to changes and developments, the necessary measures are taken for this.	2,94	,96	
4	Every kind of change and development are seen as an opportunity for organizations.	3,07	1,02	
5	Personnel are subject to constant education related with changes and development.	2,95	1,04	
6	Business man's opposite views are listened and take into serious account.	2,97	1,07	
7	Explores change points to resistance along with reasons.	2,77	1,05	
8	Management / top management is open to changes and developments.	2,89	1,01	
9	Research & Development surveys are given the necessary attention and they keep tracks of them.	3,07	1,03	
10	New changes/ approaches/ developments are discussed at the highest level.	3,12	1,08	
11	In a participatory manner, they prepare practice activities and theory related with new changes and developments.	2,99	1,08	
12	Shares organizational changes and developments, organizes information events.	2,98	1,11	**3,01**
13	A strong horizontal relationship is provided within the group.	3,02	1,20	
14	A sense of we is provided among the staff.	3,05	1,15	
15	The required attention is given to r&d researches.	3,08	1,02	
16	Monitoring and evolution is made systematically.	3,11	1,12	
17	In addition to managing the change, the organization takes the necessary measures to ensure that the environment is also open to the change.	2,95	1,12	
18	Create an atmosphere for staff to learn together.	3,04	1,11	
19	Communication channels within the organization are constantly open and exchanging of information horizontally and vertically circulate unimpeded.	3,00	1,09	
20	Ideas, opinions and knowledge of new attendees are used.	3,08	1,15	

Matin, Jandaghi and Moini (2007) according to the results of similar research they do, there is a meaningful difference between foundation and public schools. In terms of the entire specified dimensions foundation schools have produced high levels of organizational learning level than public schools. When teachers working in primary schools located in the organizational learning dimension within the average of the highest and lowest 20 question statements are examined, "The new changes / developments /approaches discussed at the highest level" statement is viewed as having the highest average by 3.12. Teachers see very important the discussions of the problems at the highest level fort he learning organizations. The statement 'Monitoring

and evolution are made systematically' has been accepted the second highest level with the average of 3.11. Indeed, researches show that controlling and evolution make a school an important variable. They agree about the statement 'Search for resistance against change with its reasons' at the lowest level with the average of 2.77. This also has great importance on the basis of obstacles that prevent schools becoming learning organizations. Because in order to organizations become a learning organization, it still depends on open to change and not to show resistance to change. Effective development and innovation in an organization depend on how people prepare for change and how they response that. West-Burnham (1991) stresses that it is possible to manage change in organizations by individual' learning how to learn in an atmosphere of the organization as a whole, improve communication skills (Töremen, 2002).

The most important characteristic of learning organizations is sensivity of responding to change. The need for change shall be determined in terms of both product and organization. According to Wilms (1998), in times of change, organizations are becoming both the learner and teacher. (Participation Levels of Learning Organization Characteristics are given in Table 6.)

1. 4. The Participation Dimension of The Reasons that block becoming a Learning Organization

Table 7: Teachers' Participation Ratings To Reasons that blocks to Their Institutions Become A Learning Organizations (N=214)

Series No	Poll Question Materials	*M*	SD	TotalScores Averages
1	Not to accept the problem.	2,53	1,28	
2	See the problem but ignore the problem.	2,44	1,22	
3	Not to share the information.	2,30	1,08	
4	Not to associate events/problems	2,35	1,18	
5	Blocking the production of information.	2,15	1,08	
6	Stuck with events.	2,42	1,21	
7	Search for the enemy outside.	2,50	1,27	
8	Lack of desire for individual learning.	2,45	1,32	
9	The lack of appropriate work environments for team/group.	2,35	1,16	**3,21**
10	Not be open to change and development of culture in the organization.	2,50	1,27	
11	Low level of using of technology	2,26	1,20	
12	Failure to provide continued education.	2,47	1,23	
13	The lack of a sufficient incentive system.	2,49	1,25	
14	The manager form of management is not appropriate to bring the institution the state of the learning organization.	2,68	1,10	

The Participation Dimension of The Reasons that block becoming Learning Organization is given in table 7. Accordingly, at the highest level "management form of government is not the appropriate institution to bring the state of the learning organization" with an average 2,68 is seen as a barrier to organizations become the learning organization. Indeed, top management in learning organizations is a significant

91

change and learning actor. As evidenced by the researches related to the top management, top management forms often an obstacle to change and development. Especially, this situation is seen more apparent in public organizations. If there is a change, there is also a resistance of top management to change. Indeed, in similar studies on educational organizations, while the causes of change in terms of learning are "Environmental Pressures, communication disorders in school, Impairment, crisis and conflict at school, School Performance, School Culture Changes, Changing laws and Regulations, Technological changes; barriers to change are determined as "to be satisfied with the situation, the lack of sufficient staff for changing, resistance to change, lack of a leader, to have a lot of change " (Töremen, 2002).

2. **Teachers' having individual, team and organizational learning task dimensions properties and barriers to learning scores;**
   2.1. Gender,
   2.2. Branch and
   2.3. Is there a significant difference according to the duration of service?

2.1. **Teachers' having 'individual, team and organizational learning task dimensions properties and obstacles to learning scores, the result of t-test according to gender is shown in table 8.**

Teachers' having 'individual, team and organizational learning task dimensions properties and barriers to learning scores do not show a significant difference according to gender: The dimension of the individual [t(212)= ,062, p>.05]; the dimension of the team/group [t(212)= ,592>p.05]; the dimension of the organizational learning [t(212)= ,911, ,p>.05] and the dimension of the obstacle causes [t(212)= -1,119, p>.05].

92

Table 8: The result of t-test according to gender related with dimensions of indiviual, team and organizational learning.

Dimension	Gender	*n*	*M*	S	SD	t	P
Individual	Female	100	80,54	20,64	212	,062	,951
	Male	114	80,37	20,47			
Team/Group	Female	100	56,76	13,93	212	.537	,592
	Male	114	57,80	14,25			
Organization al learning	Female	100	60,01	15,20	212	.112	,911
	Male	114	60,26	16,51			
Barriers	Female	114	33,07	11,64	212	1,11	,264
	Male	100	34,96	13,05			

2.2. **Teachers' having 'individual, team and organizational learning task dimensions properties and barriers to learning scores, the result of ANOVA according to branch are given in table 9.**

The result of analysis, while there is a significant difference in the dimension of individual scores according to branches [*F*(6,207)=2,571, *p*<.05).]; team/group [6,207=,520,*p*=792>.05]; organizational learning [*F*(6,207)=1.444,*p*=.199>.005] and there is not a significant difference in the dimension of obstacles to learn. [*F*(6,207)=1.4166, *p*=.326>.05]. In other words, the participants / teachers' institutions

in which they work, the individual dimension scores vary depending on the branches. In order to find the difference between the branches, Scheffe test is made, according to its result, "individual dimension" class teachers (M=75.50) with Turkish teachers (M=77.00) have more negative views than other branch teachers.

Table 9: The result of ANOVA according to branch that related with the dimensions of individual, team and organizational learning.

Dimensions	Source of variance	Sum of squares	*df*	Squares mean/Average	F	p
Individual	Intergroups	6218,796	6	1036,466	2,571	,020
	In groups	83454,405	207	403,161		
	Total	89673,201	213			
Team/group	Intergroups	626,238	6	104,373	,520	,792
	In groups	41513,635	207	200,549		
	Total	42139,874	213			
Organizational Learning	Intergroups	2132,927	6	355,488	1,444	,199
	In groups	50977,409	207	246,268		
	Total	53110,336	213			
Barriers	Intergroups	1058,705	6	176,451	1,166	,326
	In groups	31330,828	207	151,357		
	Total	32389,533	213			

2.3. Teachers' having 'individual, team and organizational learning task dimensions properties and barriers to learning scores, the result of ANOVA according to duration of service are given in table 10.

The result of analysis (see Table 10), in institutions that teachers work individual [t(3-210)= ,164, p=.920>.05]; team [3,210=,164, p=,920>.05]; organizational learning [F(3,210)=.731 p=.535>.005] and the dimension of obstacles to learn [F(3,210)=.445, p=.721>.005] scores don't indicate a significant difference according to the duration of service.

Table 10: The result of ANOVA according to duration of service related with dimensions of indiviual, team and organizational learning

Dimensions	Source of variance	Sum of squares	*df*	Squares Mean/Average	F	p
Individual	Intergroups	317,476	3	105,825	,249	,862
	In groups	89355,725	210	425,503		
	Total	89673,201	213			
Team/Group	Intergroups	98,625	3	32,875	,164	,920
	In groups	42041,249	210	200,196		
	Total	42139,874	213			
Organizational Learning	Intergroups	548,741	3	182,914	,731	,535
	In groups	52561,595	210	250,293		
	Total	53110,336	213			
Obstacles	Intergroups	204,707	3	68,236		
	In groups	32184,825	210	153,261	,445	,721
	Total	32389,533	213			

93

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

All organizations are required to become a learning organization. It also includes educational organizations. The information age makes it mandatory. The information age schools are schools that have already completed the evaluation of being learning schools (Johnson, 1996).

According to Kış and Konan (2010), 20th century schools reveal that they are inadequate to answering questions of the 21st century and schools are required to have new characteristics to sustain their existences (Kış ve Konan, 2010), Demirci and Aydemir's (2006) studies also gave a result in this direction. When compared private businesses with public organizations, private businesses have more characteristics of learning organizations than public organizations.

In this study, levels of schools carrying characteristics of the learning organizations and according to teachers' perception to the dimension of individual, team and learning organizational are discussed and it is identified that the level of primary schools carrying characteristics of learning organizations is not enough. According to the total scores average with all dimensions, remain with the range (2.61-3.40), with an average of (M=3.13) 'mid-level' participation and this level is not sufficient in terms of educational organizations' showing the characteristics of the learning organization. Teachers also participate in 'mid-level' to the obstacles to become schools' learning organizations. (M =3.2185).

Analysis of the data by separating each group, in other words, it is understood that teachers participation in the their schools' becoming a learning organization individual dimension (M =3.22); team/group dimension (M =3.18); organizational learning dimension (M =3.00) and obstacles to learn dimension(M =3.22) is 'mid-level'.

Levels of schools carrying characteristics of the learning organizations and according to teachers' perception to the dimension of individual "Learning is not an instantaneous event, see it as a continuous process" feature with 3.53 average and with 1.09 standard deviation carries the highest level; while with 2,97 average and with 1,17851 standard deviation , the statement " They talk with people about what they do and learn" carries the lowest level is identified.

Levels of schools carrying characteristics of the learning organizations and according to teachers' perception to the dimension of team/group "Teams/groups do not hesitate to apply new ideas about their fields or take risks" feature with 3.04 average and with 1.19 standard deviation carries the highest level ; while with 3,04 average and with 1,19 standard deviation the statement "Teams/groups hesitate to apply new ideas about their fields or do not take risks" carries the lowest level identified.

Levels of schools carrying characteristics of the learning organizations and according to teachers' perception to the dimension of organizational learning "New changes/approaches and developments are discussed at the highest level' feature with 3.12 average and with 1.18 standard deviation carries the highest level ; while with 2,77 average and with 1,05 standard deviation the statement "search for the resistance to change along with its reasons, take risk" carries the lowest level is identified.

94

Levels of schools carrying characteristics of the learning organizations and according to teachers' perception to the dimension of obstacles to learn "The manager form of management is not appropriate to bring the institution the state of the learning organization" feature with 2,68 average and with 1,10 standard deviation carries the highest level; while with 2,15 average and with 1,18 standard deviation the statement "Blocking the production of information" carries the lowest level is identified.

As a result, in the information age, educational organizations need to stay out of the discussion issues about becoming learning organizations. However, most public research shows that most of public organizations still don't have the required organization characteristics and especially this, in terms of educational institutions, is seen as a negative situation.

What needs to be done is that with a broad and comprehensive perspective, in terms of education organizations' system perspective, to investigate the conditions that cause to be a learning organization and the necessary measures must be taken immediately.

References

Açıkalın, A. (1994). *Çağdaş Örgütlerde İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi*, Ankara, Turkey: Pegem A Yayıncılık.

Arat, M. (1997). "Şirketler Neden Öğrenemez". *Power*, 4.

Argryrıs, C. ve . Schon , D. A. (1978). *Organizational Learning: A Theory of Action Perspective.* (1. Basım.). Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Arslantaş, C. C. ve Dikmenli, O. (2007). Eğitim Örgütleri Öğrenen Organizasyon Özellikleri Göstermekte midir? Kamu ve Özel İlköğretim Okullarının Balıkesir İli Örneğinde Karşılaştırmalı Bir Analizi. *İşletme ve Ekonomi Araştırmaları Dergisi*, ISSN:1309-2448.

Atak, M. ve Atik, İ. (2007). Örgütlerde Sürekli Eğitimin Önemi Ve Öğrenen Örgüt Oluşturma Sürecine Etkisi. *Hava Kuvvetleri Komutanlığı Sürekli Eğitim Modeli Örneği, Havacılık ve Uzay Teknolojileri Dergisi,* 63(7).

Aziz, A. (1994). *Araştırma Yöntemleri-Teknikleri ve İletişim*. (Genişletilmiş ikinci Baskı.). Ankara, Turkey:Turhan Kitapevi.

Balay, R. (2004). Küreselleşme, Bilgi Toplumu ve Eğitim. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi,* 37(2): 61–82.

Başaran, İ. E. (2000). *Eğitim Yönetimi-Nitelikli Okul*. (Dördüncü Basım.). Ankara, Turkey: Feryal Matbaası.

Bozkurt, A. (2000). *Yönetimde Çağdaş Yaklaşımlar, Uygulamalar ve Sorunlar.*(Vol.43). Ankara, Turkey: Anı Yay.

Çam, S. (2002). *Öğrenen Organizasyon ve Rekabet Üstünlüğü*. İstanbul, Turkey: Papatya Yayınları,.

Çiftçi, F. ve Yılmaz, H.C. (2004). *Toplam Kalite Yönetiminin EFQM Modeline Göre İlköğretim Okullarında Uygulanması*. Ankara.

Demirci, M. K. ve Aydemir, M. (2006). "Örgütsel Değerlerin İşletmelerin Sosyal Sorumluluk Anlayışlarını Belirlemedeki Rolü: Bursa İlinde Gerçekleştirilen Bir Araştırma". *Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi,* 20 (2): 311-326.

95

Elebeyi, P. ve Keleş, Y.(2010). Organizasyon ve Yönetim. *Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2 (2): ISSN: 1309 - 8039 (Online).

Elma, C. (2000). *Öğrenen örgütlerde Takım Çalışması, Yönetimde Çağdaş Yaklaşımlar, Uygulamalar ve Sorunlar.* Ankara, Turkey: Anı Yayıncılık.

Erdoğan, M. (1987). Türkiye'de Spor Salonlarının ve Faaliyetlerinin Durumu ve Yaygınlaştırılması. *T.M.O.K. Dergisi*, 70.

Fındıkçı, İ. (1996). Öğreten Okuldan Öğrenen Okula. *Yeni Türkiye*, 7.

Garvin, (1997). The learning organization: a review and evaluation. *The Learning Organization*, 4: 19-25.

H. Z. Mating; G, Jandaghı; B. Moını (2007). Comparıng Organızatıonal Learnıng Rates In Publıc And Non-Profıt Schools In Qom Provınce Of Iran. *Journal of Applied Quantitative Methods* ISSN: 18424562, 2(4).

İpek, C.(2004). *Milli Eğitim Teftiş Sisteminde Yeniden Yapılanma İhtiyacı: Eğitim Denetiminde Yeniden Yapılanma*. (1ˢᵗ ed.). Ankara, Turkey: Tem-Sen Yayınları.

Johnson, M. (1996). *Gelecek Bin yılda Yönetim*. İstanbul: Gençlik yayınları.

Karabulut, K. (2012) *Örgüt Kültürü ve Cinsiyet İlişkisi* http://kaankarabulut.blogcu.com/orgut-kulturu-ve-cinsiyet-iliskisi/7938169. Erişim tarihi: 10.10.2012).

Kış, A. ve Necdet K. (2010). The Characteristics of a Learning School in Information Age. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences,* 2(2): 797-802.

Koel, T.(2007*). İşletme Yöneticiliği*. (11. Basım.). İstanbul: Arıkan Basım.

Lussier R.. N. (2006). *Management Fundamentals Concepts Application Skill Development*. (Third Edition.). Springfiel Collage.

McGill, M.E., Slocum, J.W.Jr. (1993). "Unlearning The Organization". *Organizational Dynamics*, 22(2).

Money, D., Maybury, M. ve Thuraisigngham , B. (2000). *Knowledge Manegement*. MIT Pres.

Naktiyok, A.,(2003). *İç Girişimcilik*. (1.baskı, vol. 203.). İstanbul, Turkey: Beta Yayıncılık.

Numanoğlu, G. (1999). Bilgi Toplumu-Eğitim-Yeni Kimlikler-II: Bilgi Toplumu ve Eğitimde Yeni Kimlikler. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*. 32 (1-2): 341-350.

Probst, G.J.B. ve Buchel, B.S.T. (l997). *Organizational Learning: The Competitive Advantage of the Future*. London, England: Prentice Hall.

Senge, P. M. (1993). *Beşinci Disiplin*. (2. Baskı, Çev. Ayşegül İldeniz ve Ahmet Doğukan). İstanbul, Turkey: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Şimşek, Ş. (1999). *Yönetim ve Organizasyon*. (5. Baskı.). Ankara, Turkey : Nobel Yayın ve Dağıtım.

Töremen, F. (2002). Eğitim Örgütlerinde Değişimin Engel ve Nedenleri. *Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi,* 12(1).

Toprakci, E. (2013) Sınıf Yönetimi Ankara : PegemA Yayınları

Willard, B.(1994). *Annual Leadership Development Prework*. IBM Canada: Leadership.

Wilms, W. W. (1998). Başarıya Giden Yol. *Executive Excellence*, Mayıs.

Yalçın, B.; Ay, C. (2011). Bilgi Toplumunda Öğrenen Örgütler Ve Liderlik Süreci Bağlamında Bir Örnek Olay Çalışmas. *Celal Bayar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 9(1).

Yanov, D. (2000). Seeing Organizational Learning. *A 'Cultural' View*,7(2): 247–268.

Yazıcı, S (2001). *Öğrenen Organizasyonlar*. İstanbul, Turkey :Alfa Yayınları,.

96

Yılmaz, E. (2005). Okullarda Örgütsel Güven Ölçeğinin Geçerlilik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 14: 739–756.

Yılmaz, H., ve Karahan, A. (2010). Liderlik Davranışı, Örgütsel Yaratıcılık ve İş gören Performansı Arasındaki İlişkilerin İncelenmesi: Uşak'ta Bir Araştırma. *Yönetim ve Ekonomi*, 17.

Yumuşak, S., ve H.Yıldız. (2011). " Eğitim Örgütleri Öğrenen Organizasyon Özellikleri Göstermekte midir? Kamu ve Özel İlköğretim Okullarının Balıkesir İli Örneğinde Karşılaştırmalı Bir Analizi". *İşletme ve Ekonomi Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2(4):159-177.

97

İlköğretim Okullarının Öğrenen Örgüt Özellikleri ve Öğrenen Örgüt Olmalarının Engelleri
(Amasya İl Örneği)

Doç.Dr.Ahmet Üstün
Amasya Üniversitesi-Türkiye
ahmet.ustun@amasya.edu.tr

Yrd.Doç.Dr.Sabit Menteşe
Tunceli Üniversitesi-Türkiye
sabitmentese@hotmail.com

Genişletilmiş Özet

Problem Bilgi toplumunun belirleyici özellikleri çağına uyum sağlayan, sürekli personelini geliştiren, öğrenme olayını yaygın hale getiren yönetim bilimindeki bu yaklaşım "öğrenen organizasyonlar" ya da "öğrenen örgütler" olarak adlandırılmaktadır. "Öğrenen Örgüt"lerde öğrenme faaliyeti örgütün bütün kanallarına yayılmıştır. Hızlı değişim ve yenilikler karşısında başarılı olmak isteyen bir örgütte sadece tepe yöneticilerinin öğreniyor olması yeterli görülmemektedir. Bu araştırmanın amacı, öğretmenlerin görev yaptıkları okulların öğrenen örgüt özelliklerini taşıma düzeylerine ve öğrenen örgüt olmaya engel nedenlere ilişkin görüşlerini belirlemektir.

Yöntem Araştırma 2010–2011 yılında Amasya Merkez ilçede ilköğretim okullarında görev yapan 214 öğretmen üzerinde gerçekleştirilmiştir. Betimsel kapsamda nicel olan bu araştırmada, araştırmacılar tarafından geliştirilen "öğrenen örgüt özelliklerine katılma düzeyi ve öğrenen örgüt olmaya engel nedenleri belirleme anketi" kullanılmıştır. Verilerin çözümlenmesinde, aritmetik ortalama, standart sapma, t testi ve ANOVA kullanılmıştır.

Bulgular Elde edilen verilerin çözümlemesi sonucu öğretmenlerin görev yaptıkları okulların birey boyutunda (X=3.22); ekip/takım boyutunda (X=3.18); Örgütsel öğrenme boyutunda (X=3.00) ve öğrenmeye engel nedenler boyutunda ise (X=3.22) toplam puan ortalamalarına göre (2.61-3.40) aralığında kaldıklarını ve bu düzeyin ise öğrenen örgüt özelliklerine "orta düzeyde" katıldıklarını göstermektedir.

Sonuç ve Öneriler Öğretmenlerin görev yaptıkları kurumlarının öğrenen örgüt özelliklerine yeter düzeyde sahip olmadığını belirtmeleri, eğitim örgütleri için üzerinde durulması gereken önemli bir tespit olduğu, ilgililerin bu duruma dikkat çekmeleri gerektiği kanısına varılmıştır. Yapılması gereken öğrenen örgüt olmaya neden durumların eğitim örgütleri yönünden sistem bakış açısıyla nedenleri geniş ve kapsamlı olacak şekilde araştırılarak, ivedilikle gerekli önlemlerin alınması gerekir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İlköğretim, İlköğretim öğretmenleri, Örgütsel öğrenme, Öğrenen örgüt, Öğrenen örgüt engelleri