

A STUDY ON THE INVESTIGATION OF LEARNING ORGANIZATION STRUCTURE AND INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP IN TERMS OF TEACHERS IN SCHOOL

Özlem ERDEM

Phd Student, Near East University, Hayat Boyu Öğrenme Genel Müdürlüğü (MEB)
ozlemerdem02@gmail.com

Erkan AÇIKYÖRÜK

Phd Student, Oxford Brooks University, İstanbul İl Milli Eğitim Müdürlüğü
erkanacikyoruk33@hotmail.com

ABSTRACT

In this study, the relation between learning organization and educational leadership has been searched from teachers' point of view. To this purpose, 94 primary school teachers and 65 high school teachers, actively working in Ankara province, have been included in the study as the sample of the population. The data for the research were collected through literature review, survey, and information sheet. The survey used by Şişman (2004) on school administrators' educational leadership has been determined as the means to gather data in this study. The data have been analyzed through SPSS 20. At the end of the study, it was found that there is a positive correlation between learning organizations and educational leadership from teachers' point of view.

Keywords: school administrator, learning organization, educational leadership

INTRODUCTION

Leadership is a field that has been studied for a long time and is pointed out from different ways in each research. Each study takes the leadership in its own way and brings different features to the foreground. There is a lot of difference, in practice, between a political scientist and a psychiatrist's understanding of psychiatric leadership both in content and practice, and this is a natural process. It has become a recognized fact that many more leaders take part at the center of success in organizational structures than the managers. İnan (2013), therefore, says that "leadership is a kind of compass task" (page 55). As in many other areas, the achievements in education are also directly proportional to the leadership qualities of managers (Şişman, 2014, Lashway, 2002). Hodginkson's (2008) definition of managerial power as the ability to reach goals through others can be evaluated in this context.

Considering the definitions made in the daily leadership activities, different definitions of the leadership are seen, by bringing forefront such matters as personal characteristics, exhibited behaviors, the strength of the effects that they leave in other individuals, the way they interact with the individuals in their environment and the roles they play in their environment, the tasks they undertake due to their positions. Leadership is the process of influencing the activities of a person or a group to achieve an aim in a particular situation (Hersey vd., 2008, s. 62).

Leadership is the activity of effectively planning, organizing, managing and transferring people, money, materials, time, place and other resources in order to achieve the task of giving a management to any one's management and constantly checking whether they are achieved or not. The leader will succeed not only with a particular department, person or group of endeavors and work, but with excellent leadership, management, skills and practice (Gürsoy, 2005, s. 10).

Leadership in general framework can be defined as the process by which one person influences and directs others' activities to achieve specific personal or group goals under certain circumstances. So leadership is a process of what the leader has done (Koçel, 2001, s. 465). Although there are many definitions of leadership in the literature, they also have common features.

Bennis's has identified four sub-headings as the areas of competence for leaders in his researches, as meaning management, attention management, trust management, and self-regulation (Akt. Sağlam Arı, 2014). Therefore, the managers who will be taking the leadership role in the schools should have some qualifications as training leaders. Sergiovanni also mentions the leadership roles of school managers in educational, supervisory, organizational and managerial leadership titles (Akt. Aksoy, Işık, 2008).

The main purpose of an educational or in other words instructional leader is to determine the purpose, mission and vision of an educational institution, to set up new and up-to date resources for the continuity of education and training, managing institution and education programs, planning and monitoring in-class and extracurricular activities and to play a role in evaluating and promoting teachers. Indeed, instructional leadership is based on encouraging the development of these activities and the learning process of the student. In other words, the leaders in education and training institutions should first aim to create a quality in the institution and put a vision for the institution in this direction (Phillips, 2004).

When evaluated in terms of our education system; duties, powers and responsibilities of managers are defined in the main objectives and principles of the national education in the regulations of the Ministry of Education as education and training leaders who are primarily responsible for effective and efficient use of all resources, team spirit understanding and management and representation in order to realize the objectives of the school with the general objectives (Çil, 2015).

The most important points that many of the works that have been done show us that it is necessary to visit the classrooms in different periods, closely examine the effects of students, teachers and teaching programs and become an inspection and evaluation factor in the system of educational institutions in order to increase the effectiveness of the leaders. (Can, 2007, Şişman, 2004).

Researchers such as Krug (1992), Andrew and Smith (1989), Gümüşeli (1996) and Şişman (1997) have examined the educational leadership in different sub-dimensions.

Formation and Transfer of Institutional Mission and Vision: Education and training programs should be planned, presented and put into practice on the axis of mission and vision to be established. Institutional leaders are also required to create the objectives of the institution in a clear way in this direction. The whole responsibility of this task belongs to the administrators and leaders of the institutions, especially to the directors. As a result of researches carried out on schools which are successful and have an important position in society, it is obviously viewed that these institutions have a clearly defined mission and vision. In addition, this mission and vision usually aims the success of the student (Şişman, 2004, Aydın, 2005).

Management of Learning Programs and Processes: Curriculum for the educational institutions is of equal importance with a planned work for a manufacturing firm in the service sector. Therefore, managing education institutions can also be called as managing these programs which are applied in these institutions. In education institutions, when it comes to curriculum, many topics come to mind such as distribution and programming of lessons, planning of working hours of teachers, planning of lessons yearly, weekly and daily, activities to be organized, and determination and planning of sportive, social and cultural activities to be organized and involved (Erdoğan, 2000).

Process and Evaluation of Students: It is a process aimed at determining clear aspects of development in order to evaluate and improve the situation of the identified institutional objectives and educational programs (Aydın, 2005). Directors take necessary measures to improve the performance of teachers and students and the quality of teaching in cooperation with committees and teams within the school (Çil, 2015). In other words, the usefulness of the determined processes is detected in the process and if necessary, the interventions are made. We can say that this intervention is in fact an attempt to take necessary measures for the continuity of the institution. Measuring and evaluating student achievement is also an important feature of educational leaders, as it is the responsibility of leaders to ensure the sustainability of institutional success. This is why leaders must be able to master and manage both traditional and alternative assessment and evaluation processes.

Support and Development of Teacher: Education is a lifelong process. Teachers also have great responsibilities for constantly developing themselves because of their active role in the educational process. But without managerial support, this development will always be missing. Therefore, the leader educators, especially those working in educational institutions, should be guide and supporters of teachers in this regard. Otherwise, teachers' inadequacies in their fields are becoming the problem of those teachers together with the leaders and the institution (Açıkalın, 1997). When a director wants to mentor a school he increases his effectiveness within the institution. It can be said that effective leaders are the people who understand the needs of the stakeholders of the school and know the general management structure well (Çil, 2015). One of the most important qualities of the leaders in educational institutions is to add value to teachers' individual and professional development and to encourage them to freely express their thoughts both for themselves and for their institutions (Blase and Blase, 1999). In addition, it is also one of the most important tasks of school administrators to announce the opportunities for professional development to teachers and to organize necessary in-service activities.

Creating the Appropriate Environmental Conditions and the Training Atmosphere for Education and Teaching: Researches have shown that one of the most important values that affect the leadership is the reflection of the atmosphere in which the institution is located and the dominant atmosphere in the institution to the business efficiency. According to Smith and Andrews, the new changing environmental conditions and the mood within the institution can affect the leadership positively or negatively (Akt. Serin, Buluç, 2012). Keeping environmental factors and institutional atmosphere under will increase both the yield to be obtained and the confidence of the leaders in the position they are. It can be said that the atmosphere of educational institutions is the working conditions in these institutions and the effect of these conditions on the individual. The atmosphere of an educational institution has a multidimensional influence on issues such as motivation of individuals, integration with institutions and performance of individuals (Şişman, 2004).

LEARNING ORGANIZATION CONCEPT

In the world that has become a globalized and small town, there are rapid developments and changes in many areas

(Bakan and Karayılan, 2011). In the light of these changes and developments, information has become the main sources for individual and organizational structures (Ayden and Uçcan, 2002). Therefore, there is a need for restructuring for information access, information processing and evaluation for the continuity of life, both on an individual basis and on an institutional basis, in the name of continuous adaptation and development (Bozkurt, 2003).

It is unacceptable for organizations to keep their knowledge of accessing, processing and evaluating information stable in today's conditions, where markets change day by day and different competitive environments occur. To be able to keep up with these changes and in order to strengthen organizational structure, the features such as the ability to keep up with changing conditions, preparation for new developments and crises, to be open to innovation and so on needs to be developed. This can only be achieved with learning organizations (Bakan ve Karayılan, 2011).

The concept of learning organization began with the work of Chris Argyris in the 1960s. In 1990, with the work of Peter Senge, its popularity increased and became widespread (Atak and Atik, 2007). When the concept of learning organization is examined, definitions can be seen in the literature in many ways. All of these definitions focus on the development and changes of individuals within the organization. One of the most comprehensive definitions and the definition made by Şimşek is as follows,

Learning organizations are organizations that create individual environments for individuals to develop themselves, in short, for individuals to turn to themselves, to get out of their own deficiencies, to try to fix themselves without seeking other responsibilities, to look at their place and role in the system, to renew their old knowledge and contribute to knowledge production (Simsek, 2001, p 377). In today's rapidly changing and developing world, it is not enough for someone who thinks for the organization. The idea of one person's thinking about everything from the top and being followed by the others loses its importance and value now.

The differences between learning organizations and traditional organizations in the literature have been examined many times. For example, in the study conducted by Türemen in 2001, the following two organizational structures were compared with each other and it was revealed how different organizational learning is from traditional learning and organizational structure.

Table-1: Traditional Organizations-Learning Organizations Comparison

Traditional Organizations	Learning Organizations
It is a need center.	It is a student-learning center.
It's about finding the problems.	It is aimed at preventing problems.
There is no vision.	Vision is vital.
Complaints are perceived as discomfort.	Complaints are an opportunity to learn.
The role of management is control.	The role of management is sharing values.
It only consists of the management team.	Learning teams are vital.
Procedures and rules are important.	Flexibility is essential.
There are short-term plans.	Plans are long-term.
There is no different mission.	The mission is different.
Learning is individual.	Learning is individual, team and organizational.
Leadership is rank and privilege.	Leader is designer and teacher.
Tasks are individual.	The tasks focus on the team.
Learning depends on the need.	Learning is continuous and long term.
The education unit is responsible without learning.	Everyone is responsible for not learning.

(Türemen, 2001)

There are two views on the main characteristics of learning organizations. The first of them is that was presented by Calvert and his friends (1994) and the main features are as follows;

- Learning organizations are open to learning with team spirit and on different conditions,
- Learning organizations evaluate what they learn and how they learn,
- Learning organizations strive to learn more quickly against the institutions they compete with and gain superiority

in terms of competition by providing specialization,

- Learning organizations transform the acquired information into action in a fast and accurate way.
- Learning organizations have an understanding that they are aiming to increase their motivation by transferring their experiences into learning.
- Learning organizations prevent incorrect learning by recognizing their weaknesses and deficiencies.
- Learning organizations take the necessary risks without endangering their main elements.
- Learning organizations invest in experiential learning.
- Learning organizations support new ideas and projects, groups and individuals who have with the aim of learning and self-development.
- Learning organizations do not punish the sharing of the trainings made, rather adopt extending this practice as an organization policy.
- Learning organizations do not punish the sharing of the trainings made, on the contrary making this sharing the organizational policy.

Some of the different features can be added to these specific characteristics, such as sharing responsibilities, making distributions appropriate to leadership characteristics, creating organizational culture, increasing information sharing, and organizing organizational structure (Öneren, 2008).

A second view on the main features of learning organizations were put forward by Garvin (1993). In this view, there are sub-topics, including systematic problem solving, experimenting with new approaches, learning from past experiences, learning from others' experiences and best practices, and transferring information quickly and effectively. There are no significant differences between these views. We can say that researchers identified the headings in time and then collected them under the main headings.

THE OBSTACLES OF BECOMING A LEARNING ORGANIZATION

Today, while some organizations are on the path of being learning organizations, others insist on not making an effort on this issue (Güney, 2007). It should not be forgotten that organizational structures' not learning can never be a coincidence. Planning and administrative forms of Organizations, individual's learning, thinking and communication styles are the most important issues affecting learning (Senge, 2011). When approaching from this point, the first step that organizations should take is to identify situations that will cause learning difficulties in themselves or prevent them from learning, and remove them (Düren, 2002). Seven different learning disabilities are mentioned in Senge's work (Senge, 2011). These headings can be listed as follows:

- Focusing solely on his / her own task individually and defending against teamwork,
- To think that the problems are entirely outsourced and to blame others by thinking himself/herself being innocent,
- Taking preliminary interventions against possible problems that may arise from others by taking all responsibility on their own.
- Employees', especially administrators's being caught up by a matter and cause other employees to lose their energy for this reason.
- Failure to develop a response to time-spread processes,
- Over-reliance on learning through experience and prognosis of learning in processes,
- Disruption of the boards of directors and management structures and the deterioration of decision-making mechanisms.

In addition, there may be obstacles to learning in organizational structures such as caching information, blocking new knowledge, ideas and thoughts, not focusing on causal relations, failing to learn from the past, and hiding behind the achievements of the past (İşdar, 2006).

The role of leaders and managers in organizational learning can never be denied. For this, the headlines such as leadership and communication styles, support for learning, importance for teamwork, rewarding and vision development strategies of administrators may also be confronted as obstacles against learning. (Altman ve Iles, 1998).

PURPOSE AND SUBGOAL

The general purpose of this research is to evaluate the level of instructional leadership roles of primary school and high school administrators in terms of teacher views within learning organization concept in the city center of Ankara. In response to this general objective, the following research questions were also sought.

1. What is the level of school managers' instructional leadership roles according to the views of teachers with whom they are working?
2. According to teachers working at schools, what is the level of structural learning organization of schools?
3. Is there a relationship between the educational leadership roles of school administrations and being learning organization schools?

METHOD

This research; aimed to determine the instructional leadership roles of official high school and elementary school principals and the organizational structures of schools in terms of teacher opinions. As the research has descriptive qualities, the scanning model is used for this purpose, which is the most appropriate model.

The universe and sample: The nature of the research was created by primary schools and high schools in Ankara city center. 94 primary schools and 65 high school teachers from different branches were sampled to represent the universe.

Collection of Data: The data required for the research were obtained through literature review, questionnaire application, school and manager information form. The questionnaire form used by Şişman (2004) was used as a data collection tool in the research of school administrators about teaching leadership behaviors. This questionnaire has been delivered to the teachers on the internet via Google Drive.

Analysis of Data: The findings obtained in the study were evaluated by using SPSS package program. Tables were prepared by finding the average standard deviation values of school perceptions of frequency, percentage, arithmetic mean and certain behaviors related to the data. Subsequently, Pearson Correlation was applied in order to investigate the relationship between the subheadings of the used surveys.

FINDINGS AND COMMENT

In this part of the study, findings and interpretations obtained by the application of the questionnaire, which is a data collection tool, were included. First, findings related to the personal characteristics of the sampling group were included. Then the results obtained by evaluating the purpose and sub-objectives of the research in turn were tabulated and the data were interpreted.

INFORMATION ON PARTICIPATORY TEACHERS

When we look at the distribution of the teachers according to their genders, it is seen that 114 of them (71.7%) are female and 45 (28.3%) of them are male.

When the distribution of the teachers who participated in the study were examined according to the type of school they worked at, it was found that 94 (59.1%) of the 159 teachers were in primary school and 65 (40.9%) were in high school.

When the distributions according to the seniority of the participating teachers were examined, it has been found that 17 of the 159 teachers (10,7%) have 1-5 years, 16 (10,1%) have 6-10 years, 23 (14,5%) have 11-15 years, 46 (28,9%) 16-20 years and 57 (35,8%) have 21 years and over experience of teaching.

When the distributions according to the branches of the teachers are examined, it is seen that 27 (17%) of the 159 teachers are classroom teachers, 5 (3,1%) are the master class teachers, 20 (12,6%) are Turkish and Literature teachers, 8,8) Science group, 20 (12,6%) mathematics teachers, 17 (10,7%) social science group teachers, 18 (11,3%) foreign language teachers and 38 (23,9%) different branches.

Table 1

Descriptive statistical data of participant teachers

Teacher's	f	%	
Gender	Male	45	28,3
	Female	114	71,7
Type of School	Primary School	94	59,1
	High School	65	40,9
Seniority at Work	1-5 years	17	10,7
	6-10 years	16	10,1
	11-15 years	23	14,5
	16-20 years	46	28,9
	21 years and over	57	35,8
Total	159	100	

LEARNING LEADERSHIP ROLES OF SCHOOL DIRECTORS

Findings and interpretations about the academic leadership roles of school administrators and teachers, working in primary and secondary schools, takes in this part of the research. Level of Instructional Leadership Performance Level Scale of School Administrator’s 5 sub-titles, for which instructional leadership data is collected, will be addressed one by one. The data related to these substances will be examined one by one. Likewise, the Learning Organization Scale data will be examined separately in 5 sub-chapters. Subsequently, the relations between the subheadings of these two surveys will be evaluated and examined by the Pearson Correlation study.

Table.2: Levels of School Administrators' Determination of School Purposes and Sharing Behaviors in Terms of Teacher Opinion

Levels of School Administrators' Determination of School Purposes and Sharing Behaviors in Terms of Teacher Opinion	Never		Very Rare		Sometimes		Frequently		Always		X	S
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
1. Explaining the general objectives of the school to teachers and students	0	0	8	5	29	18,2	75	47,2	47	29,6	4,01	0,83
2. Leading everyone in the school to share the goals of the school	2	1,3	9	5,7	37	23,3	68	42,8	43	27	3,89	0,91
3. Reviewing the objectives of the school and re-setting it according to the conditions of the day	1	0,6	6	3,8	32	20,1	65	40,9	55	34,6	4,05	0,87
4. Benefitting from the success of students while improving the school's goals	0	0	7	4,4	29	18,2	66	41,5	57	35,8	4,09	0,84
5. Pioneering the harmonization of purpose of the school and the goals of the lessons	2	1,3	6	3,8	29	18,2	76	47,8	46	28,9	3,99	0,86
6. Opening up the goals of the school at board meetings	4	2,5	11	6,9	36	22,6	59	37,1	49	30,8	3,87	1,01
7. Encouraging teachers' works towards the same goals	2	1,3	8	5	25	15,7	71	44,7	53	33,3	4,04	0,90
8. Identifying the objectives for increasing students' present achievements	1	0,6	7	4,4	30	18,9	59	37,1	62	39	4,09	0,90
9. Pioneering the reflection of the	1	0,6	10	6,3	31	19,5	66	41,5	51	32,1	3,98	0,91

aims of the school to the implementation												
10. Encouraging everyone to have high expectations about student success	1	0,6	5	3,1	37	23,3	60	37,7	56	35,2	4,04	0,88
Average	1,40	0,88	7,70	4,84	31,50	19,80	66,50	41,83	51,90	32,63	4,01	0,89

As seen in Table 2, the instructional leadership behaviors that primary school administrators have achieved at the highest level in terms of the determination of school objectives and the ability to have shared behavior are identifying goals to increase the students' present achievements and making use of the student's achievement status while developing the School's aims ($X=4,09$).

Elementary school administrators are always performing the behavior of observing the school's objectives and re-setting them according to the conditions of the day by $X= 4,05$, the behavior of encouraging everyone to have high expectations about the student achievement and the behavior of teachers to work towards the same goals by $X = 4, 04$, behavior of explaining the general purpose of the school to teachers and students by $X = 4, 01$.

Table.3: Levels of School Administrators' Educational Program and Instructional Process Management Attitudes toward Teacher Opinion

Levels of School Administrators' Educational Program and Instructional Process Management Attitudes toward Teacher Opinion	Never		Very Rare		Sometimes		Frequently		Always		X	S
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Our School Administrator's Behavior	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
11. Preparing the annual activity plan for the school's education activities.	1	0,6	8	5	29	18,2	74	46,5	47	29,6	3,99	0,86
12. Caring about the consideration of student needs and expectations in the school program	1	0,6	12	7,5	32	20,1	73	45,9	41	25,8	3,89	0,90
13. Coordinating between the I and II grade teaching curriculums of the school.	7	4,4	13	8,2	43	27	62	39	34	21,4	3,65	1,04
14. Actively participating in the review and selection of program-related materials.	8	5	19	11,9	45	28,3	58	36,5	29	18,2	3,51	1,08
15. Visiting classes to ensure the effective use of classroom teaching time.	1	0,6	11	6,9	25	15,7	66	41,5	56	35,2	4,04	0,92
16. Encouraging extracurricular social, cultural and	2	1,3	14	8,8	31	19,5	64	40,3	48	30,2	3,89	0,98

educational activities in school.												
17. Preventing students to be late for the class and block the lesson.	1	0,6	4	2,5	20	12,6	51	32,1	83	52,2	4,33	0,84
18. Providing timely initiation and completion of courses	4	2,5	12	7,5	30	18,9	69	43,4	44	27,7	3,86	0,99
19. Spending most of the time in the school to make observation and participate in teaching environments.	10	6,3	17	10,7	31	19,5	52	32,7	49	30,8	3,71	1,19
20. Preventing the interruption of classes by means of announcements or class recruitment.	3	1,9	5	3,1	23	14,5	55	34,6	73	45,9	4,19	0,93
Average	3,80	2,38	11,50	7,21	30,90	19,43	62,40	39,25	50,40	31,70	3,91	0,97

As seen in Table 3, the behavior that was fulfilled by the elementary school administrators at the highest level with respect to the behavior of the "managing the education program and teaching process" regarding the teaching leadership behavior was found to be lagging behind the classroom and preventing classroom division with X = 4.33 average.

Elementary school administrators always carry out the behaviors of visiting classrooms to ensure the effective use of classroom teaching time by X = 4, 04 and preventing the interruption of classes by means of announcements or class recall by X = 4, 19.

Table.4: Levels of School Administrators' Educational Program and Instructional Process Management Attitudes toward Teacher Opinion

Levels of School Administrators' having Teaching Process and Evaluation of Students' Behavior in Terms of Teacher Opinion	Never		Very Rare		Sometimes		Frequently		Always		X	S
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Our School Administrator's Behavior	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
21. Making interviews with teachers to discuss the success of students.	2	1,3	7	4,4	36	22,6	52	32,7	62	39	4,04	0,95
22. Interviewing with teachers to identify the strengths and weaknesses of curriculum	4	2,5	14	8,8	39	24,5	50	31,4	52	32,7	3,83	1,06
23. Examining the school schedule according to the exam results and making	2	1,3	13	8,2	34	21,4	58	36,5	52	32,7	3,91	0,99

changes when necessary.													
24. Identifying students who are in need of special education and attention according to exam results.	7	4,4	7	4,4	26	16,4	65	40,9	54	34	3,96	1,04	
25. Informing students about the success of the school and its students.	4	2,5	7	4,4	34	21,4	60	37,7	54	34	3,96	0,98	
26. Informing teachers about the success of the school, written or verbally.	4	2,5	7	4,4	30	18,9	56	35,2	62	39	4,04	0,99	
27. Awarding students with outstanding achievement in their school and classroom behavior.	4	2,5	4	2,5	28	17,6	47	29,6	76	47,8	4,18	0,98	
28. Explaining important issues to teachers related to teaching after classroom observations.	3	1,9	13	8,2	31	19,5	66	41,5	46	28,9	3,87	0,99	
29. Reviewing student's works while assessing the classroom instruction.	2	1,3	9	5,7	37	23,3	65	40,9	46	28,9	3,91	0,93	
30. Direct contact with students to discuss school issues.	3	1,9	9	5,7	34	21,4	57	35,8	56	35,2	3,97	0,98	
Average	3,50	2,21	9,00	5,67	32,90	20,70	57,60	36,22	56,00	35,22	3,97	0,99	

As shown in Table 4, primary school administrators' behavior of awarding students with superior achievement by their attitudes within the school and classroom with $X = 4,18$ average, was founded as the role they played at the highest level, regarding the teaching process and the evaluation of the students regarding the teaching leadership dimension.

The attitudes of reporting the school success to the teachers in writing or verbally and conducting interviews with teachers to discuss the successes of the pupils were found to be the instructional leadership behavior always carried out with the average of $X = 4,04$.

Table.5: Levels of School Administrators' Educational Program and Instructional Process Management Attitudes toward Teacher Opinion

Levels of School Administrators' Educational Program and Instructional Process Management Attitudes toward Teacher Opinion	Never		Very Rare		Sometimes		Frequently		Always		X	S
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
31. Encouraging teachers to improve their performance at a high level.	6	3,8	9	5,7	36	22,6	60	37,7	48	30,2	3,85	1,04
32. Complimenting teachers because of their superior effort and success.	4	2,5	10	6,3	37	23,3	68	42,8	40	25,2	3,82	0,97
33. Appreciating teachers in written because of their special efforts and endeavours.	19	11,9	28	17,6	44	27,7	37	23,3	31	19,5	3,21	1,28
34. Organising in-service training for teachers' professional development.	11	6,9	18	11,3	48	30,2	55	34,6	27	17	3,43	1,11
35. Informing teachers about the opportunities that they can improve themselves professionally	11	6,9	9	5,7	35	22	57	35,8	47	29,6	3,75	1,15
36. Supporting teachers who are involved in the development of the profession (participation in in-service training, post-graduate education, etc.).	9	5,7	12	7,5	32	20,1	63	39,6	43	27	3,75	1,11
37. Distributing important articles in newspapers and magazines related to education to teachers.	28	17,6	25	15,7	42	26,4	41	25,8	23	14,5	3,04	1,31
38. Inviting speakers from outside the school to give conferences to teachers.	24	15,1	23	14,5	41	25,8	53	33,3	18	11,3	3,11	1,24
39. Making meetings to share new knowledge and skills acquired	18	11,3	16	10,1	43	27	52	32,7	30	18,9	3,38	1,23

during in-service training studies.												
40. Supporting the usage of new knowledge and skills gained from in-service training activities in the classroom.	13	8,2	13	8,2	35	22	65	40,9	33	20,8	3,58	1,15
Average	14,30	8,99	16,30	10,26	39,30	24,71	55,10	34,65	34,00	21,40	3,49	1,16

As shown in Table 5, teachers indicated that primary school administrators perform at a highest level with an average of $X = 3,85$, by encouraging teachers to perform at high levels regarding the “supporting and encouraging the development of teachers” instructional leadership behavior dimension.

Elementary school administrators always perform behaviors of supporting teachers by complimenting them due to their superior endeavors and successes in the developmental direction with an average of $X = 3,85$, supporting teachers who are in the developmental struggle (including in-service training, post-graduate education, etc.) and informing them about the opportunities they can develop themselves from the professional perspective with an average of $X = 3,75$.

Table.6: Levels of School Administrators' Educational Program and Instructional Process Management Attitudes toward Teacher Opinion

Levels of School Administrators' Educational Program and Instructional Process Management Attitudes toward Teacher Opinion	Never		Very Rare		Sometimes		Frequently		Always		X	S
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Our School Administrator's Behavior	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
41. Leading the formation of "team spirit" between manager, teacher, student and other staff.	9	5,7	19	11,9	21	13,2	63	39,6	47	29,6	3,75	1,17
42. Supporting teachers so that they can do their job better.	8	5	13	8,2	24	15,1	49	30,8	65	40,9	3,94	1,16
43. Providing the necessary order and discipline for effective teaching and learning.	3	1,9	9	5,7	27	17	61	38,4	59	37,1	4,03	0,97
44. Trying to place a belief that all students in the school can learn and succeed.	3	1,9	11	6,9	30	18,9	59	37,1	56	35,2	3,97	1,00
45. Preparing physical environments in which students and teachers can work with pleasure.	7	4,4	12	7,5	26	16,4	56	35,2	58	36,5	3,92	1,11
46. Leading the social activities that provide the integration between teachers and students.	8	5	7	4,4	32	20,1	65	40,9	47	29,6	3,86	1,05

47. Supporting teachers who raise new and different opinions about education and training.	7	4,4	11	6,9	25	15,7	60	37,7	56	35,2	3,92	1,09
48. Preventing school to be damaged from conflicts between individuals and groups.	3	1,9	8	5	24	15,1	61	38,4	63	39,6	4,09	0,96
49. Prioritizing the issues related to teaching in terms of time and resources related to the work to be done.	3	1,9	14	8,8	24	15,1	67	42,1	51	32,1	3,94	1,00
50. Providing support from the family and environment to the school to improve student achievement.	1	0,6	13	8,2	23	14,5	61	38,4	61	38,4	4,06	0,96
Average	5,20	3,27	11,70	7,35	25,60	16,11	60,20	37,86	56,30	35,42	3,95	1,05

As seen in Table 6, teachers indicated that school administrators' preventing school damage from conflicts between individuals and groups was performed with an average of $X = 4,09$ as the behavior of the elementary school administrators that they fulfill at the highest level regarding the regular teaching learning environment and climate formation instructional leadership behavioral dimension.

Elementary school administrators always perform the behaviors of providing support to the family and the school to improve student achievement with an average of $X = 4.06$ and the necessary order and discipline for effective teaching and learning with the average of $X = 4.03$.

Table 7: Levels of Personal Skilful Behavior in Terms of Teacher Views

Levels of Personal Skilful Behavior in Terms of Teacher Views	Never		Very Rare		Sometimes		Frequently		Always		X	S
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
I follow the publications about my profession.	1,00	0,63	2,00	1,26	23,00	14,47	91,00	57,23	42,00	26,42	4,08	0,72
Individuals who want to improve themselves in our institution are valued.	4	2,5	10	6,3	28	17,6	71	44,7	46	28,9	3,91	0,97
There is an incentive environment in my institution to develop myself.	7	4,4	17	10,7	42	26,4	58	36,5	35	22,0	3,61	1,08
Written resources are provided to help me improve myself.	16	10,1	27	17,0	47	29,6	49	30,8	20	12,6	3,19	1,16
Seminar, panel etc. meetings are being held to improve myself in my institution.	18	11,3	25	15,7	50	31,4	50	31,4	16	10,1	3,13	1,15
Average	9,20	5,79	16,20	10,19	38,00	23,90	63,80	40,13	31,80	20,00	3,58	1,02

When the levels of schools having personal mastery behavior in terms of teacher opinions regarding the learning organization structures are examined, the answer “I follow the publications about my profession” has been the most effective behavior with an average of $X = 4,08$.

In schools, “Individuals who want to improve themselves in our institution are valued” and “there is an incentive environment in my institution to develop myself are the behaviors that are frequently achieved with an average of $X = 3.91$ and $X = 3.61$ respectively.

In schools, written resources are provided to help me improve myself and Seminar, panel etc. meetings are being held to improve myself in my institution are the behaviors that are sometimes achieved with an average of $X = 3.19$ and $X = 3.13$ respectively.

Table.8: Levels of Mental Models Behavior in Terms of Teacher’s Views

Levels of Mental Models Behavior in Terms of Teacher’s Views	Never		Very Rare		Sometimes		Frequently		Always		X	S
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
I can easily explain my ideas to the people around me.	3	1,9	9	5,7	26	16,4	59	37,1	62	39,0	4,06	0,98
I feel that I am valuable at my institution.	5	3,1	12	7,5	33	20,8	65	40,9	44	27,7	3,82	1,02
Every subject in the institution can be questioned.	11	6,9	20	12,6	41	25,8	51	32,1	36	22,6	3,51	1,17
What my colleagues say and what they do is consistent with each other.	3	1,9	12	7,5	49	30,8	71	44,7	24	15,1	3,64	0,90
I think my institution will succeed in the future.	6	3,8	11	6,9	25	15,7	64	40,3	53	33,3	3,92	1,05
Daily problems can be solved in our institution.	3	1,9	15	9,4	27	17,0	70	44,0	44	27,7	3,86	0,99
Innovations aiming for improvement can be produced in our institution.	3	1,9	11	6,9	44	27,7	65	40,9	36	22,6	3,75	0,95
Average	4,86	3,05	12,86	8,09	35,00	22,01	63,57	39,98	42,71	26,86	3,80	1,01

When the levels of school attitudes of having mind-model behaviors in terms of teachers' views on the learning organization structures are examined, the behavior that is “I can easily explain my ideas to the people around me” has been the highest effective behavior with an average of $X = 4,06$.

In schools, “I think my institution will succeed in the future”, “daily problems can be solved in our institution” and “I feel that I am valuable at my institution” are the behaviors that are frequently achieved with an average of $X = 3.92$, $X = 3,86$ and $X = 3.82$ respectively.

In schools, “innovations aiming for improvement can be produced in our institution”, “what my colleagues say and what they do is consistent with each other.” and “every subject in the institution can be questioned” are the behaviors that are sometimes achieved with an average of $X = 3.75$, $X = 3,64$ and $X = 3.51$ respectively.

Table. 9: Levels of Having Shared Vision Behavior from Teachers' Views

Levels of Having Shared Vision Behavior from Teachers' Views	Never		Very Rare		Sometimes		Frequently		Always		X	S
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Our opinions are being asked while preparing plans for the future in our institution.	5	3,1	19	11,9	31	19,5	62	39,0	42	26,4	3,74	1,08

Our views are taken into account while preparing plans for the future in our institution.	7	4,4	17	10,7	40	25,2	53	33,3	42	26,4	3,67	1,11
Applications in our institution are carried out after our views are received.	6	3,8	19	11,9	42	26,4	51	32,1	41	25,8	3,64	1,10
The purpose of the institution is clear.	1	,6	10	6,3	21	13,2	65	40,9	62	39,0	4,11	0,91
The objectives of the institution have been determined correctly.	4	2,5	11	6,9	27	17,0	61	38,4	56	35,2	3,97	1,02
The purpose of my institution increases my determination to work.	8	5,0	10	6,3	38	23,9	63	39,6	40	25,2	3,74	1,06
The aims of my instituteion are in harmony with my personal goals.	6	3,8	19	11,9	29	18,2	69	43,4	36	22,6	3,69	1,07
The plans of my institution are in harmony with my personal plans.	8	5,0	20	12,6	27	17,0	64	40,3	40	25,2	3,68	1,13
I would like to work for many years to realize the aims of my institution.	8	5,0	19	11,9	24	15,1	58	36,5	50	31,4	3,77	1,16
My colleagues believe in the purpose of the institution.	6	3,8	18	11,3	38	23,9	67	42,1	30	18,9	3,61	1,04
Plans are carried out before rising of problems, not after emerging of problems.	9	5,7	16	10,1	50	31,4	60	37,7	24	15,1	3,47	1,05
Average	6,18	3,89	16,18	10,18	33,36	20,98	61,18	38,48	42,09	26,47	3,73	1,07

When the levels of schools having shared vision behaviors in terms of teacher’s opinions regarding the learning organization structures are examined, the behavior that is “the purpose of the institution is clear” has been highest effective behavior with an average of $X = 4, 11$.

In schools, “the objectives of the institution have been determined correctly”, “I would like to work for many years to realize the aims of my institution” and “the purpose of my institution increases my determination to work” and “our opinions are being asked while preparing plans for the future in our institution are the behaviors that are frequently fulfilled with an average of $X = 3.97$, $X = 3,77$ and $X = 3.74$ respectively.

In schools, “applications in our institution are carried out after our views are received” and “plans are carried out before rising of problems, not after emerging of problems” are the behaviors that are sometimes achieved with an average of $X = 3.64$ and $X = 3.47$ respectively.

Table. 10: Levels of Having System Thinking Behavior in Terms of Teacher’s Views

Levels of Having System Thinking Behavior in Terms of Teacher’s Views	Never		Very Rare		Sometimes		Frequently		Always		X	S
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
There is the effect of my personal efforts in solving the institution's problems.	2	1,3	13	8,2	66	41,5	51	32,1	27	17,0	3,55	0,91
There are permanent solutions to problems in our institution.	5	3,1	16	10,1	47	29,6	69	43,4	22	13,8	3,55	0,96
Problems in our institution are caused by external factors.	7	4,4	18	11,3	68	42,8	48	30,2	18	11,3	3,33	0,97

Our institution is trying to create tomorrow instead of reacting today.	4	2,5	16	10,1	47	29,6	65	40,9	27	17,0	3,60	0,97
The activities of the Institution are completed without long delays.	3	1,9	14	8,8	35	22,0	71	44,7	36	22,6	3,77	0,96
My colleagues are active participants rather than reactive individuals, shaping their own reality.	4	2,5	15	9,4	45	28,3	73	45,9	22	13,8	3,59	0,93
Detailed studies are being done in our institution to find the source of the problems.	3	1,9	22	13,8	50	31,4	59	37,1	25	15,7	3,51	0,98
Communication channels are open in my institution.	3	1,9	11	6,9	35	22,0	65	40,9	45	28,3	3,87	0,97
In our institution, individuals can see the whole rather than pieces.	0	0	22	13,8	46	28,9	61	38,4	30	18,9	3,62	0,95
Average	3,44	2,17	16,33	10,27	48,78	30,68	62,44	39,27	28,00	17,61	3,60	0,96

When the levels of schools having thought behaviors in terms of teacher opinions regarding the structures of learning organizations are examined, the behavior that is “communication channels are open in my institution” has been highest effective behavior with an average of $X = 3,87$.

In schools, “the activities of the Institution are completed without long delays.”, “in our institution, individuals can see the whole rather than pieces.” and “our institution is trying to create tomorrow instead of reacting today” are the behaviors that are frequently fulfilled with an average of $X = 3,77$, $X = 3,62$ and $X = 3,60$ respectively.

In schools, the behaviors that are sometimes fulfilled are “there are permanent solutions to problems in our institution and there is the effect of my personal efforts in solving the institution's problems” with an average of $X = 3,55$, “detailed studies are being done in our institution to find the source of the problems” with an average of $X = 3,51$ and “problems in our institution are caused by external factors” with an average of $C = 3,47$.

Table.11: Levels of Teaching Behavior in Team in Terms of Teacher's Opinions

Levels of Teaching Behavior in Team in Terms of Teacher's Opinions	Never		Very Rare		Sometimes		Frequently		Always		X	S
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Meetings are held with our colleagues in order to realize the aims of the institution.	4	2,5	19	11,9	34	21,4	70	44,0	32	20,1	3,67	1,01
In our institution, a suitable environment for team work is provided.	6	3,8	13	8,2	33	20,8	72	45,3	35	22,0	3,74	1,02
Activities in our institution are realized by team work.	6	3,8	13	8,2	30	18,9	82	51,6	28	17,6	3,71	0,98
I want to work in a team that can be created.	2	1,3	10	6,3	22	13,8	77	48,4	48	30,2	4,00	0,90
A positive environment is provided for dialogue in the team work carried out in our institution.	0	0,0	14	8,8	36	22,6	66	41,5	43	27,0	3,87	0,91
I enjoy taking part in team work.	3	1,9	7	4,4	27	17,0	67	42,1	55	34,6	4,03	0,93
The discussions in the team work are constructive.	3	1,9	4	2,5	40	25,2	73	45,9	39	24,5	3,89	0,87

In team work all members of the team can come together.	2	1,3	17	10,7	30	18,9	67	42,1	43	27,0	3,83	0,99
Basic dialogue rules are explained when team work is started.	4	2,5	11	6,9	41	25,8	63	39,6	40	25,2	3,78	0,99
Each member of the team work suspends his / her thoughts when necessary to understand other friends.	5	3,1	14	8,8	53	33,3	59	37,1	28	17,6	3,57	0,98
Average	3,50	2,20	12,20	7,67	34,60	21,76	69,60	43,77	39,10	24,59	3,81	0,96

When the levels of having a team work learning behavior in terms of teacher's opinions regarding the learning organization structures of schools are examined, the behavior that is "I enjoy taking part in team work" has been highest effective behavior with an average of $X = 4,03$. This behavior was followed by the behavior that is "I want to work in a team that can be created" with an average of $X = 4,03$. These two behaviors usually emerged as behaviors to be frequently fulfilled.

In schools, the behaviors that are frequently fulfilled are "the discussions in the team work are constructive" with an average of $X = 3,89$, "a positive environment is provided for dialogue in the team work carried out in our institution" with an average of $X = 3,83$ and "basic dialogue rules are explained when team work is started" with an average of $X = 3,78$.

In schools, the behaviors that are sometimes fulfilled are "in our institution, a suitable environment for team work is provided" with an average of $X = 3,74$, "activities in our institution are realized by team work" with an average of $X = 3,71$, "meetings are held with our colleagues in order to realize the aims of the institution" with an average of $X = 3,67$ and "each member of the team work suspends his / her thoughts when necessary to understand other friends" with an average of $X = 3,57$.

Table 12: Correlation Analysis Results toward Relation between Teaching Leadership Sub-Dimensions and Organizational Learning Sub-Dimensions

CORRELATION										
Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Creation and Transfer of Mission and Vision	1,00	0,829**	0,785**	0,685**	0,788*	0,587**	0,585*	0,637*	0,566*	0,591**
2. Management of Program and Process	0,829**	1,00	0,829**	0,729**	0,800*	0,631**	0,625*	0,674*	0,621*	0,656**
3. Evaluation of the Process and Student	0,785**	0,829**	1,00	0,732**	0,803*	0,656**	0,641*	0,663*	0,578*	0,639**
4. Supporting Teachers	0,685**	0,729**	0,732**	1,00	0,848*	0,813**	0,651*	0,703*	0,672*	0,659**
5. Environmental Conditions	0,788**	0,800**	0,803**	0,848**	1,00	0,732**	0,738*	0,785*	0,693*	0,685**
6. Personal Mastery	0,587**	0,631**	0,656**	0,813**	0,732*	1,00	0,685*	0,734*	0,719*	0,636**
7. Mind-Models	0,585**	0,625**	0,641**	0,651**	0,738*	0,685**	1,00	0,859*	0,815*	0,730**
8. Shared Vision	0,637**	0,674**	0,663**	0,703**	0,785*	0,734**	0,859*	1,00	0,876*	0,803**
9. System Thought	0,566**	0,621**	0,578**	0,672**	0,693*	0,719**	0,815*	0,876*	1,00	0,752**
10. Learning in Team	0,591**	0,656**	0,639**	0,659**	0,685*	0,636**	0,730*	0,803*	0,752*	1,00

** p < 0 .01

As a result of this study, teaching leadership sub-dimensions and organizational learning sub-dimensions were examined one by one and valuable data were obtained. In addition, a correlation study between headings was conducted to examine the relationship between these sub-dimensions. In these studies, positive correlation between $p < ,001$ level was found among all subtitles.

The highest relationship rate was 0,876, which was between the level of having the system thinking behavior in terms of teacher's opinions and the level of having the shared vision behavior in terms of teacher's opinions.

The lowest relationship rate was 0,566, which was between the level of having the system thinking behavior in terms of teacher's views and the level of having school administrators determining school objectives and sharing behavior in terms of teacher's opinions.

COMMENTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Instructional leadership behaviors of school administrators were examined in five dimensions and the following comments were made on the findings of all dimensions. The results of the organizational learning study were then examined. The relations between sub-titles were evaluated in the light of the results obtained here and finally some suggestions were made for similar studies.

In terms of teacher's views, when we examine how school administrators have to determine the school objectives and share their behaviors: According to the findings of Şişman's research, the average of the meanings of the teachers' perceptions regarding the behaviors in the dimension of "determining and sharing the school objectives" were mostly found (Şişman, 2002, p.147). According to the findings of the research conducted by Aksoy (2006), the average of teacher perceptions related to the role of "determining and sharing of school objectives" has always been found (p. 56).

Findings obtained from teachers' views on behaviors such as "determining and sharing school objectives" in this study are similar to those obtained by other researches. The research is consistent with the studies in the literature in this title.

When we examine the school administrators in terms of teachers' views and the degree to which the educational program and the educational process have management behavior, it has been found that the behaviors of "education program and teaching process management" have been found mostly in the research conducted by Şişman (2002). In the research conducted by Aksoy (2006), the "educational program and the management of the teaching process" of primary school administrators' instructional leadership has often been found as the role of instructional leadership fulfilled.

In this study, the findings obtained from the views of the teachers regarding the behaviors of the "educational program and the management of the teaching process" are similar to the findings of other researches. The research is consistent with the studies in the literature in this title.

In terms of teacher opinions, when we examine the level of school administrators, teaching process and students' evaluation behaviors: Teacher perceptions were mostly related to behaviors in the dimension of "teaching process and evaluation of students" in the research conducted by Şişman (2002). In the research conducted by Aksoy (2006), "the process of teaching and evaluation of the students" of elementary school administrators was often found as the role of instructional leadership fulfilled.

Findings obtained from teachers' opinions about behaviors of "teaching process and evaluation of students" in this research are similar to findings obtained from other researches. The research is consistent with the studies in the literature in this title.

When we examine the level of school administrators, teachers' support and development behaviors in terms of teacher opinions: Teacher perceptions of behaviors in the dimension of "support and development of teachers" were found occasionally in Şişman's research (2002). It was concluded that in primary schools especially the activities of awarding the teachers, in-service training activity and activities for teachers' professional development were inadequate. According to Çalhan's (1999) study, according to teacher perceptions, school administrators occasionally fulfilled the tasks of providing professional development for teachers.

Findings obtained from teachers' views on behaviors such as "support and development of teachers" in this study are similar to those obtained from other researches. The research is consistent with the studies in the literature in this title.

In terms of teacher opinions, when we examine the extent to which school administrators have the attitudes towards the formation of regular teaching and learning environments and climate: In the survey conducted by Şişman (2002), teachers' perceptions about behaviors in the dimension of "creating a regular learning-teaching climate" were mostly

found. Findings in the research show similarity. Taş (2000) found that school administrators always fulfilled the roles of making the school environment suitable for learning and teaching.

Findings obtained from the teachers' views on behaviors such as "creating a regular learning-teaching climate" in this study are similar to the findings of other researches. The research is consistent with the studies in the literature in this title.

According to the researches conducted by Oktaylar (2003), it is determined that schools have a learning school culture according to the views of administrators and teachers working in general high schools. In the research conducted by Kuru (2007), it was concluded that the academic staff perceives the level of organizational learning of the university as moderate level and the administrative staff perceives the level of organizational learning of the university as the upper level in Muğla University.

According to Şahin's (2010) research results, as the knowledge management skills of school principals increase, the level of schools becoming learning organizations also increases. As a result of the studies conducted by Çandır (2010) in the province of Denizli, the level of the schools being learning organizations is generally found to be positive. In studies conducted by Ulutin (2010), it was founded out that "as the perception of institutional identity can be increased through the increase of organizational learning capacity, a high level of corporate identity will increase individual efforts in the sense of developing organizational learning capacity."

As a result, we concluded that there is a positive relationship between organizational learning sub-titles and instructional leadership sub-titles. From this point of view, it is once again revealed how important the role of the leaders of the schools in organizational learning is. There is parallelism between the many studies mentioned above and the results of this study.

In the light of these results we can make the following suggestions;

1. The most important task for increasing organizational learning belongs to the manager and deputy manager who are in the leadership role in educational institutions,
2. In order to increase the quality of education, these burdens imposed to the managers and deputy managers should be supported by other institutions and organizations, in particular by the Ministry of Education,
3. The establishment of organizational learning processes in schools should be supported by various sanctions and encouraging practices,
4. In the field of organizational learning and educational leadership, in-service training should be given to managers and deputy managers,
5. The situation in our country should be determined by conducting studies in the country at the point of educational leadership and organizational learning,
6. An action plan should be organized by an institution and supported by the Ministry of Education and the universities, and new projects should be carried out.
7. Detailed studies should be done at the new studies in the future, considering the many points (education level, seniority level, working hours etc.).
8. The impact of creating learning school environments on school and student achievement should be investigated,
9. Effective school surveys should be conducted to include all stakeholders of the school, and stakeholders' expectations should be accurately understood by using qualitative research techniques.

REFERENCES

- Açıklım, A. (1994) *Teknik ve Toplumsal Yönleriyle Okul Yöneticiliği*. Ankara: Pegem.
- Cazden, C. (1986). Classroom discourse. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp.432-463). NY:MacMillan.
- Anderman, E. M., Bezler, S., & Smith, J. (1991). Teacher commitment and job satisfaction: The role of school culture and principal leadership. *American Educational Research Association*. 1-41.
- Altman, Y. and Iles, P. (1998). Learning, Leadership, Teams: Corporate Learning and Organizational Change. *Journal of Management Development*, 14(1), 44-55.
- Arı, S. G. (2015). Örgütlerde Fiziksel Semboller ve Psikolojik Güçlendirme İlişkisi Üzerine Kavramsal Bir Çalışma. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 32 (2), 1-25. DOI: 10.17065/huifb.87376
- Atak, M. ve Atık, İ. (2007). Örgütlerde Sürekli Eğitimin Önemi ve Öğrenen Örgüt Oluşturma Sürecine Etkisi. *Havacılık ve Uzay Teknolojileri Dergisi*, 3(1), 63-70.
- Ayden, C. ve Düşükcan, M. (2002). Örgütsel Öğrenme Kavramı ve Öğrenme Engellerinin Giderilmesinde Örgüt Kültürü ve Liderliğin Rolü. *SÜ İİBF Sosyal ve Ekonomik Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 2(4), 121-139.
- Aydın, M. (2005). *Eğitim yönetimi* (7. basım). Ankara: Hatiboğlu.
- Blase, J., & Blase J. (1999). Principals' instructional leadership and teacher development: Teachers' perspectives. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35(3), 349-378.

- Bakan, I. ve Karayılan, D. (2011). Öğrenen Organizasyonlar. İçinde, İ. Bakan (Ed.). Çağdaş Yönetim Yaklaşımları: İlkeler, Kavramlar ve Yaklaşımlar (2. Baskı), 393-416. İstanbul: Beta Basım Yayım Dağıtım.
- Bozkurt, A. (2003). Öğrenen Örgütler. İçinde, C. Elma ve K. Demir (Ed.). Yönetimde Çağdaş Yaklaşımlar (2.Baskı), 43-61. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Calvert, G., Mobley, S. and Marshall, L. (1994). Grasping The Learning Organization. *Training & Development*, 48(6), 38-43.
- Can, N. (2007). İlköğretim okulu yöneticisinin bir öğretim lideri olarak yeni öğretim programlarının geliştirilmesi ve uygulanmasındaki yeterliliği. *Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama*.
- Çandır, R. (2010). Lise öğretmenlerinin örgütsel öğrenme düzeyine ilişkin algıları, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Denizli
- Çil, M. (2015). Fen Bilgisi Zümre Faaliyetlerinin Sınav Hazırlama Yöntemleri Üzerindeki Etkisi.(Yayımlanmış yüksek lisans tezi) İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü
- Düren, Z. (2002). 2000’li Yıllarda Yönetim: Sürekli Değişim ve Belirsizlik Ortamında Gelişen Yönetimsel Yaklaşımlar (2. Baskı). Ankara: Alfa Basım Yayım Dağıtım.
- Erdoğan, İ. (2002). *Okul yönetimi ve öğretim liderliği*. İstanbul: Sistem.
- Garvin, D. A. (1993). Building a Learning Organization. *Harvard Business Review*, 71(4), 78-91.
- Gümüşeli, A.İ. (1996) İstanbul İlindeki İlköğretim Okulu Müdürlerinin Öğretim Liderliği Davranışları, (Yayımlanmış Araştırma) İstanbul: Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü.
- Gümüşeli, A.İ. (2001). Çağdaş Okul Müdürlerinin Liderlik Alanları. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi*, 28, 531-548.
- Güney, S. (2007). Öğrenen Örgütlerde Liderliğin Rolü ve Önemi. İçinde, S. Güney (Ed.). Yönetim ve Organizasyon (Genişletilmiş ve Gözden Geçirilmiş 2. Baskı), 551-566. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Gürsoy, A. (2005). “Liderlikte Duygusal Zekâ (Liderlik Özellikleri İle Duygusal Zekâlı Liderlere Ulaşılması) Türk Silahlı Kuvvetlerinde Örnek Bir Uygulama”, Celal Bayar Üniversitesi, Manisa: Basılmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi.
- Hersey P., Blanchard K. H. & Johnson D. E. (2008). “Management of Organizational Behavior, Leading Human Resources”, New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Hodgkinson, C. (2008). Yönetim Felsefesi Örgütsel Yaşamda Değerler ve Motivasyon, İbrahim Anıl, Binali Doğan (Çev. Ed.) İstanbul, Beta
- İnan, M. (2013). Liderlik, İstanbul: Optimist Yayınları.
- Koçel, T. (2001). İşletme Yöneticiliği, İstanbul: Beta Yayınevi.
- Krug, S. E. (1992). *Instructional leadership: School instructional climate and student learning outcomes*. (Eric Document Reproduction Service) <http://www.eric.ed.gov>. ED 359668
- Kuru, S. (2007). Muğla Üniversitesi’nin örgütsel öğrenme açısından incelenmesi, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Muğla Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Muğla
- Lashway, L. (2002). Developing instructional leaders. *ERIC Digest, Clearing house on Educational Management*, University of Oregon.
- McEwan, E. (1994). 7 steps to effective instructional leadership. *New York: Scholastic Publications*. <http://bul.sagepub.com/content/78/564/121.extract> adresinden 04.02.2017 tarihinde alınmıştır.
- Oktaylar, A. (2003). Öğretmen ve yöneticilerin öğrenen örgüt kültürüne ilişkin görüşler, Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Anadolu Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Eskişehir
- Phillips, J. A. (2004). Manager-administrator to instructional leader: Shift in the role of the school principal. *Jurnal Pendetua (Journal of Principalship)*, 5(2).
- Senge, P. (2011). Beşinci Disiplin (Çev.: A. İldeniz ve A. Doğukan). İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Şimşek, Ş. (2001). Yönetim ve Organizasyon (6. Baskı). Konya: Günay Ofset.
- Şimşek, M. (2005). Lise Müdürlerinin Liderlik Tarzları (Erzurum İli Örneği). Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Kırıkkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Kırıkkale.
- Şişman, M. (1997). Okul müdürlerinin öğretim liderliği davranışları. *IV. Eğitim Bilimleri Kongresinde Sunulan Sözlü Bildiri*, Anadolu Üniversitesi, Eskişehir.
- Şişman, M. (2014). Öğretim Liderliği. Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık, 5. Baskı.
- Türemen, F. (1999). Devlet Liselerinde ve Özel Liselerde Örgütsel Öğrenme ve Engelleri. Doktora Tezi, Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Elazığ.
- Türemen, F. (2001). Öğrenen Okul. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Sergiovanni, J.T. and J.Starrat R. (1984) Leadership and Excellence In Schooling. *Educational Leadership*, 13 (4) February.
- Ulutin, H.C. (2010). Okul yöneticilerinin kurumlarının kimliğine ve örgütsel öğrenme kapasitesine ilişkin algıları, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara
- Senge, P., Cambron, N., Lucas, T., Smith, B., Dutton, J. & Kleiner, A. (2014). Öğrenen Okullar, Münevver Çetin (Çev. Ed.), Ankara, Nobel Yayınevi