Avrasya Sosyal ve Ekonomi Araştırmaları Dergisi (ASEAD)
Eurasian Journal of Researches in Social and Economics (EJRSE)
ISSN:2148-9963 **www.asead.com**

EFFECTS OF LEARNING ORGANIZATION PRACTICES ON EDUCATION SECTOR AND APPROACHES OF TEACHERS TO APPLICATIONS: İSTANBUL CASE

Gökhan Oruç ÖNALAN[1]
Assist. Prof. Dr. Canan YILDIRAN[2]
Lecturer Oya ÖNALAN[3]
Prof. Dr. Fatma Zehra TAN[4]

ABSTRACT

In this study, it is aimed to determine the effect of learning organization practices on education sector and to determine how teachers approach to their learning organization. In the study, data were collected from 1000 people who were working as teachers in 39 different districts of Istanbul with simple random sampling method and their data were analyzed with STATA 11.0 program. As a result of the research, it was understood that the general scores related to the five discipline applications of Senge showed a significant difference according to the teachers' experiences and branches. On the other hand, it was found that the general scores on five disciplinary applications did not show a significant difference according to the gender, marital status, age and working place districts.

Keywords: Learning Organization, Teacher, Management Science, İstanbul.

ÖĞRENEN ORGANİZASYON UYGULAMALARININ EĞİTİM SEKTÖRÜ ÜZERİNDEKİ ETKİLERİ VE ÖĞRETMENLERİN BU UYGULAMALARA YAKLAŞIMLARI: İSTANBUL ÖRNEĞİ

ÖZET

Bu çalışmada öğrenen organizasyon uygulamalarının eğitim sektörü üzerindeki etkisinin belirlenmesi ve öğretmenlerin öğrenen organizasyonlara nasıl yaklaşım sergilediklerinin belirlenmesi amaçlanmıştır. Araştırmada İstanbul'un 39 farklı ilçesinde öğretmen olarak görev yapan 1000 kişiden basit tesadüfi örnekleme yöntemi ile veriler toplanmış ve bu veriler STATA 11.0 programı ile analiz edilmiştir. Araştırma sonucunda Senge'nin beş disiplin uygulamasına ilişkin genel puanların, öğretmenlerin deneyimlerine ve branşlarına göre anlamlı bir farklılık gösterdiği anlaşılmıştır. Öte yandan beş disiplin uygulama genel puanlarının cinsiyet, medeni durum, yaş ve çalışılan işyeri ilçelerine göre anlamlı bir farklılık göstermediği görülmüştür.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Öğrenen Organizasyon, Öğretmen, Yönetim Bilimi, İstanbul.

[1] Phd. Std., Karabuk University, ORCID: 0000-0002-6290-414, goruconalan@gmail.com
[2] Karabuk University, ORCID: 0000-0001-8245-197, cananyildiran@karabuk.edu.tr
[3] Karabuk University, ORCID: 0000-0002-4169-8789, oyaonalan@karabuk.edu.tr
[4] Karabuk University, ORCID: 0000-0003-1554-6500, fatmazehra@karabuk.edu.tr
Araştırma Makalesi/Research Article–Geliş Tarihi/Received:20/01/2021–Kabul Tarihi/Accepted: 22/04/2021

INTRODUCTION

Globalization and increasing competition conditions force organizations to move faster, learn faster and realize what they learn faster than their competitors. This is the point that is based on the idea of the Learning Organizations approach. Learning organizations are one of the most popular fields of study in today's world. Within the scope of this study, a literature review has been made about the learning organization disciplines. Then, by making the explanations about the disciplines of learning organizations, the results of the research on the teachers working in the province of Istanbul about these disciplines are given. The data obtained within the framework of the research were analyzed with variable statistical methods.

1. LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Especially since the 1950s, when System Theory came to the fore, organizations started to be seen as a living system. From this point of view, Senge adapted the "System Theory" to the learning processes, and with the positive results obtained by transferring the information to the business world, the learning organizations became popular in the business world as a discipline (Senge, 2016).

The concept of learning organizations started with studies by Chris Argyris in 1960s (Atak, 2007: 64). Especially in the 1970s it showed itself in the business world. It was initially perceived as the capture and correction of errors. However, in the 1980s, Shell's interest in organizational learning processes related to strategic planning increased the interest in learning organizations. Especially after the publication of the book "Fifth Discipline" by Peter Senge at the beginning of the 1990s, the learning organization discipline reached the top of its popularity. In his study of this field, Garwin (2000) describes learning organizations as structures that produce knowledge, at the same time interpret, use new knowledge and can transform them into behavior. According to Toplu and Akça (2013), it is stated that the employees of the learning organizations are both more willing to have personal development and they are the individuals who feel themselves psychologically strong. It is also stated that organizations are closely related to their ability to react to change and to adapt to the changing environment and to the characteristics of being a learning organization (Korkmaz, 2008). On the basis of individual and organizational learning and practice, the learning organization disciplines can be defined under five headings as follows;

Personal Mastery: Personal mastery, which is the first component, is expressed as the development of individual capacities for each individual within the organization to reach the desired results (Najafbagy and Doroudi, 2010). In other words, if we define personal mastery, it is necessary to create appropriate learning environments that will enable the other individuals in the team to come together in an organizational way in line with the organizational goals and objectives (Senge, 2016).

Mental Models: The second component of the learning organizations, mental models, focuses on the enrichment of the inner world of each individual in the system. In this context, we should seek answers to the question of how personal decisions and personal actions should be shaped? (Plessis et al., 1999)

For this reason, mental models are also expressed as a system of values that shape social attitudes and break prejudices by directing individual and social choices and behaviors in the same way (Arıoğlu, 2006).

Shared Vision: The idea of shared vision, which is the third pillar of the learning organization practices, is a set of practices that support the steps to be taken towards the future within organizations. In this context, strengthening the sense of belonging of the principles and personnel guiding the practices within the organization and creating a common future theme becomes a part of the shared vision pillar (Heck and Hallinger, 2005).

Learning as a Team: Teamwork learning, which is the fourth leg of the process, develops in the institutional sense due to the production of information (Confessore, 1997). It will not be a wrong approach to see teams within organizations as non-individual basic learning units. In the same way learning as a team discipline also aims to create a much larger talent accumulation by gathering the talents of the individuals within the organization and developing the capacities and interrelated thinking styles of the groups within the organization (Lewis, 2008).

System Thinking: The fifth component of the learning organizations, the system idea, is used to shape the organizational behaviors and to cover the languages and thinking processes necessary to understand and define mutual relations and pressure groups. System thinking, which is the final component, helps organizations' employees and managers interpret how systems will be changed in a more effective process and act in harmony with environmental processes. Looking at the organizations in terms of systems, first envisages identifying internal and external stakeholders, then identifying the system in general and optimizing it as a result (Hiebert and Klatt, 2001).

2. METHOD

2.1. Sample and Data Collection

The sample of the study consisted of 1000 participants who teach in different branches selected from 39 different districts of Istanbul with simple random sampling method. Survey method was used to obtain data. The questionnaire consists of questions about the demographic characteristics and likert scale questions which are formed by re-adapting the expressions under the headings of the learning organization disciplines. The relevant survey was filled out by the participants via Google-Forms. Obtained data were taken between 5-28 March 2019. Research data were analyzed using STATA 11.0 program.

2.2. Analysis

In the analyses conducted within the scope of the research, chi-square test statistic was used among categorical variables to determine the difference between the masses. In comparison of the dependent variable metric variable, Independent Two Sample T-Test or ANOVA (One-Way Variance Analysis) was applied according to the number of masses. If the assumption of normality or homogeneous variance is not assumed from the assumptions of the parametric hypothesis tests, the non-parametric test Kruskal-Wallis test is used instead of ANOVA (Mert, 2016).

3. FINDINGS

3.1. Descriptive Analysis Findings

Within the scope of descriptive statistics of the study, the sample has distribution by districts, branches, gender, age group, marital status and experience.

Table 1: Distribution By Living District Variable

District	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Adalar	2	0.20	0.20
Arnavutköy	18	1.80	2.00
Ataşehir	28	2.80	4.80
Avcılar	29	2.90	7.70
Bağcılar	49	4.90	12.60
Bahçelievler	39	3.90	16.50
Bakırköy	15	1.50	18.00
Başakşehir	28	2.80	20.80
Bayrampaşa	18	1.80	22.60
Beşiktaş	13	1.30	23.90
Beykoz	16	1.60	25.50
Beylikdüzü	22	2.20	27.70
Beyoğlu	15	1.50	29.20
Büyükçekmece	15	1.50	30.70
Çatalca	5	0.50	31.20
Çekmeköy	17	1.70	32.90
Esenler	30	3.00	35.90
Esenyurt	59	5.90	41.80
Eyüpsultan	25	2.50	44.30
Fatih	29	2.90	47.20
Gaziosmanpaşa	32	3.20	50.40
Güngören	19	1.90	52.30
Kadıköy	30	3.00	55.30
Kağıthane	29	2.90	58.20
Kartal	31	3.10	61.30
Küçükçekmece	51	5.10	66.40
Maltepe	33	3.30	69.70
Pendik	46	4.60	74.30
Sancaktepe	27	2.70	77.00
Sarıyer	23	2.30	79.30
Silivri	12	1.20	80.50
Sultanbeyli	22	2.20	82.70
Sultangaz	35	3.50	86.20
Şile	2	0.20	86.40
Şişli	18	1.80	88.20
Tuzla	18	1.80	90.00
Ümraniye	46	4.60	94.60
Üsküdar	35	3.50	98.10
Zeytinburnu	19	1.90	100.00
Total	1,000	100.00	

As shown in Table 1, a sample of one thousand people was tried to be distributed to 39 districts of Istanbul in proportion to size of the sub-sample. The distribution of the sample size according to the districts and the percentage shares are seen.

Table 2: Distribution By Branch Variable

Branch	Freg.	Percent	Cum.
Physical Education	36	3.60	3.60
Information Technologies	20	2.00	5.60
Biology	18	1.80	7.40
Geography	19	1.90	9.30
Child Development	4	0.40	9.70
Religion and Ethics	43	4.30	14.00
Drama	2	0.20	14.20
Educational Counselling	4	0.40	14.60
Philosophy	19	1.90	16.50
Science	23	2.30	18.80
Physics	21	2.10	20.90
Visual Arts	19	1.90	22.80
Chemistry	22	2.20	25.00
Mathematics	70	7.00	32.00
Vocational Education	88	8.80	40.80
Music	15	1.50	42.30
Preschool Teaching	53	5.30	47.60
Guidance and Psychological Counselling	131	13.10	60.70
Primary School Teaching	31	3.10	63.80
Social Science	223	22.30	86.10
History	13	1.30	87.40
Technology and Design	31	3.10	90.50
Turkish Language and Literature	8	0.80	91.30
Turkish	71	7.10	98.40
Foreign Languages	16	1.60	100.00
Total	1,000	100.00	

As it can be seen in Table 2, while the weight of the participants in the distribution of branches are Social Studies and Guidance branch, it was found that the participants in the Vocational Courses branch, which has an important place in the concept of learning organizations, have an important place in the sample.

Table 3: Gender Variable Distribution

Gender	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Female	671	67.10	67.10
Male	329	32.90	100.00
Total	1,000	100.00	

As seen in Table 3, 67.1% of the participants are female and 32.9% are male

Table 4: Distribution By Age Variable

Age	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
20-25	49	4.90	4.90
26-30	144	14.40	19.30
31-35	191	19.10	38.40
36-40	200	20.00	58.40
41-45	137	13.70	72.10
46-50	140	14.00	86.10
51-55	75	7.50	93.60
56-60	44	4.40	98.00
61-65	20	2.00	100.00
Total	1,000	100.00	

As seen in Table 4, the biggest weight of the participants in terms of age group is 19,1% and 31-35 age range and 20,0% 36-40 age range.

Table 5: Distribution By Marital Status Variable

Marital Status	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Married	702	70.20	70.20
Single	273	27.30	97.50
Other	25	2.50	100.00
Total	1,000	100.00	

As seen in Table 5, 70.2% of the participants were married and 27.3% were single.

Table 6: Experience Time Variable Distribution

Experience	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
0-5	216	21.60	21.60
6-10	190	19.00	40.60
11-15	146	14.60	55.20
16-20	161	16.10	71.30
21-25	154	15.40	86.70
26-30	73	7.30	94.00
31-35	28	2.80	96.80
36-40	25	2.50	99.30
41-45	7	0.70	100.00
Total	1,000	100.00	

As seen in Table 6, it is seen that the biggest weight 21.6% of the participants in terms of experience is 0-5 years and the minimum weight is 0.7% to 41-45 years.

3.2. Participation Findings in Statements

According to the responses of the participants to the question expressions, participation status and standard deviations are given in the table below. In addition to the research questions, five new variables were created by taking the average of the questions related to each of the fifth disciplinary applications. These; Personal Mastery General Score, Mental Models General Score, Shared Vision General Score, Overall Score of Team Learning, System Thinking General Score.

The General Score of the Fifth Disciplinary Practices was determined by also taking the arithmetic average of the general scores of a newly created variable.

Table 7: Distribution By Participation in The Expressions

Variable	Obs.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min.	Max.
pm1	1000	4.188	.8952416	1	5
pm2	1000	3.783	1.059733	1	5
pm3	1000	3.808	1.054632	1	5
pm4	1000	4.241	.9663606	1	5
pm5	1000	3.903	1.104904	1	5
pm6	1000	3.757	1.064464	1	5
pm7	1000	3.823	1.023092	1	5
pm8	992	3.662298	1.050621	1	5
pmgeneral	1000	3.89419	.863168	1	5
mm1	1000	3.849	1.165142	1	5
mm2	1000	3.795	1.098263	1	5
mm3	1000	3.819	1.037938	1	5
mm4	1000	3.733	1.044415	1	5
mm5	1000	3.676	1.13239	1	5
mm6	1000	3.734	1.065072	1	5
mm7	988	3.659919	1.151948	1	5
mmgeneral	1000	3.74602	.9293588	1	5
sv1	1000	3.579	1.097709	1	5
sv2	1000	3.758	1.123699	1	5
sv3	1000	4.043	.9960638	1	5
sv4	1000	3.982	1.024073	1	5
sv5	1000	4.176	.9869134	1	5
sv6	1000	4.188	.9917861	1	5
sv7	1000	3.058	1.279169	1	5
svgeneral	1000	3.826286	.834137	1	5
lt1	1000	3.693	1.181587	1	5
lt2	1000	3.793	1.115973	1	5
lt3	1000	3.25	1.388318	1	5
lt4	1000	3.812	1.117992	1	5
lt5	1000	3.853	1.092055	1	5
lt6	1000	3.112	1.392622	1	5
lt7	1000	3.76	1.118772	1	5
ltgeneral	1000	3.610429	.9056812	1	5
st1	1000	3.732	1.136428	1	5
st2	1000	3.62	1.03763	1	5
st3	1000	3.879	1.016559	1	5
st4	1000	4.029	1.044629	1	5
st5	1000	4.316	.9492339	1	5
st6	1000	3.803	.9783395	1	5
st7	1000	3.847	.9759834	1	5
st8	1000	3.948	1.045174	1	5
stgeneral	1000	3.89675	.8532504	1	5
generalscore	1000	3.794735	.7971138	1	5

3.3. Analysis Findings About Hypotheses

H_1: Overall score related to the fifth discipline practices varies according to the experience of the teachers.

Table 8: Barlett Test Findings Regarding The Variance of Experience Time

. oneway generalscore – experience					
Analysis of variance					
Source	SS	df	MS	F	Prob > F
Between groups	**14.8861639**	**8**	**1.86077048**	**2.97**	**0.0027**
Within groups	**619.868879**	**991**	**.625498364**		
Total	**634.755043**	**999**	**.635390433**		
Barlett's test for equal variances: chi2(**8**) = **29.9958** Prob>chi2 = **0.000**					

As seen in Table 8, the first case to be looked at in the result of the One-Way Analysis of Variance is the Bartlett test results, which test the assumption of homogeneity. According to the Bartlett test, P= 0.000 is calculated. In this case, the assumption of homogeneity will not be provided. Non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test is performed because the homogeneity assumption is not provided.

Table 9: Kruskal-Wallis Test Findings

. kwallis generalscore, by(experience)		
Kruskal-wallis equality-of-populations rank test		
Experience	**Obs**	**Rank Sum**
0-5	216	115596.50
6-10	190	94598.00
11-15	146	66996.00
16-20	161	77755.00
21-25	154	77069.50
26-30	73	36195.00
31-35	28	10021.00
36-40	25	18748.00
41-45	7	3521.00
chi-squared = **32.245** with **8** d. f.		
probability = **0.0001**		
chi-squared with ties = **32.246** with **8** d. f.		
Probability = **0.0001**		

As seen in Table 9, P=0.0001 emergence as a result of Kruskal-Wallis test indicates that there is a significant difference in the scores of the fifth discipline applications according to the experience duration of the participants.

H_2: Overall score related to the fifth discipline practices varies according to the gender of the teachers.

The homogeneity of the groups is tested before the independent two samples T-Test is performed.

Table 10: Ratio Test Findings of Variances

. sdtest generalscore, by(gender)						
Variance ratio test						
Group	Obs	Mean	Std. Err.	Std. Dev.	(95% Conf. Interval)	
Female	**671**	**3.82723**	**.0304778**	**.7894881**	**3.767386**	**3.887074**
Male	**329**	**3.728461**	**.0446355**	**.8096149**	**3.640653**	**3.816269**
Combined	**1000**	**3.794735**	**.025207**	**.7971138**	**3.74527**	**3.8442**
ratio = sd(**Female**) / sd(**Male**) f = **0.9509**						
Ho: ratio = 1 degrees of freedom = **670,328**						
Ha: ratio < 1 Ha: ratio != 1 Ha: ratio > 1						
Pr(F < f) = **0.2945** 2*Pr(F < f) = **0.5889** Pr(F > f) = **0.7055**						

As it is seen in Table 10, according to the ratio test of variances because P=0.5889>0.05, it is concluded that the masses are homogeneous.

Table 11: T-Test Findings

. ttest generalscore, by(gender)						
Two-sample t test with equal variances						
Group	Obs	Mean	Std. Err.	Std. Dev.	(95% Conf. Interval)	
Female	**671**	**3.82723**	**.0304778**	**.7894881**	**3.767386**	**3.887074**
Male	**329**	**3.728461**	**.0446355**	**.8096149**	**3.640653**	**3.816269**
Combined	**1000**	**3.794735**	**.025207**	**.7971138**	**3.74527**	**3.8442**
diff		**.0987692**	**.0535847**		**-.0063823**	**.20339208**
diff = mean(**Female**) – mean(**Male**) t = **1.8432**						
Ho: diff = 0 degrees of freedom = **998**						
Ha: diff < 0 Ha: diff != 0 Ha: diff > 0						
Pr(T < t) = **0.9672** Pr(|T| > |t|) = **0.0656** Pr(T > t) = **0.0328**						

As seen in Table 11, there was no significant difference between the averages as P=0.0656>0.01 according to the Independent Two Sample T-Test results.

H_3: Overall score on fifth discipline practices varies according to teachers' marital status.

Table 12: Barlett Test Findings Related To Marital Status Variables

. oneway generalscore – maritalstatus					
Analysis of variance					
Source	SS	df	MS	F	Prob > F
Between groups	**.005560973**	**2**	**.002780487**	**0.00**	**0.9956**
Within groups	**634.749482**	**997**	**.63665946**		
Total	**634.755043**	**999**	**.635390433**		
Barlett's test for equal variances: chi2(**2**) = **5.7035** Prob>chi2 = **0.058**					

As can be seen in Table 12, in the results of the One-Way Analysis of Variance, which should be looked at first, are the Bartlett test results in which the assumption of homogeneity is tested.

According to the Bartlett test, P=0.058. In this case, homogeneity assumption is ensured. Moreover, since P=0.9956>0.05, there is no difference between the averages of general scores on the fifth discipline practices according to marital status.

H_4: The overall score related to the fifth discipline practices varies according to the age group of teachers.

Table 13: Barlett Test Findings Related To Age Variables

. oneway generalscore – age					
Analysis of variance					
Source	SS	df	MS	F	Prob > F
Between groups	**5.79747336**	**8**	**.72468417**	**1.14**	**0.3323**
Within groups	**628.957569**	**991**	**.634669596**		
Total	**634.755043**	**999**	**.635390433**		
Barlett's test for equal variances: chi2(**8**) = **15.8658** Prob>chi2 = **0.044**					

As can be seen in Table 13, in the results of one-way analysis of variance which should be looked at first are the results of the Bartlett test, where the assumption of homogeneity is tested.

According to the Bartlett test, P=0.044. In this case, the assumption of homogeneity will not be provided. Non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test is performed because the homogeneity assumption is not provided.

Table 14: Kruskal-Wallis Test Findings

.. kwallis generalscore, by(age)		
Kruskal-wallis equality-of-populations rank test		
Age	**Obs**	**Rank Sum**
20-25	49	25815.00
26-30	144	77479.50
31-35	191	90820.50
36-40	200	99037.00
41-45	137	66392.00
46-50	140	70953.50
51-55	75	32502.50
56-60	44	25527.50
61-65	20	11972.50
chi-squared = **14.531** with **8** d. f.		
probability = **0.0689**		
chi-squared with ties = **14.531** with **8** d. f.		
Probability = **0.0689**		

As seen in Table 14, the result of the Kruskal-Wallis test, P=0.0689 showed no significant difference in the scores of the fifth discipline applications of the participants according to the age groups.

H_5: General score related to the fifth discipline practices varies according to the branches of teachers.

Table 15: Barlett Test Findings Related To Branch Variables

. oneway generalscore branch					
Analysis of variance					
Source	SS	df	MS	F	Prob > F
Between groups	**37.3406604**	**24**	**1.55586085**	**2.54**	**0.0001**
Within groups	**597.414382**	**975**	**.6127327**		
Total	**634.755043**	**999**	**.635390433**		
Barlett's test for equal variances: chi2(**24**) = **62.5902** Prob>chi2 = **0.000**					

As seen in Table 15, in the One-Way Analysis of Variance, the first case to be considered is the Bartlett test results, where the assumption of homogeneity is tested.

According to Bartlett test, P=0.000. In this case, the assumption of homogeneity will not be provided. The non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test is performed because the homogeneity assumption cannot be obtained.

Table 16: Kruskal-Wallis Test Findings

Kruskal-wallis equality-of-populations rank test		
Branch	**Obs**	**Rank Sum**
Physical Education	36	20171.50
Information Technologies	20	12227.00
Biology	18	8353.00
Geography	19	8248.00
Child Development	4	1854.00
Religion and Ethics	43	20538.00
Drama	2	810.50
Educational Counselling	4	3042.00
Philosophy	19	4994.50
Science	23	8642.50
Physics	21	12282.00
Visual Arts	19	11046.50
Chemistry	22	13209.50
Mathematics	70	35277.00
Vocational Education	88	38295.00
Music	15	8077.00
Preschool Teaching	53	28380.00
Guidance and Psychological Counselling	131	59918.50
Primary School Teaching	31	17710.50
Social Science	223	116366.00
History	13	7960.00
Technology and Design	31	12973.00
Turkish Language and Literature	8	3868.00
Turkish	71	40292.00
Foreign Languages	16	5964.00
chi-squared = 55.615 with 24 d.f.		
probability = 0.0003		
chi-squared with ties = 55.616 with 24 d.f.		
probability = 0.0003		

As seen in Table 16, the result of Kruskal-Wallis test showed that P=0.0003 showed a significant difference in the overall scores of the participants on the fifth discipline according to their branches.

H_6: The overall score related to the fifth discipline practices varies according to the districts where teachers work.

Table 17: Barlett Test Findings Related To The Working District

. oneway generalscore – district					
Analysis of variance					
Source	SS	df	MS	F	Prob > F
Between groups	**31.1504444**	**38**	**.819748537**	**1.31**	**0.1044**
Within groups	**603.604598**	**961**	**.628100519**		
Total	**634.755043**	**999**	**.635390433**		
Barlett's test for equal variances: chi2(**38**) = **65.5133** Prob>chi2 = **0.004**					

As can be seen in Table 17, in the results of the One-Way Analysis of Variance are the results of the Bartlett test in which the assumption of homogeneity is tested.

It was calculated as P=0.004 according to the Bartlett test. In this case, the assumption of homogeneity will not be provided. The non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test is performed because the homogeneity assumption cannot be obtained.

Table 18: Kruskal-Wallis Test Findings

Kruskal-wallis equality-of-populations rank test		
District	**Obs**	**Rank Sum**
Adalar	2	403.50
Arnavutköy	18	9362.50
Ataşehir	28	14435.00
Avcılar	29	16555.00
Bağcılar	49	26851.50
Bahçelievler	39	18533.00
Bakırköy	15	8126.50
Başakşehir	28	12904.00
Bayrampaşa	18	7967.50
Beşiktaş	13	5808.50
Beykoz	16	8696.00
Beylikdüzü	22	12509.00
Beyoğlu	15	6712.00
Büyükçekmece	15	6315.00
Çatalca	5	1295.00
Çekmeköy	17	8350.50
Esenler	30	14621.50
Esenyurt	59	33578.00
Eyüpsultan	25	13416.50
Fatih	29	16563.00
Gaziosmanpaşa	32	17152.00
Güngören	19	9175.50
Kadıköy	30	16773.00
Kağıthane	29	12251.00
Kartal	31	14118.00

Küçükçekmece	51	32882.00
Maltepe	33	12905.50
Pendik	46	20806.50
Sancaktepe	27	12352.50
Sarıyer	23	11076.00
Silivri	12	5339.50
Sultanbeyli	22	12162.50
Sultangazi	35	16240.50
Şile	2	1215.50
Şişli	18	8772.00
Tuzla	18	8070.00
Ümraniye	46	20610.50
Üsküdar	35	17564.50
Zeytinburnu	19	8029.50
chi-squared = 49.524 with 38 d.f.		
probability = 0.0998		
chi-squared with ties = 49.525 with 38 d.f.		
probability = 0.0998		

As seen in Table 18, the result of Kruskal-Wallis test showed that P=0.0998 did not show a significant difference in the overall scores of the participants on the fifth discipline according to their working districts.

To summarize in general;

H_1: According to the experience time of the teachers, scores about the fifth discipline applications show a significant difference.

H_2: According to the gender of the teachers, the scores on the fifth discipline practices do not differ significantly.

H_3: There is no difference between the averages of the general scores of the teachers on the fifth discipline practices according to marital status.

H_4: There is no significant difference between the scores of the teachers regarding the fifth discipline practices according to age groups.

H_5: There is a significant difference in overall scores on fifth discipline practices of teachers according to their branches.

H_6: According to the working districts of the teachers, their overall scores on the fifth discipline practices do not differ significantly.

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSIONS

Throughout history, humanity has constantly advanced with new knowledge and learned new things. This process will continue in the same way as it was yesterday. So, learning is a lifelong human activity (Akgemci, 1999). Especially the technological opportunities that have been developed today have made it easy to reach the information and increased the importance of information. Individuals and organizations putting the obtained information into practice at the end of the learning process come up with successful results. Individuals working within organizations will have the environment where they can develop their personal skills. In the same way, the relationship between the concepts of human and learning becomes more apparent when considered together with the system thinking. Namely; it will be inevitable that the change in one individual affects another. The basis of this process lies in the philosophy of transforming every time spent within organizations into a learning process.

In today's world shaped around knowledge, both the concept of human being and the concept of organization as well as the concepts of learning organization undertake a very important function in the fulfillment of social requirements. The societies that want to move forward in the way of becoming an information society must realize this process. The concept of development will become a dynamic concept from a static one when organizations become learning organizations by discovering their own capacity and learning to use it.

REFERENCES

Akgemci, T. (1999). "Sanayi Ötesi Toplum ve Öğrenen Organizasyonlar", *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Meslek Yüksekokulu Dergisi,* 59-71.

Arıoğlu, E. (2006). *Toplumsal Değişimin Dinamikleri*. Ankara: Yeni Reform Yayıncılık.

Confessore, S. J. (1997). "Building a Learning Organization: Communities of Practice, Self-Directed Learning and Continuing Medical Education", *The Journal of Continuing Education in The Health Professions*, 5-11.

Garvin, D. A. (2000). *Learning in Action: A Guide to Putting the Learning Organization to Work*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Heck, R. H. & Hallinger, P. (2005). "The Study of Educational Leadership and Management", *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 229-244.

Hiebert, M. & Klatt, B. (2001). *The Encyclopedia of Leadership*. New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies Permissions Deparment.

Korkmaz, M. (2008). "Okul Müdürlerinin Liderlik Stilleri ile Öğrenen Örgüt Özellikleri Arasındaki İlişki Üzerine Nicel Bir Araştırma", *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi,* 75-98.

Lewis, N. B. (2008). "Universities as Learning Organizations: Implications and Challenges", *Educational Research and Review*, 289-293.

Mert, M. (2016). *Yatay Kesit Veri Analizi Bilgisayar Uygulamaları*. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.

Najafbagy, R. & Doroudi, H. (2010). "Model of Learning Organization in Broadcasting Organization of Islamic Republic of Iran", *Serbian Journal of Management,* 213-225.

Plessis, D., Plessis, M. & Millett, B. (1999). "Developing a Learning Organization: A Case Study", *Journal of Management Practice,* 71-94.

Senge, P. M. (2016). *Beşinci Disiplin*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Toplu, D. & Akça, M. (2013). "Öğrenen Organizasyonun Psikolojik Güçlendirme Üzerindeki Etkisi: Kamu Sektöründe Bir Araştırma", *İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi,* 221-235.