Teacher Opinions on the Innovation Management Skills of School Administrators and Organizational Learning Mechanisms[1]

Yunus Emre OMUR[*]
Turkan ARGON[**]

Abstract

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

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

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

Findings and Results: According to the results of the research, teachers' opinions of both the organizational learning mechanisms of their schools

---

[1] This article is based on the master's thesis prepared by Yunus Emre Omur with the same title under supervision of Turkan Argon.
[*] Corrsponding author: Resarch Assistans. Yildiz Technical University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, yunus.emre.omur@gmail.com
[**] Prof. Dr. Abant Izzet Baysal University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, turkanargon@hotmail.com

and their administrators' innovation management skills were medium level in total and at sub-dimensions; and there is a high-level, positive, and significant relationship between teachers' opinions of organizational learning mechanisms and the innovation management skills of school administrators.

Keywords: Innovation management, organizational learning mechanisms, school administrator, teacher.

Introduction

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

Organizational Learning Mechanisms at Schools

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

Although there have been many ideas on how organizational learning is practiced, most of them have emerged from Argyris and Schon's (1978) single loop and double loop learning method. Single loop learning is defined as learning to adapt or lower the learning level (Argyris, 1976; Senge, 1990; Fiol & Lyles, 1985). This learning type emerged in order to correct organizational mistakes, and organizations incorporated this into their goals and policies (Toremen, 2011). Single loop learning is short-term, superficial, temporary, a repetition of past behaviors, and at the routine level of organization (Fiol & Lyles, 1985). Accordingly, it can be said that the goal of the single loop method is to optimize the present system and to extinguish all the mistakes.

What differentiates double loop learning from single loop learning is that double loop learning changes the mental models, policies, and assumptions underlying daily routines and actions (Van Grinsven & Visser, 2011). After comparing double loop learning with mistakes, Argyris (1995) defined double loop learning as changing the underlying program, which blames others. Contrary to single loop learning, it not only determines and corrects mistakes, but in order to attain goals, it also involves changing the strategies, norms, and values that lead to wrong actions (Huang & Shih, 2001).

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

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

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

themselves to changing trends (Park, 2006); thus, educational institutions have to efficiently manage learning mechanisms and exploit organizational learning.

Innovation Management at Schools

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

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

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

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

There is a two-way interaction between education and innovation: while schools reshape themselves according to social changes, they also pioneer social innovation (Ozdemir, 2013). Therefore, educational organizations, which are responsible for

planning the country's future human resources, have to predict the future, determine the required change, and enable these changes to become permanent (Beycioglu & Aslan, 2010). According to Argon and Ozcelik (2007), national and international change becomes evident in various ways in social and open educational systems and directly or indirectly affects the individuals who are included or excluded in the process. Everything that emerges without innovation first becomes ordinary due to institutions, ideas, technology, and changes, then loses its functions and becomes less effective (Acikalin, 1998).

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

Innovation Management and Organizational Learning Mechanisms

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

Organizational learning supports knowledge management, helps enhance creative skills throughout the innovation process (Avci, 2009), creates a shared intelligence for workers, and serves as a resource for innovations (Ozdevecioglu & Bickes, 2012). Garcia, Ruiz, and Llorens (2007) underlined that organizational learning supports creativeness, inspires new information and ideas, increases the applicability of these ideas, and hence becomes the basis of innovation. While Therin (2002) states that learning requires the acquisition of new information by integrating new knowledge or matching the present knowledge, McCharen, Song, and Martens (2011) underline that constant and cooperative organizational learning is crucial for long-term and innovative educational reforms. Lemon and Sahota (2004) claim that organizational learning culture formally or informally scans its environment; therefore, it reaches specific knowledge and assumptions and paves the way for innovations that enable the organization to adapt to its surroundings.

The organizational learning process, which begins by acquiring knowledge, continues as the knowledge is distributed to and interpreted by groups and as a shared understanding is created and passed on to the organizational memory (Ozdevecioglu & Bickes, 2012). A shared understanding and organization memory gained from organizational learning serve as the resources for new ideas. Koc and Ceylan (2007) underline that new ideas and suggestions carry the value of being the starting point of innovation. The feedback that is gained through innovative ideas resulting from organizational memory enables the organization to enter a new learning process. Accordingly, it can be said that organizational learning and innovation are facts that support and guide each other.

Purpose of the Study

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

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

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

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

Method

Research Model

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

Research Sample

The population of the study consists of 790 teachers who worked during the 2013–2014 academic year in public high schools in the center of Bolu. Sampling was

done in order to generalize study results in the population, and 272 teachers were contacted with the simple random sampling method. The main characteristic of this method is that each sample has an equal chance of being selected (Buyukozturk, Cakmak, Akgun, Karadeniz & Demirel, 2012). According to Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2007: 104), a sample of 260 people is enough for a population of 790 people.

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

Data Collection Instrument

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

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

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

Analysis and Interpretation of Data

The data was analyzed with SPSS 17.0 software. In order to decide what analyses should be conducted on the data, the distribution normality of the data was analyzed with the Kolmogorov Smirnov test, and it was found that the data did not range normally ($p < .5$). Percentage, frequency, arithmetic mean, standard deviation, and

Spearman's rho correlation analyses were conducted while analyzing the data. The score interval used on interpreting the scale options are given in Table 1.

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

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

Findings

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

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

	Dimensions	N	$\bar{X}$	Sd
Innovation Management	Project Management	272	3.21	.84
	Organizational Culture and Structure	272	3.29	.91
	Innovation Strategy	272	3.28	.84
	Input Management	272	3.25	.86
	Total Scale	272	3.25	.80

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

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

Table 3.
Teacher opinions of organizational learning mechanisms

Organizational Learning Mechanisms	Dimensions	N	$\bar{X}$	Sd
	Storing Information	272	3.32	.83
	Acquiring and Disseminating Information	272	3.07	.86
	Seeking Information	272	3.42	.85
	Analyzing Information	272	3.38	.87
	Total Scale	272	3.27	.78

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

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

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

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

*p< .05; **p< .01

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

Discussion and Conclusion

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

action of administrators and cause them to behave timidly. Schools should be places where the spirit of entrepreneurship and innovation prevails (Balay, 2004), and innovation is an act of taking risk. In order for school administrators to take risks on innovations, their radius of action should be expanded. Although the innovation management skills of administrators were at the medium level, Gol & Bulbul (2012) and Bulbul (2012) observed that school administrators have a sufficient level of innovation management skills. The reason for the differences in the findings may be due to the differences among groups, the culture and structure differences between schools, or the administrators having different levels of innovation management skills.

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

schools. Bureaucracy and hierarchy can slow learning and in fact negatively affect it. Other studies of the Turkish education system support this finding (Guclu & Turkoglu, 2003; Unal, 2006; Unal, 2014).

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

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

References

Acaray, A. (2007). *Kucuk ve orta boy isletmelerde yenilik yonetimi: yenilik yonetiminde etkili olan orgutsel yapi ve faktorlere iliskin bir arastirma*. [Innovation management in small and medium-sized enterprises: a survey related to innovation management and organizational structure and factors activating innovation management]. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Kocaeli: Kocaeli University.

Acikalin, A. (1998). Uc rakamli yildonumlerine dogru. [Towards three digits' anniversaries]. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Egitim Yonetimi, 16*(2), 387-393.

Ameli, P. & Kayes, D. C. (2011). Triple-loop learning in a cross-sector partnership: The DC central kitchen partnership. *The Learning Organization*, *18*(3), 175-188.

Argon, T. & Ozcelik, N. (2007). Ilkogretim okulu yoneticilerinin degisikligi yonetme yeterlilikleri. [The primary school administrators' competencies within the framework of administrating change]. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Universitesi Egitim Fakultesi Dergisi, 16,* 70-89.

Argyris, C. (1976). Single–loop and double–loop models in research on decision making. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *21*(3), 363-375.

Argyris, C. (1995). Action science and organizational learning. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 10*(6), 20-26.

Argyris, C. & Schon, D. (1978). O*rganizational learning: A theory of action perspective.* MA: Maddison-Wesley.

Arat, M. (1997). Sirketler neden ogrenemez. *Power, 4*, 78-85.

Avci, M. (2009). Ogrenme yonelimliligin yenilik performansı uzerine etkisi: Mugla mermer sektorunde bir inceleme. [The effect of learning orientation on firm innovativeness: An investigation in the marble industry in Mugla] *Zonguldak Karaelmas Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 5*(10), 121-138.

Aygen, S. (2006). *İsletmelerde yenilik yonetimi surecinde orgut yapilarinda ve hizmet tasarımlarinda yasanan donusumler: Antalya ili bes yildizli konaklama isletmelerinde ampirik bir arastirma ve hizmet tasarimi onerisi.* [The Changes occurred in service design and in their organization structures in innovation management process of the businesses: An emprical research in five-star-hotels in Antalya province and a service design proposal]. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Konya: Selcuk University.

Balay, R. (2004). Kuresellesme, bilgi toplumu ve egitim. [Globalisation, information society and education]. A*nkara Universitesi Egitim Bilimleri Fakultesi Dergisi, 37*(2), 61-82.

Banoglu, K. & Peker, S. (2012). Ogrenen orgut olma yolunda ilkogretim okul yoneticilerinin okullarina ve kendilerine iliskin algi durumlari. [Primary school principals' perception on their schools and themselves on the way of being a learning organization]. *Hacettepe Universitesi Egitim Fakultesi Dergisi, 43*, 71-82.

Barutcugil, I. (2004). *Stratejik insan kaynaklari yonetimi*. [Strategic human resource management]. İstanbul: Kariyer.

Beycioglu, K. & Aslan, M. (2010). Okul gelisiminde temel dinamik olarak degisim ve yenilesme: Okul yoneticileri ve ogretmenlerin rolleri. [Change and innovation as main dynamics in school development: administrators and teachers' roles]. *Yuzuncu Yil Universitesi Egitim Fakultesi Dergisi, 7*(1), 153-173.

Bulbul, T. (2012). Okullarda yenilik yonetimi olceginin gelistirilmesi: Gecerlik ve guvenilirlik calismasi. [Developing a Scale for Innovation Management at Schools: A Study of Validity and Reliability]. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Egitim Bilimleri, 12*(1), 157-175.

Bulbul, T. (2012). Okul yoneticilerinin yenilik yonetimine iliskin yeterlik inanclari. [School administrators' efficacy beliefs towards innovation management]. *Trakya Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 14*(1), 45-68.

Buyukozturk, S. (2008). S*osyal bilimler icin veri analizi el kitabi*. [Quantitative data analysis handbook for social sciences]. Ankara: Pegem.

Buyukozturk, S., Kilic Cakmak, E., Akgun, O. E., Karadeniz, S. & Demirel, F. (2012). B*ilimsel arastirma yontemleri*. [Scientific research methods]. Ankara: Pegem.

Cavusgil, S. T., Calantone, R. J. & Zhao, Y. (2003). Tacit knowledge transfer and firm innovation cabability. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing, 18*(1), 6-21.

Chou, C., Shen, C., Hsiao, H. & Chen, S. (2010). The influence of innovative organizational management of technological and vocational schools on innovative performance–using organizational innovative climate as the

mediator variable. *World Transactions on Engineering and Technology Education*, *8*(2), 237-242.

Cohen, L. Manion., L. & Morrison, K. (2007). R*esearch methods in education* (6ᵗʰ Edition). New York: Routledge.

Cyert, R. & March, J. (1963). A *behavioral theory of the firm.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Calik, T. (2003). Ogrenen orgutler olarak egitim kurumlari. [Educational instutions as learning organizations]. *Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 4*(8), 115-130.

Diker, I. (2007). *Ogrenen organizasyona gecis surecinde kurum kulturu, orgutsel engeller ve gecis asamalari* (İstanbul Tip Fakultesi ornegi). [Examing throuhg the introdiction of learning organization about institute culture, organizational constraint and process]. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Balıkesir: Balıkesir University.

Drucker, P. F. (2003). *Yenilik disiplini icinde yenilik* (Cev: A. Kardan). Istanbul: Mess.

Duffy, F. M. (1997). Knowledge work supervision: transforming school systems into high performing learning organizations. *International Journal of Educational Management*, *11*(1), 26-31.

Durna, U. (2002). *Yenilik yonetimi*. Ankara: Nobel.

Duplesis, M. (2007). The role of knowledge management in innovation. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, *11*(4), 20-29.

Edwards, T. (2000). Innovation and organizational change: Developments towards an interactive process perspective. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, *12*(4), 445-464.

Eveleens, C. (2010). Innovation management: A literature review of innovation process models and their implications. *Nijmegen, NL,* 1-16.

Fiol, C., M. & Lyles, M., A. (1985). Organizational learning. *Academy of Management Review, 10*(4), 803-813.

Garcia, V. J., Ruiz, A. & Llorens, F. J. (2007). Effects of technology absorptive capacity and technology proactivity on organizational learning, innovation and performance: An empirical examination. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management, 19*, 527-558.

Gol, E. & Bulbul, T. (2012). Ilkogretim okulu yoneticilerinin yenilik yonetimi yeterliklerine iliskin ogretmen algilari. [The perceptions of the teachers regarding the innovation management efficacies of the primary school administrators]. *Mersin Universitesi Egitim Fakultesi Dergisi, 8*(2), 97-109.

Guclu, N. & Turkoglu, H. (2003). Ilkogretim okullarinda gorev yapan yonetici ve ogretmenlerin ogrenen organizasyona iliskin algilari. [The perception level as regards learning organizations of the principals and teachers working in primary schools]. *Turk Egitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 1*(2).

Hofman, R. H., Boom, J., Meeuwisse, M. & Hofman, W. H. A. (2012). Educational innovation, quality and effects: An exploration of innovations and their effects in secondary education. *Educational Policy*, *27*(6), 843-866.

Hofman, R. H. & Dijkstra, B. J. (2010). Effective teacher professionalization in networks? *Journal of Teaching and Teacher Education*, *26*, 1031-1040.

Kapucu, A. (2012). *Orgutsel ogrenme kulturu, yenilikci kultur ve yenilikciligin firma performansi uzerinde etkisi*. [Organizational learning culture, innovative culture

and impact of innovativeness on firm's performance]. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Gebze: Gebze Higher Technology Institute.

Kathrins, R. (2007). *The relationship of leadership style and types of organizational culture to the effectiveness and employee satisfaction in acute care hospital*. Unpublished Dissertation, Touro University International.

Kerman, B., Freundlich, M., Lee M.J. & Brenner, E. (2012). Learning while doing in the human services: Becoming a learning organization through organizational change. *Administration in Social Work*, *36*, 234–257.

Koc, T. & Ceylan, C. (2007). Factors impacting innovative capacity in large-scale companies. *Technovation, 27*(3), 105-115.

Kucukoglu, A. (2005). Orgutsel ogrenme ve ogrenmenin engelleri. [Organizational learning and learning impediments]. *Millî Egitim, 33*, (166).

Lemon, M. & Sahota, P. S. (2004). Organizational culture as knowledge repository for increased innovative capacity. *Technovation*, *24*, 483-498.

Liao, S. H. & Wu, C. (2010). System perspective of knowledge management, organizational learning and organizational innovation. *Expert Systems with Application*, *37*, 1096-1103.

Lipshitz, R., Friedman, V.J. & Popper, M. (2007). *Demistifying organizational learning.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Marquardt, M. J. (2002.) *Building the learning organization mastering the 5 elements for corporate learning* (2nd Edition). Palo Alto: Davies-Black Publishing.

McCharen, B., Song, J. & Martens, J. (2011). School innovation: The mutual impacts of organizational learning and creativity. *Educational Management Administration & Leaderhip, 39*(6), 676-694.

Mohanty, K. & Kar, S. (2012). Achieving innovation and success: Organizational learning. *SCMS Journal of Indian Management, 9*(1), 36-42.

Murat, I. & Baki, B. (2011). Antecedents and performance impacts of product versus process innovation: empirical evidence from smes located in the Turkish science and technology parks. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, *14*(2), 172-206.

Oslo Manual. (2005). P*roposed guidelines for collecting and interpreting technological innovation data*. Paris: Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development.

Ozdemir, S. (2013). *Egitimde orgutsel yenilesme*. [Organizational innovation in education]. Ankara: Pegem.

Ozdevecioglu, M. & Bickes, D. M. (2012). Orgutsel ogrenme ve inovasyon iliskisi: Buyuk olcekli isletmelerde bir arastirma. [The relationship between organizational learning and innovation: A study at the large-sized businesses]. *Erciyes Universitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakultesi Dergisi, 39,* 19-45.

Ozen Kutanis, R. & Mesci, M. (2013). Bilgi yonetimi ile yenilik arasindaki iliskide orgut ici dinamiklerin ara degiskenlik etkisini belirlemeye yonelik bir arastırma. [A research aimed at determining the mediating eff ect of intra-organizational dynamics in the relationship between information management and innovation]. *Ege Akademik* Bakis, *13*(3), 367-381.

Park, J. H. (2006). *Measueremnt and validation of Senge's learning organization model in Korean vocational high schools*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Georgia: Graduate Faculty of the University of Georgia.

Popper, M. & Lipshitz, R. (1998). Organizational learning mechanisms: a cultural and structural approach to organizational learning. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *34*, 167-178.

Popper, M. & Lipshitz, R. (2000). Organizational learning mechanisms, culture and feasibility. *Management Learning*, *31*(2), 181-196.

Salim, I. M. & Sulaiman, M. (2011). Organizational learning, innovation and performance: A study of Malaysian small and medium sized enterprises. *International Journal of Business Management, 6*(12), 118-125.

Saritas, M. (2001). *Sinif yonetiminde yeni yaklasimlar.* Ankara: Nobel.

Schechter, C. (2008). Organizational learning mechanisms: The meaning, measure, and implications for school improvement. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *44*(2), 155-186.

Schechter, C. & Asher, N. (2012). Principals' sense of uncertainty and organizational learning mechanisms. *International Journal of Educational Management, 26*(2), 138-152.

Schechter, C. & Feldman, N. (2010). Exploring organizational learning mechanisms in special education. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *48*(4), 490-516.

Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The arts & practice of the learning organization.* New York: Currency and Doubleday.

Siguaw, J. A., Simpson, P. M. & Enz, C. A. (2006). Conceptualizing innovation orientation: A framework for study and integration of innovation research. *The Journal of Product Innovation Management*, *23*, 556-574.

Silins, H. C., Mulford, W. C. & Zarins, S. (2002). Organizational learning and school change. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *38*(5), 613-642.

Snell, R. & Chak, A. M-K. (1998). The learning organization. Learning and empowerment for whom? *Management Learning, 29*(3), 337-364.

Stata, R. (1994). Organizational learning – the key to management innovation. C. E. Schneier, C. J. Russel, R. W. Beatty & L. S. Baird (eds). *The training and developmen sourcebook*. Massachusetts: Human Resource Development Press.

Stormquist, N. P. (1999). Conceptual and empirical issues in educational innovations. N. P. Stormquist & M. L. Basile (Eds.) *Politics of educational innovations in developing countries: An analysis of knowledge and power,* pp. 2-16, New York: Falmer Press.

Simsek, Y. & Yildirim, C.M. (2004). Ogrenen okullarin kulturel yapilari. [Cultural structures of learning schools]. *XIII. Ulusal Egitim Bilimleri Kurultayi,* İnonu Universitesi Egitim Fakultesi, Malatya, 6-9 Temmuz.

Therin, F. (2002). Organizational learning and innovation in high tech small firms. *Proceedings of 36th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*. Hawaii, IEEE Computer Society, 6-9 January.

Toremen, F. (2011). *Ogrenen okul.* [Learning School]. Ankara: Nobel.

Trott, P. (2005). *Innovation management and new product development* (3rd Edition). London: Prentice Hall.

Turhan, M., Karabatak, S. & Polat, M. (2014). Okullarda orgutsel ogrenme engellerinin vignette teknigi ile incelenmesi. [The investigation of the organizational learning barriers in schools using vignette technique]. *Mersin Universitesi Egitim Fakultesi Dergisi*, *10*(1), 66-83.

Unal, A. (2006). *İlkogretim denetcilerin ogrenen organizasyon acisindan degerlendirilmesi.* [Evaluation of primary school inspectors concerning of learning organization]. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Konya: Selcuk University.

Unal, A. (2014). Orgutsel ogrenme mekanizmalarinin okullarda kullanilmasi konusunda ogretmen gorusleri. [The opinions of teachers about use of organizational learning mechanisms in schools] *Pamukkale Universitesi Egitim Fakultesi Dergisi*, *35*(1), 19-32.

Van Grinsven, M. & Visser, M. (2011). Empowerment, knowledge conversion and dimensions of organizational learning. *The Learning Organization, 18*(5), 378-391.

Yigit, Y. (2013). *Bazi degiskenlere gore okul yoneticileri ve ogretmenlerin bilgi yonetimi tutumlari ile ogrenen okul (orgut) algilari arasindaki iliski*. [Relation between attitudes of Teachers' Knowledge Management based on some of the variables and learning organization (school) perception]. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Sivas: Cumhuriyet University

Yucel, I. (2007). *Ogrenen orgutler ve orgut kulturu*. [Learning organizations and organizational culture]. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Erzurum: Ataturk University.

Okul Yöneticilerinin Yenilik Yönetimi Becerileri ile Okullardaki Örgütsel Öğrenme Mekanizmalarına İlişkin Öğretmen Görüşleri

Özet

Problem Durumu: Örgütsel öğrenme kavramı hem yönetim ve örgüt bilimi ile ilgili çalışan akademisyenler, hem de uygulayıcılar tarafından ilgiyle karşılanmakta ve birçok kaynakta farklı yazarlar tarafından yorumlanmaktadır. 1978 yılında ise Argyris ve Schön tarafından örgütlerde öğrenme ile ilgili ilk model ileri sürülmüştür. Bu model ve sonrasında birçok akademisyen ve yazar alanla ilgilenerek örgütsel öğrenmeyi farklı açılardan ele almışlardır. Bu bağlamda örgütsel öğrenme kavramı, hataların tespit edilip düzeltilmesi, geçmiş eylemler ve onların etkililiği ile gelecekteki eylemler arasında geliştirilmiş olan sezgi, bilgi ve ilişkiler ve istenen

sonuçlara ulaşmak için gerekli olan yetenekleri sürekli geliştirmek olarak tanımlanabilmektedir.

Zaman içinde bir çok yazar, örgütsel öğrenmenin nasıl gerçekleştiği konusunda çeşitli fikirler ileri sürmüşlerse de bunların büyük bir kısmı tek döngülü öğrenme ve çift döngülü öğrenme kavramları etrafında toplanmıştır. Tek döngülü öğrenme, adapte olmayı öğrenme veya alt düzey öğrenme olarak tanımlanabilmektedir. Örgütsel hataların düzeltilmesi için kullanılan bu öğrenme şekli, örgütlerin mevcut amaç ve politikaları dahilinde gerçekleşmektedir. Tek döngülü öğrenmenin genellikle kısa dönemli, yüzeysel ve geçici olduğunu belirterek geçmişteki davranışların bir tekrarı olabileceğini ve örgütün rutinleri seviyesinde kaldığı bilinmektedir. Bu bağlamda tek döngülü öğrenmenin hedefinin, mevcut sistemin optimizasyonu ve hataların ortadan kaldırılması olduğu ileri sürülebilir.

Çift döngülü öğrenme ise tek döngülü öğrenmeden farklı olarak günlük eylem ve rutinlerin altında yatan zihinsel modellerin, politikaların ve varsayımların değiştirilmesini öngörmektedir. Çift döngülü öğrenme ise hatalarla karşılaşıldığında başkalarının suçlanmasına neden olan ve temelde yatan ana programın değiştirilmesi olarak tanımlanmaktadır. Tek döngülü öğrenmenin aksine çift döngülü öğrenme sadece hataların tespit edilip düzeltilmesi ile kalmaz. Aynı zamanda hedeflerin gerçekleştirilebilmesi için hatalı eylemlere yön veren stratejilerin, değerlerin ve normların değişmesini de kapsamaktadır.

Tek döngülü öğrenme örgütün var olan yapısı dahilinde eylemlerin uyarlanması yoluyla öğrenmeyi sağlarken, çift döngülü öğrenme ise bu eylemlerin altında yatan zihinsel süreçlerin, yapıların değiştirilmesi vasıtasıyla öğrenmeyi sağlamaktadır. Bu iki düzey öğrenmeden farklı fakat ikisini de kapsayıcı nitelikte olan üç döngülü öğrenme ise örgütün öğrenmeyi öğrenmesi, örgüt yapısının öğrenmeye uygun bir hale getirilmesi anlamına gelmektedir. Kısacası üç döngülü öğrenme örgüt üyelerinin, kendilerinden önce örgütte var olan ve öğrenmeyi engelleyen veya teşvik eden yapıların farkına vararak öğrenme için yeni yapı ve stratejiler geliştirmesi olarak tanımlanabilir.

Yenilik kavramı ise var olan bir şeyde, öncekinden daha olumlu yönde değişiklikler yapmak ve ortaya yeni bir şeyler koymak olarak tanımlanabilir. Örgüt bağlamında ele alındığında ise yenilik kavramı örgütün çevreye uyum sürecinin kolaylaştırmak için çıktı, yapı ve süreçlerde yapılan bir değişim aracı olarak tanımlanabilir. Yenilik kavramını tanımlarken göz önünde bulundurulması gereken bir nokta, yeniliğin değişimle karıştırılmaması gerektiğidir. Yenilik kavramı değişimden daha dar bir alana vurgu yapmak için kullanılır ve geleneksel bir şekilde ürünler ve süreçler üzerine odaklanmış olumlu ve özel bir değişmedir.

Örgütlerde yenilik, tek seferde gerçekleşen bir olgu olmanın aksine bir süreci kapsayan eylemler bütünü olduğu gibi, aynı zamanda belirli prensipler çerçevesinde gerçekleşmesi gereken bir süreci ifade etmektedir. Örgütlerde yenilik, tek bir hamlede gerçekleşip verim alınabilen bir olgu değil, aksine iyi bir planlama ve yönetim gerektiren bir süreç gerektirmektedir. Bir diğer deyişle yeniliğin kendi kendine gerçekleşmediği ve bir süreci kapsayarak gerçekleştiğinden hareketle,

yeniliğin de diğer örgütsel süreçler gibi yönetilmesi gerektiğini ifade etmek yanlış olmayacaktır.

Özetlemek gerekirse örgütlerde yenilik, hızlı bir şekilde değişiklik gösteren dünya ve çevre şartlarına uyum sağlama ve hatta bu çağın bir adım önüne geçebilmek için bir gerekliliktir. Çünkü sürekli gelişim gösteren bir ortamda yenilikten uzak kalan örgütlerin fonksiyonlarını sürdürebilmeleri mümkün değildir. Diğer yandan örgütlerin yenilik girişimlerini ne yönde başlatacaklarını belirleyebilmeleri açısından belirli bir seviyede bilgi toplamaları ve bu bilgiyi işleyerek örgüt açısından anlamlı bir hale getirmeleri gerekmektedir. Bu noktada da yenilik yönetimi açısından örgütlerin öğrenmesi ve bu öğrenme sürecinde kullandıkları mekanizmalar önem kazanmaktadır.

Kaynağını aldığı ve çıktısını verdiği toplumların geçirdiği değişimler, okulların işlevlerinin, yükümlüklerinin ve tanımlarının da sürekli değişmesini zorunlu kılmaktadır. Örneğin pozitivist paradigmalara göre okul, öğrenciye bilmesi gerekenleri öğreten ve gerçek bilginin tartışmasız doğru olduğunu savunan kurumlar olarak tanımlanabilecekken yeni değerler ışığında okuldan beklenen, bilgiyi değil öğrenmeyi öğreterek öğrencinin kendi bilgisine ulaşmasını sağlamaktır. Okula ilişkin olan bu algının değişmesinin altında yatan sebeplerden biri de toplumun artık endüstri toplumu olmaktan çıkıp bilgi toplumu haline gelmesidir. Okulun da toplumun bu değişen yapısına cevap verebilmesi için değişiklik göstermesi, sanayi toplumu bireylerinden ziyade bilgi toplumu bireyleri yetiştirebilecek şekilde bir değişim ve yenileşme göstermesi gerekmektedir. Bu bağlamda ise okulların örgütsel öğrenmeyi gerçekleştirebilen kurumlar olabilmeleri, yenilik girişimlerinde bulunabilen ve bu girişimleri etkili bir şekilde yönetebilen örgütler haline gelmeleri önem kazanmaktadır

Araştırmanın Amacı: Bu doğrultuda yapılan bu çalışma ile eğitim örgütlerinin kullandıkları örgütsel öğrenme mekanizmalarının neler olduğu, yöneticilerin yenilik yönetimi becerilerinin ne düzeyde olduğu ve örgütsel öğrenme mekanizmaları ile yenilik yönetimi becerileri arasındaki ilişkinin ne düzeyde olduğu belirlenerek literatüre katkıda bulunulmak amaçlanmıştır.

Araştırmanın Yöntemi: Bu araştırma, ilişkisel tarama modelindedir. Bu doğrultuda yapılan bu çalışma ile Bolu ili merkez ilçede bulunan liselerdeki örgütsel öğrenme mekanizmaları, yenilik yönetimi becerileri ve aralarındaki ilişki var olan şekliyle belirlenmeye çalışılmıştır. Araştırmanın evrenini ise 2013-2014 eğitim öğretim yılında Bolu ili Merkez ilçedeki liselerde görev yapan öğretmenleri kapsamaktadır. Araştırmada öğretmenlerin tamamına ulaşılamayacağı için örneklem alma yoluna gidilmiş ve basit rastgele örneklem alma yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Bu doğrultuda çalışma Bolu Merkez ilçedeki liselerde görev yapan 272 öğretmen ile yürütülmüştür. Araştırma verilerinin toplanmasında Okullarda Örgütsel Öğrenme Mekanizmaları Ölçeği ve Okullarda Yenilik Yönetimi Ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Araştırma verilerinin çözümlenmesinde yüzde frekans analizleriyle, parametrik olmayan tekniklerden Spearman Rho Korelasyon Analizi kullanılmıştır.

Araştırma Bulguları: Araştırma sonucunda lise öğretmenlerinin hem okullarındaki örgütsel öğrenme mekanizmalarına ilişkin hem de yöneticilerin yenilik yönetimi becerilerine ilişkin görüşlerinin toplamda ve alt boyutlarda orta düzeyde olduğu ve öğretmenlerin örgütsel öğrenme mekanizmalarına ile yöneticilerin yenilik yönetimi becerilerine ilişkin görüşleri arasındaki yüksek düzeyde, pozitif yönlü ve anlamlı ilişki olduğu sonuçlarına ulaşılmıştır.

Sonuç ve Öneriler: Araştırma sonuçları doğrultusunda; liselerdeki öğrenme mekanizmalarının yüksek düzeyde işletilmesi için üç döngülü öğrenmeyi gerçekleştirecek şekilde çalışmasının sağlanması, liselerin bilgiyi daha etkili arayan, oluşturan, yorumlayıp anlamlandıran ve gerektiğinde kullanmak üzere hafızasında saklayabilen kurumlar haline getirilmesi sağlanarak yenilikçilik potansiyelinin artırılması, yöneticilerin okullarıyla ilgili inisiyatif alabilmelerini sağlayacak esnek bir hareket alanı oluşturularak yenilik konusunda risk alabilir bir duruma getirilmeleri, liselerin örgütsel öğrenme mekanizmaları ve yenilik yönetimine yönelik ihtiyaç ve beklentileri belirlenirken okul tür ve farklılıkları göz önünde bulundurulması önerileri geliştirilmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Yenilik yönetimi, örgütsel öğrenme mekanizmaları, okul yönetimi, öğretmen.