

## The Effectiveness Level of School Administrator's Coaching Characteristic on School's Being Learning Organization

Eray EĞMİR

*Kütahya İl Milli Eğitim Müdürlüğü, Kütahya, Türkiye*

Sinan YÖRÜK\*

*Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü, Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi, Afyon, Türkiye*

---

<b>Article history</b>	The aim of the study is to determine the effectiveness level of the coaching skills of school administrators on the school becoming a learning organization. The population of the study consists of teachers who are working at public and private secondary schools affiliated to Ministry of National Education, Kütahya Province National Education Directorate in the academic year of 2011-2012. The method of convenience sampling was used in the study. In the research, as a means of data collection, Learning School Perception Scale taken from Subaş (2010) and Coaching and Management Skills Scale from Yeltan (2007) were used. As a result of the research, a significant difference was found between the coaching skills of the school administrators and the school's becoming a learning organization.
<b>Received:</b> 05.02.2013	
<b>Received in revised form:</b> 12.03.2013	
<b>Accepted:</b> 13.03.2013	
<b>Key words:</b> Coaching, Learning Organization, School Administrators	

---

### Introduction

One of the most important terms that this era has brought into our life is the change. Schools that have taken over the responsibility to transform the society are also affected by this change. Schools which were organized appropriate to meet industrial society's needs in the previous eras have been seen to lose their functions. From now on, they are expected to be organizations that are open for innovativeness, have managed to provide an active information transfer within and outer environment and are able to renew themselves as a result of detections related to the needs of changing society.

Various studies are being held in our country on ruling educational institutions appropriate to modern management methods. One of the applications coming to the forefront in these studies is coaching. Coach-manager is the person that will reform the school in order to cope with social changes and needs and increase school's total quality by providing organizational effectiveness (Başaran, 2000, p. 80-81). In this study, due to the reasons mentioned above, it has been tried to find out the effectiveness level of the coaching skills of school administrators on the school becoming a learning organization.

### Theoretical Framework

---

\* Asst.Prof., Afyon Kocatepe University, Faculty of Education, Department of Education, Afyon, Turkey, E-mail: [syoruk@aku.edu.tr](mailto:syoruk@aku.edu.tr)

The word “coach” has gained a symbolic meaning as to move a person to a better position that s/he is (Berg & Karlsen, 2007, p. 4). The term “coach” that emerged with sports origin is now used widely including management, business administration, organization and education fields.

The term “coaching” which is seen to be a multidimensional term when examined according to dictionary meaning is described by Oxford and Webster dictionaries and International Coaching Federation as to teach, train, counsel, inform, guide, direct, familiarize, and as a professional person that helps people in their life, careers, works or organizations to have magnificent results (Poussard, 2004, p. 14; Čiutienė et al., 2010, p. 446).

Being one of the modern terms of management field, coaching is examined by all organizations that contain a management function within. In this point, the question that if educational institutions can apply coaching while making a revision in management processes arises. First, educational administration and education administrator terms should be reviewed in order to answer it.

Educational administration is the process of effectively managing, developing and renewing the educational institute that is found to meet society’s need of education in order to realize previously determined aims (Başaran, 2000, p. 29). Education administrator is a specialist that has had enough training to take a role in management processes of all kinds of educational organizations and (Karaman, 2008, p. 48). The person that will improve school’s environment and manage and direct the interaction between the school and its environment is the school administrator (Başaran, 2000, p. 80-81).

However, the position of the education administrator has changed due to post-modern understanding in management, the rapid change of the society and technological developments. Education administrator is no longer only a person that makes others do what s/he wants by using legal authority but an educational leader at the same time (Hoca, 2007, p. 10). We can explain education administrators’ new missions and responsibilities as (McEwan, 1998, p. 5); to evaluate staff’s performance, to determine and carry on the vision mission and aims of the school, provide positive relations among individuals, create an organized and safe environment. One of the best applications that a school manager who wants to perform these missions can apply is coaching. A school manager who does coaching within the institution has following characteristics (Erdoğan, 2000, p. 89-95): sees the problems in a realistic way; has a special conscious and understanding appropriate to the school vision; has the power to affect school staff; determines the aims that will direct the school and creates the required atmosphere to realize them.

A school manager that takes the coaching responsibility in the institution and has the above mentioned characteristics indeed starts a transform in his/her institution. This change in the management function will affect all functions in the system and will move the institution into a “learning organization” form.

### **Learning Organization**

Learning organizations are organizations that people develop their capacities to reach their aims and continually learn to learn together and in which thinking ways that are new and push the limits are put forward (Senge, 2002, p. 11). Learning organization is the organization that renews itself by learning. These organizations change via learning and learn for change. They reach pre-determined aims easier and have the opportunity to realize what they want more quickly (İraz, 2004, p. 39). Learning organizations have some special characteristics. These

characteristics are as follows (Doğan, 2002: 132; Marquardt, as cited in Yazıcı, 2001, p. 183); learning is the basic value in learning organizations; individuals learn on their own or from others; healthy communication and cooperation are in the foreground; all staff can reach to the information sources that play a crucial role in organization's success; unexpected surprises and mistakes are accepted as opportunities to learn; they are awake and flexible against the environment.

These are basic disciplines of learning organization (Akgemci, 1999; Senge, 2002);

***Personal Mastery:*** Personal mastery is a spiritual keystone of learning organization. Learning organization supports personal mastery and trains people under umbrella of organization.

***Mental Models:*** Improving an organization's operating capability by mental models requires both being learned of new skills and being practiced of institutional innovation which provides with being on display of these new skills.

***Shared Vision:*** Vision is power of forethought. However; this word is not seeing by eyes; is seeing by mental capacity. In other words; it means foreseeing. In every organization, leaders should have vision, perspective. They should make this vision active, being shared in whole organization.

***Learning as a Team:*** After a certain point; individual learning is not important for organization learning. On the other hand; if teams learn, a suitable environment is formed for leaning of whole organization. Learning as a team can be converted into acting.

***Systems Thinking:*** Systems thinking evaluates an organization as a whole in which different parts affect perpetually each other. Thanks to its effect that strengthens all other disciplines, system thinking shows that whole is more than sum of parts.

Today's schools should have disciplines of learning organization. Because; schools organized according to needs of industrial society do not perform functions of information society. Keeping company with 21st century schools is possible by updating themselves and continuous learning. Continuous learning can be come true if school is a learning organization (Şimşek & Yıldırım, 2004, p. 3). Gaining key cognitive skills such as analytical thinking, critical thinking, judging skill, digital logic, stabilizing adverse opinions are significant aims for learning schools (Töremen, 2001, p. 105-106).

School head should achieve using intramural variances in accordance with organizational learning. He / she should enhance a comprehensible vision and mission for organizational learning. All staff member in school should see following picture of school in accordant with this vision. It is necessary appropriate cultural background for learning school (Çelik, 2003, p. 140).

### **The Relationship between Coaching and Learning Organization**

As stated in literature, the features that an administrator should have to transform into his/her organization to a learning organization are similar with coaching abilities. Kış (2009) indicated in her study named "The Learning Leadership Role of Principals in Building a Learning Organization" that, administrators are guides instead of managers in learning organizations. There is supportive and participative leadership in learning school. School administrator is a key and catalyst for evolution. School administrator should encourage teachers to research and explore new ways to make the school a better environment. In addition he/she should ask questions to teachers about their aims, processes and outputs.

Consequently administrator should do coaching in the school. Ash and Persall (2000) stated in their study named “The Principal as Chief Learning Officer: Developing Teacher Leaders” that, the schools of past and present are not adequate for future. New approaches and mentality are necessary. Researchers indicated that, school administrator is the leader of learning and he/she has a formative role in the organization. The other roles of the administrator in a learning school stated below;

- Advance the expectations for teacher and student performance
- Give chances for cooperation in school
- Promote progressive processes in school
- Create opportunities for learning in school

## **Methodology**

### ***Model of Survey***

This study was done on the purpose of specifying the roles of schools as a learning organizations and coaching skills of school administrators working in educational institution. In this study, survey method was employed. Secondary school teachers’ perceptions were evaluated by questionnaire. Study’s findings were tried to be explained depending upon literature.

### ***Population and Sample***

The population of the study consists of teachers who are working at public and private secondary schools affiliated to Ministry of National Education, Kütahya Province National Education Directorate in the academic year of 2011-2012. Sample of the study was convenience sampling method. Convenience sampling used in this study was chosen from nonrandom sampling by convenience sampling (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2006, p. 99).

Sample of the study consists of 108 (%61,7) male, 67 (%38,3) female, in total 175 teachers. 51 (%29,1) teachers have 1-8 year, 60 (%34,3) teachers have 9-16 year, 47 (%26,9) teachers have 17-24 year and 17 (%9,7) teachers have 25 and above year seniority. According to education level variable, 5 (%2,9) teachers have associate degree, 130 (%74,3) teachers have bachelor’s degree and 40 (%22,9) teachers are postgraduate teachers. The 94 (%53,7) of teachers consists sample of the study are working in Science and Anatolian High School and the rest 81 (%46,3) teachers are working in Vocational High School.

### ***Data Collection Tool***

In the first part of questionnaire; there is a personal information form created in order to specify teachers’ gender, seniority and education background.

In the second part of questionnaire; in order to confirm the perception level of learning school’s indications by teachers; learning school perception scale that was tested in terms of reliability and validity is used. Scale items are developed by Subaş (2010) and it is used in master’s thesis named “the Perception of Learning Organization (School) by Classroom and Branch Teacher Works in Primary Schools”. Scale having 5 sub-dimensions and 30 items is a data collection tool. Reliability co- efficient of scale is confirmed as 0,910 (Cronbach alpha 0,910, Guttman 0,690 ve Spearman brown 0,709). 1. Sub- dimension “personal mastery” consists of 6 items, 2. Sub- dimension “Mental Model” consists of 5 items, 3. Sub- dimension “Shared Vision” consists of 7 items, 4. Sub- dimension “Learning as a Team” consists of 8 items and the last one “Systems Thinking” consists of 4 items. As a result of factor analysis; values of KMO and Barlett were found meaningful as KMO value was .89 and the value of Bartlett test was .00.

In the last part of questionnaire; in order to confirm the perception level of coaching properties of institution manager by teachers; “Coaching and Management Skills Scale” was used. Scale items were developed by Yeltan (2007) for using in master’s thesis named “Effect of Coaching on Job Satisfaction”. There are 40 items in the thesis of Yeltan (2007). In this study; the part having the first 20 items being relevant coaching was used. After research conducted; Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient was confirmed .914. Circumstantially; Coaching and Management Skills Scale can be evaluated as a high scale. As a result of factor analysis; 3 sub – dimensions (motivation and pride, positive communication media and creating learning environment and delegation) were specified, and value of KMO was .89 and the value of Bartlett test was .00 which means that both of them are meaningful.

### Data Collection

179 questionnaires were carried out by researcher, 4 questionnaires defined as failure were removed and as a result 175 questionnaires were used for this study.

### Data Analysis

Frequency and percentage calculating were done in order to specify teacher’s personal information, perception and interpretation. Independent sample t test was carried out in order to confirm whether there was a significant difference between gender, school type and sub-dimensions of scale. Whether there was a significant difference between educational background and seniority year in occupation was tested by one way ANOVA test. HSD Tukey test was applied to the items being meaningful in ANOVA in order to find out there is or isn’t difference among which dimensions and items. In the last part; crosstab and chi-squared test were used for specifying whether there was a significant difference between coaching skills of institution manager and institution’s having properties of learning organization. In all statistical studies; significance level was accepted as 0,05. All results from questionnaire were interpreted on tables. Scale consists of 5 rating scale having options like Totally Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree and Totally Agree for each item. These options are given respectively 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

### Findings

In this section/part of study whether perceptions of teachers in sample group vary/differ or not depending on their demographic characteristics were examined and the results were shown below.

**Table 1:** For Gender Variable Data Distribution Related to Learning School Dimension

Dimension	Gender	N	$\bar{x}$	Df	SE	t	p
Personal Domination	Male	108	3.78	.678	.065	-1.134	.26
	Female	67	3.90	.577	.070		
Mental Patterns/Models	Male	108	3.99	.640	.062	-.831	.40
	Female	67	4.06	.457	.056		
Shared Vision	Male	108	3.30	.785	.076	-2.007	.05*
	Female	67	3.54	.750	.092		

Learning As a Team	Male	108	3.38	.831	.080	-1.054	.29
	Female	67	3.51	.853	.104		
System Thought	Male	108	3.63	.666	.064	-1.530	.13
	Female	67	3.78	.667	.081		

\*p = .05, t > 1.96

When the data in Table 1 were examined, there is no significant difference at any dimension except “Shared Vision” between gender variable and learning organization. A significant difference is found between male and female subject thoughts according to t-test in “Shared Vision” dimension (t=-2.007; p=.05). Because the t-value is above the critical value of 1.96 which indicate the meaningfulness for .05 level (Büyüköztürk, 2010). According to this difference, it can be stated that female teachers “Shared Vision” perception is higher than male teachers.

**Table 2:** For Gender Variable Data Distribution Related to Coaching Skills Dimension

Dimension	Gender	N	$\bar{x}$	Df	SE	t	p
Motivation and Praise	Male	108	3.20	.898	.086	-1.835	.07
	Female	67	3.47	1.002	.122		
Positive Communication Environment	Male	108	3.07	1.160	.112	-1.404	.16
	Female	67	3.31	.992	.121		
Creating Learning Environment and Delegation	Male	108	3.07	.903	.087	-2.106	.04*
	Female	67	3.36	.901	.110		

\*p < .05

According to t-test no significant difference is found between male and female subject thoughts in “Motivation and Praise” (t=-1.835; p=.07) and in “Positive Communication Environment” (t=-1.404; p=.16) dimensions. A significant difference is found between male and female subject thoughts according to t-test in “Creating Learning Environments and Delegation” (t=-2.106; p=.04).It can be concluded that administrators perceive Creating Learning Environment Skills at higher level depending on the findings of female teachers are more open to development than male teachers.

**Table 3:** For School Type Variable Data Distribution Related to Learning School Dimension

Dimension	Type of School	N	$\bar{x}$	df	SE	t	p
Personal Domination	Science And Anatolian High School	94	3.94	.586	.065	2.655	.01*
	Vocational High School	81	3.69	.679	.070		
Mental Patterns	Science And Anatolian High School	94	4.10	.460	.062	2.150	.03*
	Vocational High School	81	3.91	.676	.056		

Shared Vision	Science And Anatolian High School	94	3.57	.779	.076	3.290	.00*
	Vocational High School	81	3.19	.732	.092		
Learning As A Team	Science And Anatolian High School	94	3.53	.925	.080	1.772	.08
	Vocational High School	81	3.31	.716	.104		
System Thought	Science And Anatolian High School	94	3.78	.664	.064	1.952	.05
	Vocational High School	81	3.58	.662	.081		

\*p < .05

According to t-test in “Personal Domination” dimension a significant difference is found between the thoughts of teachers working in Science And Anatolian High School and the thoughts of teachers working in Vocational High School (t=2.655; p=.01). When the participation rate is considered, the teachers working in Science and Anatolian High School have higher rates of Personal Dominance than the teachers working in Vocational High Schools. With t-test in “Mental Patterns” dimension a significant difference is found between thoughts of Science and Anatolian High School Teachers and Vocational High School Teachers(t=2.150; p=.03). It can be stated that teachers consistently supervise themselves when the quality of students in Science and Anatolian High Schools are considered. With the t-test in “Shared Vision” dimension, a significant difference is found between male and female subject thoughts (t=3.290; p=.00). Starting with this difference, it can be stated that teachers in Science and Anatolian High Schools have higher levels of perception for having a shared vision in their schools than the teachers in Vocational High Schools. With t-test in “Learning as a Team” (t=1.772; p=.08) and “System Thought” (t=1.952; p=.05) dimensions, no significant difference is found according to school type dimension.

**Table 4:** For School Type Variable Data Distribution Related to Coaching Skills Dimension

Dimension	School Type	N	$\bar{x}$	Df	SE	t	p
Motivation and Praise	Science And Anatolian High School	94	3.54	.949	.086	3.683	.00*
	Vocational High School	81	3.03	.869	.122		
Positive Communication Environment	Science And Anatolian High School	94	3.47	1.183	.112	4.177	.00*
	Vocational High School	81	2.80	.879	.121		
Creating Learning Environment and Delegation	Science And Anatolian High School	94	3.42	.903	.921	3.820	.00*
	Vocational High School	81	2.91	.901	.824		

\*p < .05

According to t-test in “Motivation and Praise” dimension a significant difference is found between the thoughts of teachers working in Science and Anatolian High School and the

thoughts of teachers working in Vocational High School( $t=3.683$ ;  $p=.00$ ). Starting with this difference, it can be concluded that teachers working in Science and Anatolian High School have higher perceptions for administrators' motivation and praise skills than teachers working in Vocational High Schools. "Positive With t-test in "Positive Communication" dimension a significant difference is found between the thoughts of Science and Anatolian High School teachers and thoughts of Vocational High School teachers( $t=4.177$ ;  $p=.00$ ). Science and Anatolian High School Administrators have higher skills of creating positive communication environment and this can be considered as a reason for this situation. With t-test in "Creating Learning Environment and Delegation" dimension a significant difference is found between the thoughts of Science and Anatolian High School teachers and thoughts of Vocational High School teachers. Depending on this case, it can be stated that Science and Anatolian High School teachers' perception for administrators creating learning environment skills are higher than Vocational High School teachers.

**Table 5:** For Seniority Variable Anova Findings of Learning Schools Dimension

Dimensions	Dimensions	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	P
Personal Dominance	Between Groups	.060	3	.020	.048	.986
	In Groups	71.596	171	.419		
	Total	71.657	174			
Mental Patterns	Between Groups	2.126	3	.709	2.176	.093
	In Groups	55.681	171	.326		
	Total	57.807	174			
Shared Vision	Between Groups	.274	3	.091	.148	.931
	In Groups	105.143	171	.615		
	Total	105.417	174			
Learning as a Team	Between Groups	1.302	3	.434	.133	.609
	In Groups	121.434	171	.710		
	Total	122.736	174			
System Thought	Between Groups	.123	3	.011	.133	.995
	In Groups	50.646	171	.455		
	Total	50.769	174			

When data in Table 5 were examined seniority variable shows no difference at any dimension of learning organization.

**Table 6:** For Seniority Variable Anova Findings of Coaching Skills Dimension

Dimensions	Dimensions	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	P
Motivation and Praise	Between Groups	6.060	3	.041	2.310	.078
	In Groups	149.519	171	.309		
	Total	155.579	174			
Positive Communication Environment	Between Groups	6.030	3	.041	1.674	.174
	In Groups	205.302	171	.309		
	Total	211.331	174			
Creating a learning Environment and Delegation	Between Groups	2.399	3	.041	.962	.412
	In Groups	142.182	171	.309		
	Total	144.581	174			

According to data in Table 6 no significant difference is found between seniority variable and coaching skills.

**Table 7:** For Education Level Variable Anova Findings Related to Learning School Dimension

Dimensions		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	p	Dif.
Personal Dominance	Between Groups	.441	2	.221	.533	.588	
	In Groups	71.215	172	.414			
	Total	71.657	174				
Mental Patterns	Between Groups	2.059	2	1.030	3.177	*.044	2-3
	In Groups	55.748	172	.324			
	Total	57.807	174				
Shared Vision	Between Groups	1.007	2	.504	.830	.438	
	In Groups	104.409	172	.607			
	Total	105.417	174				
Learning as a Team	Between Groups	.361	2	.180	.254	.776	
	In Groups	122.375	172	.711			
	Total	122.736	174				
System Thought	Between Groups	.338	2	.169	.375	.688	
	In Groups	77.501	172	.451			
	Total	77.839	174				

When data in Table 7 are examined, there is no significant difference between education level and “Personal Dominance” (F= .533 p= .588), “Shared Vision” (F= .830 p= .438), “Learning as a Team” (F= .254 p= .776) and “System Thought” (F= .375 p= .688) dimensions. When “Mental Patterns” dimension is considered a significant difference is found between the dimension and education level.

There is a significant difference between groups of graduate (2) and postgraduate (3) (Df=2-3). Starting with this point perception of graduate teachers for mental patterns are more positive than post graduate teachers perceptions.

**Table 8:** For Education Level Variable Anova Findings Related to Coaching Skills Dimension

Dimensions		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	p
Motivation and Praise	Between Groups	.238	2	.119	.132	.876
	In Groups	155.340	172	.903		
	Total	155.579	174			
Positive Communication Environment	Between Groups	.153	2	.076	.062	.940
	In Groups	211.178	172	1.228		
	Total	211.331	174			
Creating Learning Environment and Delegation	Between Groups	.603	2	.301	.360	.698
	In Groups	143.979	172	.837		
	Total	144.581	174			

According to data in Table 8 dimensions of coaching skills show no significant difference in terms of education level variance.

Chi square test was used in order to define whether there was a significant difference between teachers' perception of their administrators coaching skills and their schools' indications of being a learning organization and the results were shown in Table 9. For two variables, Chi square test tests if there is a significant difference between two categorical variables. The difference between two variables shows the responses of a variable level differs at the other variable's level. This test is actually used to define if there is a significant difference between numeric values observed in pores which occurs depending on levels of two classified variables (number of columns x number of rows) and expected numeric values. Accordingly, if the difference increases between these two numbers (values) the possibility of having a meaningful difference between the variables increases. In this study, analysis was carried out by transferring learning organization perception scale's questions to rows and by transferring coaching and administering scale's questions to the columns.

**Table 9:** Chi Square Test Results Related to Learning School and Coaching Skills

	Value	df	p
Pearson Chi-Square	3616.854 <sup>a</sup>	3420	*.010
Likelihood Ratio	954.038	3420	1.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	60.719	1	.000
N	175		

\*p < .05

When the table is examined it can be seen that counted p value is p=0.01. Since p=0.01 < 0.05, a significant difference between Learning Schools Perception Scale's questions and Coaching and Administering Skills Scale's questions is found. Starting with this analysis, it can be stated that there is a significant difference between learning organization paradigm and school administrators' coaching skills. In other words participants think that there is a meaningful difference between administrators' coaching skills and their schools that are becoming learning organizations.

## Results

The results which was reached by the findings of the study, is indicated below.

(1) In terms of "gender", once the answers given for the "learning school perception scale" and "coaching and administration skills scale" analyzed, it came out that there is no significant difference between dimensions of scale and participant opinions (p < .05).

(2) In terms of "school type", once the answers given for the "learning school perception scale" analyzed, a significant difference is found in the dimensions "Personal Control", "Mental Models" and "Shared Vision", while a significant difference is not found in the dimensions "Team Learning" and "Systems Thinking".

In dimensions in which a significant difference determined, the difference is found in favor of teachers who work at Science and Anatolian High Schools. According to this result; it can be interpreted that teachers who work at Science and Anatolian High Schools are more eager to improve themselves and to form a common conscious in the organization. In Science and

Anatolian High Schools, both students and teachers are chosen by an examination. As a result of this, stakeholders of this type of schools have more motivation to start for a common purpose than the other schools. In addition to this, in this type of schools, success criterion is made; since students' level is suitable, school environment is enriched with various project and activities; since school has desire to reach the success goal, it tries to revise errors. As a result of this, both administrators and teachers aim to get better by forming organizational consciousness.

In terms of school type variable; once the answers given for the "coaching and administration skills scale" analyzed, a significant difference is found between dimensions of scale and participants opinions ( $p < .05$ ). When we look at the obtained data, according to school type variable, in the dimensions "Motivation and Praise", "Positive Communication Environment" and "Creating Learning Environment and Delegation" a significant difference is determined in favor of teachers who work at Science and Anatolian High Schools. The reason for this may be administrators who work at Science and Anatolian High Schools have higher coaching skills. Besides; positive situation in the school gets easy administrators' offering learning environments to the teachers instead of dealing with student and discipline problems, delegating, communicating teachers positively and motivating them.

(3) In terms of "seniority" once the answers given for the "learning school perception scale" and "coaching and administration skills scale" analyzed, it is determined that there is no significant difference between dimensions of scale and participants' opinions ( $p < .05$ ).

(4) In terms of "state of education" variable, once the answers given for the "learning school perception scale" analyzed, a significant difference is determined among the answers in the dimension of "Mental Models". After the analysis of applied post-hoc test, it is determined that the difference is between the teachers who have bachelor's degree and postgraduate teachers. According to obtained data; the difference is in favor of the teacher who have bachelor's degree. We can associate this situation to teachers' awareness level that have bachelor's degree. Because when we look at the means of the other four dimensions, it is seen that teachers' perceptions that have bachelor's degree are higher than postgraduate teachers. As a conclusion; teachers with bachelor's degree who perceive signs of learning organization at a higher level, participate in the process of changing into learning organization more actively and this situation effect the perception in a positive way.

In terms of "state of education" variable, the answers given for "coaching and administration skills scale" analyzed, a significant difference between dimensions of scale and participants' opinions is not determined ( $p < .05$ ).

As a result of Chi-Square test which was applied with intent to determine whether there is a difference between learning school and school administrators' coaching skills or not, a significant difference between these two concept is found ( $p < .05$ ). From this point of view, it can be supported that school administrators' coaching skills have effect on changing school into a learning organization.

### ***Discussion***

Öztürk (2007) determined that teachers' gender and state of education do not have significant difference on their perceptions about administrators' coaching skills. Öztürk (2007) found a significant difference between the variables teachers' seniority and administrators' coaching skills. However, in this study, seniority did not constitute a

significant difference on teachers' perceptions. This situation may result from different samples. Kalkan (2009) concluded that in terms of seniority and state of education, teachers who work in different school types, perceptions about administrators' coaching skills did not show significant difference. This stated result is parallel with result of this study. Güleş (2007), in the study for which he did teachers'-working in primary schools, perceptions about learning organization, in terms of gender, he determined a significant difference in favor of males in perceptions about shared vision discipline. Also in this study, in terms of gender, a significant difference was found about shared vision but this difference is in favor of females.

Barnett, Henry and Vann (2008), in their study, stated that application of coaching affected the climate of school positively and helped the teachers undertake the vision of the school. At this point, they advocated that school administrators should be representatives of this approach. It was determined in also our study that there is the effect of coaching in changing into learning school. Hord and Hirsh (2009), in their study stated that for the school to be a learning organization administrators need the ability of motivating teachers and also they should constitute learning environments and effective communication system. And they also said that for educational administration there is a need for a new tendency and this tendency is administrator's formative leadership role. Also in this study, the administrators' coaching skills were addressed and the relationship between learning organization and coaching was revealed.

### ***Suggestions***

In accordance with results, following suggestions are offered:

(1) It is determined that female subjects' learning organization disciplines and perceptions towards administrators' coaching skills are higher than male subjects'. School administrators should produce solution to enhance male teachers' perceptions.

(2) In Science and Anatolia High Schools, both signs of learning organization and administrators' coaching skills are perceived higher by teachers of these schools than teachers who work in Vocational High Schools. Necessary environments should be prepared to make administrators and teachers in Vocational High Schools reach this level.

(3) As the result of data, in terms of seniority, a fall is observed in teachers' perceptions who have been working 25 years or more. At this point, school administrators should create opportunities to make them include in the process of organizational learning.

(4) Teachers' perceptions that have associate degree about administrators coaching skills are more negative than the other two groups. School administrators making teachers who have associate degree include in coaching applications may enhance this perception.

(5) If we look at today's position of concept of administration, it is a necessary priority to have coaching skills. In this respect, education seminars about coaching should be organized for the school administrators who work at schools which are connected to National Education Ministry and their attending this kind of education should be provided.

### **Reference**

Akgemci, T. (1999). Sanayi Ötesi Toplum ve Öğrenen Organizasyon. Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Meslek Yüksekokulu Dergisi, (2). [Post-Industrial Society and

- Learning Organization. Journal of Selçuk University Social Sciences Vocational School, (2)].
- Ash, R. C. ve Persall, J.M. (1999). The principal as chief learning officer. National Association of Secondary School Principals, 84 (616), 15-22.
- Barnett, B., Henry, A., & Vann, B. (2008). Coaching for Teachers and Principals: Influence on Resiliency, Student Learning and School Improvement. Retrieved from <http://www.docstoc.com/docs/19448822/COACHING-FOR-TEACHERS-AND-PRINCIPALS---BG-BARNETT>.
- Başaran, İ. E. (2000). Eğitim Yönetimi Nitelikli Okul (4. Baskı). Ankara: Feryal Matbaası. [Educational Management Qualified School (Fourth Edition). Ankara: Feryal Press].
- Berg, M. E., & Karlsen, J. T. (2007). Mental Models in Project Management Coaching. Engineering Management Journal, 19(3), 3-13.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2010). Sosyal Bilimler İçin Veri Analizi El Kitabı (11. Baskı). Ankara: Pegem Yayıncılık. [Handbook of Data Analysis for Social Sciences (Eleventh Edition). Ankara: Pegem Publication].
- Čiutienė, R., Neverauskas, B., & Meilienė, E. (2010). Coaching As A Tool To Develop Employees Career. Economics and Management, 15, 444-450.
- Çelik, V. (2003). Eğitimsel Liderlik, Ankara: Pegem Yayıncılık. [Educational Leadership, Ankara: Pegem Publication].
- Doğan, E. (2002). Eğitimde Toplam Kalite Yönetimi, Ankara: Academyplus Yayınevi. [Total Quality Management in Education, Ankara: Academyplus Press].
- Erdoğan, İ. (2000). Okul Yönetimi ve Öğretim Liderliği (4. Baskı). Ankara: Pegem Yayıncılık. [School Management and Instructional Leadership (Fourth Edition). Ankara: Pegem Publication].
- Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2006). How to Designe And Evaluate Researche in Education (Third Edition). New York.
- Güleş, H. (2007). İstanbul İli Bayrampaşa İlçesindeki Resmi İlköğretim Okulu Yönetici ve Öğretmenlerinin Öğrenen Organizasyona İlişkin Algıları. (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Yeditepe Üniversitesi, İstanbul. [Perceptions of Formal Primary Education School Administrators and Teachers, Who Work In Bayrampaşa, Istanbul District About Learning Organizations. (Unpublished master's thesis). Yeditepe University, Istanbul].
- Hoca, E. (2007). Bir Vakıf Üniversitesinde Eğitim Yönetimi Alanındaki İdeal Lider Tipi Özelliklerinin Araştırılması. (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Yeditepe Üniversitesi, İstanbul. [Research on the Ideal Leadership Style Traits at the Education Management Field in a Foundation University. (Unpublished master's thesis). Yeditepe University, Istanbul].
- Hord, S., & Hirsh, S. A. (2009). The Principal's Role in Supporting Learning Communities. Educational Leadership, 66(5), 22-23.
- İraz, R. (2004, Ekim). Öğrenen Organizasyonlarda Bilgi Yönetim Uygulamaları, S.Ü. IV. Ulusal Üretim Araştırmaları Sempozyumu, Konya. [(2004, October). Information Management Practices in Learning Organizations, S.Ü. 4<sup>th</sup> National Production Surveys Symposium, Konya].
- Kalkan, F. S. (2009). Farklı Okul Türündeki Yöneticilerin Algılanan Koçluk Becerilerinin Karşılaştırılması. (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Yeditepe Üniversitesi, İstanbul. [Comparison Between the Perceived Coaching Abilities of the Directors Working at Different Types of Schools. (Unpublished master's thesis). Yeditepe University, Istanbul].
- Karaman, F. (2008). Ortaöğretim Okullarında Görev Yapan Okul Müdürlerinin Göstermiş Olduğu Liderlik ve Etkili Yöneticilik Davranışları. (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans

- Tezi). Beykent Üniversitesi, İstanbul. [Leadership and Effective Management Behaviors of School Managers In Secondary Education. (Unpublished master's thesis). Beykent University, İstanbul].
- Kıış, A. (2009). Öğrenen Örgüt Oluşturmada Okul Müdürlerinin Öğrenen Liderlik Rolü. (Yayımlanmamış Bilim Uzmanlığı Tezi). İnönü Üniversitesi, Malatya. [The Learning Leadership Role of Principals in Building a Learning Organization. (Unpublished master's thesis). Inonu University, Malatya].
- McEwan, E. K. (1998). Seven Steps to Effective Instructional Leadership, California: Corwin Press.
- Öztürk, S. (2007). Ortaöğretim Özel ve Resmi Okul Yöneticilerinin Koçluk Becerilerinin Karşılaştırılması. (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Marmara Üniversitesi, İstanbul. [Comparison Between the Coaching Abilities of Private and Public School Instructors' at the Secondary Education. (Unpublished master's thesis). Marmara University, İstanbul].
- Poussard, J. M. (2004). Yönetimde Yeni Bir Stil Coaching, İstanbul: Yaylacık Matbaası. [A New Style in Management Coaching, İstanbul: Yaylacık Press].
- Senge, P. M. (2002). Beşinci Disiplin (9. Baskı). İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları. [The Fifth Discipline (Ninth Edition). İstanbul: Publications of Yapı Kredi].
- Subaş, A. (2010). İlköğretim Okullarında Çalışan Sınıf ve Branş Öğretmenlerinin Öğrenen Örgütü (Okulu) Algılamaları. (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Marmara Üniversitesi, İstanbul. [Perception of Class and Branch Teachers Working In The Primary Schools About Learning School. (Unpublished master's thesis). Marmara University, İstanbul].
- Şimşek, Y., & Yıldırım, M. C. (2004, Temmuz). Öğrenen Okulların Kültürel Yapıları, XIII. Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kurultayı, Malatya. [(2004, July). Cultural Structure of Learning Schools, 13<sup>th</sup> National Educational Sciences Congress, Malatya].
- Töremen, F. (2001). Öğrenen Okul, Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım. [Learning School, Ankara: Nobel Press and Delivery].
- Yazıcı, S. (2001). Öğrenen Organizasyonlar, İstanbul: Alfa Basım Yayın Dağıtım. [Learning Organizations, İstanbul: Alfa Print Press and Delivery].
- Yeltan, A. (2007). Effect of Coaching On Job Satisfacton. (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Marmara Üniversitesi, İstanbul. [Effect of Coaching On Job Satisfaction. (Unpublished master's thesis). Marmara University, İstanbul].