International Online Journal of Educational Sciences, 2014, 6 (1), 8-20

iojes
www.iojes.net

International Online Journal of Educational Sciences

ISSN: 1309-2707

Relationship between Learning Organization and Job Satisfaction of Primary School Teachers*

Mustafa Erdem[1], Abdurrahman İlğan[2] and Halil İbrahim Uçar[3]

[1]Yüzüncü Yıl University Faculty of Education Department of Education Sciences, Van, Turkey; [2]Düzce University, Faculty of Education, Department of Education Sciences, Düzce, Turkey; [3]Diyarbakır Provincial Education, Department Head of Education Inspectors, Diyarbakır, Turkey

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:
Received 03.10.2013
Received in revised form 18.12.2013
Accepted 24.12.2013
Available online 21.04.2014

ABSTRACT

Problem Statement: The idea of learning organization in the context of management theory was developed by Argyris and Schön and made popular by Senge. Literature suggests that learning organization has a significantly positive effect on job satisfaction of employees. Purpose of Study: The major purpose of this study was to examine the relations of learning organization level perceived by primary school teachers to job satisfaction. Methods: The quantitative survey research method was used to investigate the relationship between learning organization and job satisfaction. The model of the research is a descriptive correlation survey design. Targeted population of the research were 2387 primary school teachers working in the city center of Van province, eastern part of Turkey, in academic year 2011-2012. 450 primary school teachers were selected as cluster sampling. Findings and Results: Average mean for Job satisfaction of teachers was at satisfied level. There were no statically significant differences in terms of gender and subject matter of teachers at the level of dimensions of learning organization and job satisfaction of teachers. There were statistically significant differences at the two dimensions of learning organization, shared vision and team learning in terms of service period of teachers; whereas there was no statistically significant difference at the rest of the dimensions of learning organization, personal mastery, mental models, and system thinking. 'Shared vision' and 'team learning' as dimensions of learning organization accounted for 36.3 % of the total variance in job satisfaction of teachers. It is suggested that to increase teachers' job satisfaction level, as important factor for teachers' performance, perceived learning organization of teacher should be increased. Keywords: Learning organization, job satisfaction, prediction, primary school teachers.

© 2014 IOJES. All rights reserved

Keywords:
Learning organization, job satisfaction, primary school teachers, Turkey

Introduction

Learning Organization

The idea of learning organization in the context of management theory was developed by Argyris and Schön (1978) and made popular by Senge (1990; as cited in Coppieters, 2005). The concept of the learning organization evolved out of the research from organizational learning and became popular in the early 1990s. Senge (1990) defined organizations as learning where people continually explain their capacity to create the results they truly desire, where new and expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured, where collective aspiration is set free, and where people are continually learning to learn together (p.3). Learning

* Preliminary result of this paper presented at the 3rd International Conference "Education in Pakistan: Practices & Practices Challanges

[1] Corresponding author's address: Department of Educational Sciences, Faculty of Education, Düzce University, Turkey.
Telephone: +90 380 542 13 55 / 2431
Fax: +90 380 542 13 66
e-mail: abdurrahmanilgan@gmail.com

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.15345/iojes.2014.01.002

© 2014 International Online Journal of Educational Sciences (IOJES) is a publication of Educational Researches and Publications Association (ERPA)

organizations are organic 'system' of shared learning rather than impersonal bureaucratic machines or market driven entities focused on individual self-interest and competition (Bui & Baruch, 2010). Garvin (1993) defined learning organization as "skilled at creating, acquiring and transferring knowledge, and at modifying its behavior to reflect new knowledge and insights" (p. 80) whereas Bowen, Rose and Ware (2006, p. 98) defined it as "associated with a core set of conditions and processes that support the ability of an organization to value, acquire, and use information and tacit knowledge acquired from employees and stakeholders to successfully plan, implement, and evaluate strategies to achieve performance goals", and Ortenbald (2002) identified four perspectives to understand what a learning organization is. These perspectives are organizational learning, learning at work, learning climate, and learning structure.

Coppieters (2005) summarizes Senge's disciplines as following: "The first concerns personal mastery. People in the organization need to have a good self-knowledge of what they wish to achieve. The personal attitude to learning is the basis for organizational learning. The second discipline necessitates the continual reflection of the tacit mental models that members of the organization bring to all its activities. Building of a shared vision for the organization and its members of the future that they wish to create is the third discipline. Organizations have to be value driven." (p. 135)

The fourth discipline is a devotion to team learning. Aligning personal vision with organization vision is not a matter of chance; it is a matter of practice and process. Senge (1990) called this process "team learning" and described it as a discipline marked by three critical dimensions as followed: (1) The ability to think insightfully about complex issues, (2) the ability to act in innovative and coordinated ways, (3) the ability to play different roles on different teams (p. 236). Many voices in the school reform movement have discussed the need for schools to operate as "learning organization", which addresses the importance of faculty and staff working together to solve problems through networking and team learning (Senge et al., 2000).

The discipline which unites the others is system thinking. A good understanding of how complex (chaotic) and dynamic (living organism) systems work is required referring to 'system thinking' as a fifth discipline. Senge (1990) explained 'system thinking' as a discipline for seeing wholes. It is a framework for seeing an interrelationship rather than things, for seeing patterns of change rather than static 'snapshots' (p. 68). Mingers (2006) emphasized that system thinking has long and complex intellectual genealogy, and it has assumed an enormous and disparate variety of disciplinary and trans-disciplinary forms.

Even though this research based on Senge's (1990) study defined characteristics of learning organization, there are different aspects to characteristics of learning organization. Coppieters (2005) explains essential characteristic of learning organization as follows: shared insights or vision; learning based on experience; willingness to change mental models; individual and group motivation; team learning; learning nurtured by new information; increasing the learning capacity to reach a state of continuous change or transformation. There are some numerous researchers attempting to describe characteristics of learning organization such as open communications (Phillips, 2003; Pool, 2000), rewards for learning (Lippit, 1997; Phillips, 2003), knowledge management (Loermans, 2002; Selen, 2000), team learning (Anderson, 1997; Salner, 1999), risk taking (Rowden, 2001), support and recognition for learning (Griego, Geroy & Wright, 2000; Wilkinson & Kleiner, 1993). Bowen et. al, (2007) defined learning organization dimensions as following: team orientation, innovation, involvement, information flow, tolerance for error and results orientation. An instrument as learning organization developed by Yang, Watkins and Marsick, (2004) includes 9 dimensions as followed: Continuous learning, inquiry and dialogue, team learning, embedded system, empowerment, system connection, providing leadership, financial performance and knowledge performance.

As a learning organization, the professional development school promotes students and teacher learning, as well as an opportunity to reform education in both contexts (Harris, Tassel, 2005, p. 181). Hiatt-Michael (2001) defined schools as learning communities: "The learning community is an organization in which all members acquire new ideas and accept responsibility for developing and maintaining the organization and members working together, mutually understanding each other, yet respecting the diversity of one another." (p. 115) Brandt (2003) defined 10 ways of learning organization in school context. Learning organizations 1) have an incentive structure that encourages adaptive behavior. 2) have

challenging but achievable shared goals. 3) have members who can accurately identify the organization's stages of development. 4) gather, process, and act upon information in ways best suited to their purposes. 5) have an institutional knowledge base and processes for creating new ideas. 6) exchange information frequently with relevant external sources. 7) get feedback on products and services. 8) continuously refine their basic process. 9) have supportive organizational cultures. 10) are "open systems" sensitive to the external environment, including social, political, and economic conditions.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is a popular research topic for the researchers in organization and management studies (Luthans, 2005). Job satisfaction is defined by Taylor and Tashakkori (1995) as "feelings that employee hold toward the job, whereas Schultz (1982) defined it as "the psychological disposition of people toward their work". Satisfaction can be defined as the degree of an individual's affective orientation toward his or her role in an organization or simply as the degree to which an individual likes his or her role in an organization. Satisfaction is important because it affects a variety of individuals and organization outcomes. Individuals who are satisfied with their roles in organizations are generally physically and mentally healthier, experience a higher quality of life. Satisfaction also affects commitment, motivation, productivity performance, absenteeism, and turnover (Fenwick, 2006). Job satisfaction is very important to performance. People happy with their work are motivated, put in more effort and are likely to perform better than those who are not (Kwong, Wang, & Clifton, 2010). Research on job satisfaction in the field of education has explored both the consequences (outcomes) and antecedents (influences) of teacher satisfaction. Research has examined at least three possible outcomes (retention, attrition, and absenteeism) and at least three major influences (demographic variables, job role-related characteristics, and work experiences) (Perrachione, Rosser, Petersen, 2008). Teachers who report greater social support, particularly from the principals with whom they work, also report greater job satisfaction (Zellars & Perrewe, 2001) and who feel satisfied with their job generally display more loyalty to their organization (Matzler & Renzl, 2006). As can be seen from literature, job satisfaction is vital for both employees and organizations.

Relationship between Learning Organization and Job Satisfaction

Chang and Lee (2007) found from the practical researches that the promotion of learning organization can help improve job satisfaction. Under flexible experiment, the encouragement of continuous learning, extensive learning of culture, and system thinking, it is available to change employees' attitude and opinions toward jobs and enhance the internal satisfaction mentally. Furthermore, improving employees' idea about values and authorizing employees can actually enhance job willing and motives and also intensify the external satisfaction. McKinnon et al. (2003) found organizational culture has a relationship with learning organization, values of respect to people, innovation, stability and aggressiveness had uniformly strong association with affective commitment, job satisfaction and information sharing. Gardiner and Whiting's (1997) research suggests that altered behaviors managed by learning organizations in response to external environment not only bring with beneficial effect on organization performance but also improve the job performance and satisfaction of employees. As can be seen from literature, learning organization has a significantly positive effect on job satisfaction of employees.

The purpose of this study is to contribute to this literature and find out how the dimension of learning organization is related to job satisfaction. Given these limitations of learning organization research, the main purpose of this study is to address the gap in empirical research by examining the relationship between learning organization dimensions (personal mastery, mental models, shared vision, system thinking, team learning) based on Senge's (1990) study and the job satisfaction of teachers.

Purpose of the Study

The major purpose of this study was to examine the relations of learning organization level perceived by primary school teachers to job satisfaction. The over-all guiding questions for this study were:

1) To what extent is the level of learning organization perceived by primary school teachers?

2) To what extent is the level of job satisfaction achieved by primary school teachers?

3) Does the perceived level of learning organization and achieved job satisfaction of primary school teachers in terms of gender, subject matter and, service period change? It is aimed to determine whether or not there were significant differences in the primary school teachers' perceptions of the learning organization dimensions and job satisfaction based on demographics variables.

4) In which level sub-dimensions of learning organizations (personal mastery, mental models, shared vision, system thinking, team learning) predict job satisfaction of primary school teachers?

Methods

The quantitative survey research method was used to investigate the relationship between learning organization and job satisfaction. The model of the research is a descriptive correlation survey design. The methodology includes sample of the research, instruments, how the data is collected and how the data is analyzed.

Data Sources (Sample of the Research)

Targeted population of the research were 2387 primary school teachers working in the city center of Van province, eastern part of Turkey, in academic year 2011-2012. 450 primary school teachers were selected as cluster sampling. Lists of schools and school districts were obtained from provincial Office of Education. There are five school districts in the city center of Van province. Each school district was divided into three levels -low, middle, and high- in terms of social economic status (SES). Finally from each school district three schools (low, middle, and high) were selected via simple random sampling. Thus, 5 low, 5 middle and 5 high SES schools, totally 15 schools, were selected as sample.

There were 196 (45.7%) female and 233 (54.3%) male participants. Of those, 243 (56.6%) were class teachers; 186 (43.4%) were subject matter teachers. The sample represented participants at different career stages: 156 (36.4%) participants worked as teachers for less than 5 years; 137 (31.9%) served for 6 to 10 years; and 136 (31.7%) worked as teachers for 11 and more years.

Instruments

Perception of Learning Organization Scale (PLOS) developed by Güçlü and Türkoğlu (2003) was used in this research with the approval of the researcher. PLOS based on Senge's (1990) study consisting of five dimensions, personal mastery, mental models, shared vision, system thinking, and team learning includes 42 items. PLOS is a 5-point Likert Type scale and response options are 1) Never, 2) Rarely, 3) Occasionally, 4) Frequently, and 5) Very Frequently. Respondents are asked to determine the extent to which each of the questions reflects their school in the aspect of the learning organization. Güçlü and Türkoğlu (2003) obtained Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient for the PLOS as 0.97 and Sperman-Brown coefficient was .93. Researcher validated the scale through experts' opinions. Uysal (2005) used PLOS developed by Güçlü and Türkoğlu (2003) and calculated Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient for dimensions of PLOS as follows: Personal mastery: .81; Mental models: 0.89; Shared vision: 0.93; System Thinking: 0.89; Team learning: 0.95. A scale developed by Park and Rojewski (2006) based on Senge's (1990) study having the same dimensions used in this research found reliability (alpha) coefficient for five factors derived from exploratory factor analysis ranged from 0.856 to 0.897, with an overall internal consistency value for all 35 items equal to 0.954. The research conducted by Khasawneh (2011) using the same scale as this research found the following alpha coefficient for dimensions of learning organizations: personal mastery: .83; mental models: 0.86; shared

vision: 0.85; team learning: 0.83; and system thinking: 0.88. Khasawneh's research calculated the overall internal consistency coefficient for the survey as 0.90.

The short form Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) developed by Weiss et al. (1967) was used to evaluate job satisfaction of the teachers who participated in the research. MSQ includes 20 items measurement with 5-point Likert Type scale and response options are 1) Very dissatisfied, 2) Dissatisfied, 3) N (Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied), 4) Satisfied, and 5) Very satisfied. The respondents were asked to indicate their level of satisfaction. The Alpha reliability coefficient value of MSQ for this research was 0.90 and total item correlation ranged from 0.38 to 0.65.

Procedures and Data Analysis

The data gathered by PLOS and MSS scales have been analyzed by SPSS (Version 20). Demographic variables percentages and frequencies were used for the analysis. To describe perceived learning organization and level of teachers' job satisfaction, descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviation were used. To compare perceived learning organization and teachers' job satisfaction level in terms of gender, t-test; for period of service, One Way ANOVA were used. In order to see how accurately the perceived learning organization could predict job satisfaction of teachers, Stepwise Regression Analysis was used. Stepwise method defined by Howel (2010) as "a set of rules for delivering a regression equation by adding or subtracting one variable at a time from the regression equation" (p. 266). Stepwise method combines both Forward and Backwards procedures. Due to the complexity of inter-correlations, the variance explained by certain variables will change when new variables enter in the equation. Sometimes a variable that is qualified to enter loses some of its predictive validity when other variables enter. If this takes place, the Stepwise method will remove the "weakened" variable. Stepwise is probably the most frequently used one of the regression methods (George & Mallery, 2001, p.215).

Durbin-Watson test showing autocorrelations between 1.5 – 2.5 values for this test is the indicator of lack of autocorrelations. Durbin-Watson test value was 1.72. Tolerance and VIF values were .558 and 1.79 consecutively. Interpretations of the PLOS point were as follows: Never: 1 – 1.79; Rarely: 1.80 – 2.59; Occasionally: 2.60 – 3.39; Frequently: 3.40 – 4.19; Very Frequently: 4.20 – 5.00 while MSS points were as follows: Very dissatisfied: 1 – 1.79; Dissatisfied: 1.80 – 2.59; N (Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied): 2.60 – 3.39; Satisfied: 3.40 – 4.19; Very satisfied: 4.20 – 5.00.

Findings and Results

Under this title, basic descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviation for perceived learning organization and job satisfaction of teachers; to compare learning organization and job satisfaction of teachers in terms of gender and subject matter, t-test; for service period, one way ANOVA; and to predict job satisfaction of teachers regression analysis results were presented and discussed. Basic descriptive statistics for perceived learning organization and job satisfaction were presented in Table 1.

Table 1 Basic descriptive statistics for perceived learning organization and job satisfaction

Scales	Dimensions	N	Mean	Std. Dev.
Job Satisfaction		429	3.62	0.56
Learning Organization	Personal Mastery	429	3.11	0.77
	Mental models	429	3.46	0. 72
	Shared vision	429	3.31	0.77
	System thinking	429	3.22	0.70
	Team Learning	429	3.50	0.64
	Total	429	3.37	0.63

As can be seen in Table 1, teachers were satisfied with their jobs. Average mean for learning organization perceived by teachers was (X= 3.37) at "frequently" level. It means that teachers' perceptions of

their schools were positive and their schools could be included in "moderate"-level learning organizations. The dimension that teachers most agreed on in PLOS was "team learning" (X= 3.50), whereas teachers' least agreed-upon dimension was personal mastery (X= 3.11). Teachers agreeing with dimensions of personal mastery (X= 3.11), system thinking (X= 3.22), and shared vision (X= 3.31) at "occasionally" level means could be considered moderate whereas agreed dimensions of mental models (X= 3.46), and team learning (X= 3,50) at "frequently" level means could be considered high. T-test results comparing teachers' perceptions of learning organization and job satisfaction in terms of gender were as follows: There were statistically significant differences between female and male teachers at the level of job satisfaction [$t_{(427)}$=2.056; p<.05]. Female teachers (X= 73.66) were more satisfied than male teachers (X= 71.44) in terms of job satisfaction. There were no statically significant differences between female and male teachers at the level of dimensions of learning organization (p > .05). This means that female and male teachers have the same perspectives of their school in terms of dimensions of learning organization.

T-test results comparing teachers' perceptions of learning organization and job satisfaction in terms of subject matter were as follows: There were no statistically significant differences between class teachers' (grade 1 to 5) and subject matter teachers' perspectives at the level of job satisfaction [$t_{(427)}$= -,358; p > .05] and dimensions of learning organization (p > .05).

One-way ANOVA between the subjects was conducted to compare the effect of service period on job satisfaction and learning organization and results were as follows: There was no statistically significant difference at the level of job satisfaction of teachers in terms of service period [$F_{(2\text{-}426)}$=2.876; p>.05]. There were statistical differences at the two dimensions of learning organization, shared vision [$F_{(2\text{-}426)}$=3.221; p<.05] and team learning [$F_{(2\text{-}426)}$=4.967; p<.05], in terms of teachers' service period; whereas there was no statistically significant difference at the rest of the dimensions of learning organization, personal mastery, mental models, and system thinking. Schefee post hoc test result shows that teachers who had 11 years or more service period ($\overline{X}$ = 37.8 for shared vision; $\overline{X}$ = 36.33 for team learning) were more agreed on than teachers who had 6-10 years of service period ($\overline{X}$ = 35.22 for shared vision; $\overline{X}$ = 33.95 for team learning) at the dimensions of shared vision and team learning. The result can be interpreted as experienced teachers having more tendency to share vision of their schools and team learning than less experienced teachers. The Multiple Regression Analysis was used to predict job satisfaction of teachers as a dependent variable while the independent variables were the dimensions of learning organization. The results of the stepwise regression analysis were presented in Table 2.

Pearson correlation coefficients between job satisfaction and dimensions of learning organization were positive and at moderate level. The coefficients between job satisfaction and dimensions of learning organization were (r = 0.425) for personal mastery, (r =0.514) for mental models, (r =0.573) for shared vision, (r = .492) for system thinking and (r = .520) for team learning. The stepwise regression analysis result shows that (see Table 2) two variables entered in the model.

Table 2 The results of the stepwise regression analysis concerning the prediction of the teachers' job satisfaction

					Change Statistic					
Model	R	R Square	Adj. R Square	Std. Err. Of the Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	F1	df2	Sig. F. Change	Durbin-Watson
1	0.57[a]	0.33	0.33	9.16	0.33	208.70	1	427	0.00	
2	0.60[b]	0.36	0.36	8.93	0.03	23.06	1	426	0.00	1,72

a. Predictors: (Constant), shared vision
b. Predictors: (Constant), shared vision, team learning
c. Dependent Variable: Job satisfaction

'Shared vision' as a dimension of learning organization was the first variable entering in the model, and additional to this, 'team learning' was the second variable entering in the model as significant independent variables predicted teachers' job satisfaction. Other independent variables as dimensions of learning

organizations, 'personal mastery', 'mental models' and, 'system thinking' were not significant predictors of teachers' job satisfaction. Durbin-Watson coefficient (1.72) result shows that there was not autocorrelation among the independent variables.

As can be seen in Table 2, in the first model, 'shared vision' accounted for 32.8 % of the total variance in job satisfaction of teachers (R= 0.573, R^2 = 0.328). In other words, shared vision was the most effective independent variable to predict the job satisfaction of teachers. This result shows that the more teachers have shared perceptions of vision, the more their job satisfaction will increase. In the second regression model, 'team learning' added to 'shared vision' as the predictors of job satisfaction of teachers. As a result of the second model, the variance in job satisfaction of teachers rose from 32.8 % to 36.3 % (R= .602, R^2= 0.36). It means that team learning contributed to the overall variance additional to 3.4 %. The result of ANOVA shows that the model was significant. ANOVA results show that the model generating 'shared vision' and 'team learning' predicting the job satisfaction of teachers were significant [$F_{(1,427)}$= 208,699 p<,001]. Results of the beta coefficients of stepwise regression analysis were presented in Table 3.

Table 3 Results of the Beta Coefficients of Stepwise Regression Analysis Including Coefficients

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Err	Beta	t	Sig.	Zero-Order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
Constant	45.09	1.95		23.18	.000					
Shared Vision	.75	.52	.573	14.44	.000	.57	.57	.57	1.00	1.00
Constant	37.86	2.42		15.62	.000					
Shared Vision	.54	.07	.408	7.869	.000	.57	.36	.30	.56	1.79
Team Learning	.43	.09	.249	4.80	.000	.52	.23	.19	.56	1.79

a. Dependent Variable: Job satisfaction

As can be seen in Table 3, t-test results show that there was a statistically significant relationship between shared vision (t=7.869, p<,001) and team learning (t=4.802 p<,001) as dimensions of learning organization and teachers' job satisfaction. Multiple regression analysis accounted for 36 % of teachers' job satisfaction. Improvement in learning organization activities increases job satisfaction among primary school teachers. The regression equation for teachers' job satisfaction was = 37.855 Constant + .535 Shared Vision + .433 Team Learning. This equation means that a unit increase in shared vision of teachers will give rise to 0.54 point increase in teachers' job satisfaction whereas a unit increase in team learning of teachers will give rise to 0.43 point in teachers' job satisfaction. In this model, correlation coefficient between teachers' job satisfaction and shared vision was positive and at moderate level (r = 0.573) while the other independent variable -team learning- controlled this coefficient slightly decreasing to (r = .356) and keeping the same significance level. Another correlation coefficient in this model between teachers' job satisfaction and team learning was positive and at low level (r = 0.227) while other independent variable -shared vision- controlled this coefficient slightly decreasing to (r = ,186) and keeping the same significance level.

Discussion and Implications

Job satisfaction is a popular research topic for the researchers in organization and management studies (Luthans, 2005). The number of the studies on job satisfaction shows the significance of the issue. Teachers' job satisfaction level was moderately high (X= 3.62) in this research, which is consistent with the research results of Ayan and Kocacik (2010) who found teachers' job satisfaction level means as (X= 3.55) among Turkish teachers. Bowen et al (2007) found that teachers' job satisfaction level in North Caroline was at high level whereas Maele and Houtte's (2012) research conducted in Belgium among secondary teachers revealed the teachers' job satisfaction level as moderately high (X= 3.54), consistent with result of this research.

Klassen and Anderson's (2009) research rated teachers' job satisfaction level with a mean rating of 3.94, which is slightly below the 'satisfying in general' descriptor and slightly higher than result of this research. Griffin (2010) found that 46% (n= 78) of the surveyed teachers reported that they were either satisfied or very satisfied with their jobs whereas a total of 35.1% (n= 59) was reported to be either dissatisfied or very dissatisfied. Griffin's (2012) research conducted with teachers, working in a rural area of Georgia, USA, also found that participating teachers were satisfied or strongly satisfied with the instructional aspects of their job (89%), while 67% of teachers were dissatisfied or strongly dissatisfied with the non-instructional aspects such as paperwork. Cheng and Ren's (2010) research revealed that Taiwanese teachers' job satisfaction level was fair (X = 3.06). Heller (1992) found that only 58% of the teachers in his study reported satisfaction with their job, while Moore (1987) reported that more than half of the teachers in her study reported dissatisfaction with the choice of teaching as a career (as cited in Griffin 2010). U. S. Department of Education (2007) surveyed 9000 teachers 10 years later upon completing their bachelor's degrees. Their findings indicated that 93% of the teachers reported satisfaction with their jobs. Another research (Markow, Macia, Lee & Interactive, 2013) conducted with 1000 American teachers revealed that teacher satisfaction had declined 23 percentage points since 2008, varying from 62% to 39% very satisfied, including five percentage points since last year, to the lowest level in 25 years (p. 6). Markow et al.'s, (2013) research presented teachers' job satisfaction level from 1984 to 2012 and showed that very satisfied teachers - 40% - were in 1984, and this percentage was % 39 in 2012, and it reached its peak point in 2008 with a rate of 62%. Similar to Markow et al.';s research results for the same period, Taylor's research suggested that teachers in the United States were more satisfied for the year 2004 than they had been at any point in the previous 20 years (as cited in Klassen, Usher & Bong, 2010).

As for the relationship between the teacher's age and job satisfaction, we did not find statistically significant difference at the level of job satisfaction of teachers in terms of service period. Some researchers (Maele & Houtte, 2012; Ma & MacMillan, 1999; US Department of Education, 1997) found that teachers' job satisfaction correlated negatively with their years of experience whereas other researchers (Klassen & Anderson, 2007; Dinham & 1996) did not find the same result, consistent with the current research results. Mausner, Patterson, and Capwell (1957) found that job satisfaction started high, declined, and then started to improve again with increasing age in a U-shaped curve (as cited in Griffin, 2010). Griffin's (2010) research found that those teachers who had been in the field for more than 26 years reported higher levels of job satisfaction.

Lim (2011) found significant differences in job satisfaction of Korean conglomerates employees in terms of gender; female job satisfaction was higher than males' satisfaction, which is consistent with the results of the current research. Hsu's (2009) research showed that there was no significant difference in job satisfaction in terms of gender, job tenure, and age, which is again consistent with results of the current research. Bogler (2002), McConaghy (1993) and Ma & MacMillan (1999) found that female teachers tended to be more satisfied than male teachers whereas Klassen & Anderson (2009) and Maele & Houtte (2012) found no difference between male and female teachers. General consensus concerning gender differences and job satisfaction is that the difference between the two sexes is not large enough to be of value in the practical sense (Griffin, 2010). The research results regarding this aspect are mixed and suggest that no gender impact is available on teacher job satisfaction.

As for the teachers' perception about learning organization, Bowen et al. (2007) found in North Caroline schools that mean scores for 'actions' and 'sentiments' both totally were, in terms of learning organization, 4.34 and 4.38 consecutively at a six-point scale. It means that teachers' perceptions about learning organization were high level. Song and Chermack (2008) and Hsu (2009) found that the level of learning organization including seven dimensions in a business company was high level. Average mean for dimensions of learning organization ranged from 3.53 to 3.85 at a five-point scale. The research conducted by Khasawneh (2001) in a faculty of Jordan University revealed that whole dimensions of learning organization were in moderate-to-high level and average means ranged from 3.40 to 3.56 among dimensions. Alp's (2007) research revealed that elementary school teachers' perceptions in Turkish schools about learning organization were in moderate and low levels. Alp found that perceptions of teachers about their school in terms of learning organization 'personal mastery', 'mental models' and 'team learning' were in low level whereas 'system thinking' and 'shared vision' as dimensions of learning organization were in moderate

level. Memduhoğlu and Kuşci's (2012) research conducted among Turkish primary school administrators and teachers revealed that administrators' and teachers' perception about learning organization was moderate level (X = 3,33). Memduhoğlu and Kuşci found that perceptions of participants about their school in terms of learning organization 'personal mastery', 'shared vision' and 'system thinking' were low level whereas 'mental models' and 'team learning' as dimensions of learning organization were high level. The study of Khasawneh (2001), Hsu (2009) and Lim (2010), except for 'creating continuous learning opportunities subscale, revealed that there were no significant differences between the perception of male and female employees in college and business companies in terms of learning organization, which is consistent with the results of the current research.

Khasawneh (2001) found differences for each discipline among the four experience level groups (below 4 years, 4-10 years, 11-17 years, and 18 years and above) in favor of faculty members with less than four years of experience, which is slightly consistent with the results of the current research. The researcher found significant differences at 'shared vision' and 'team learning' dimensions of learning organization in terms of service period of teachers. Lim (2010) found differences by years of service in dimension of 'promoting inquiry and dialogue' of learning organization whereas the current research found differences in dimension of 'shared vision' and 'team learning'. Lim's research revealed that respondents who had worked for less than 4 years showed significantly higher mean scores in promoting 'inquiry and dialogue' than those who had worked for 10 years or more. The current research revealed .304 correlation coefficient between 'shared vision' as a dimension of learning organization and job satisfaction of teachers while finding .186 correlation coefficient between 'team learning' as a dimension of learning organization and job satisfaction of teachers. Consequently, primary school teachers perceive that a high degree of learning organization culture increases their job satisfaction significantly and positively. Bowen et al. (2007) found that correlations coefficient between 'actions' as a dimension of learning organization and job satisfaction of teachers was .225 while this coefficient was .285 between 'sentiments' as the other dimension of learning organization and job satisfaction of teachers. Lim (2010) and Emami et al.'s (2012) research revealed that inter--correlations among the learning organization culture subscales and job satisfaction were moderate and at positive level whereas Hsu's (2009) (γ= 0.94, t = 12.40; p < 0.05) and Chang and Lee's (2007) (γ= 0.953, t = 8.006; p < 0.001) researches revealed higher correlations than Lim's research between whole dimensions of learning organization and job satisfaction of research & development and business professionals. Watkins and Marsicks' (2003) study showed that organizations that have priority in learning and development had found increase in employees' job satisfaction. Rowden and Conine (2005) examined the relationship between workplace learning and job satisfaction in small US banks and found significant relationship between workplace learning and employees' job satisfaction. Rose, Kumar and Pak (2009) also found positive high linear relationship level between organizational learning and job satisfaction among public service managers. Wang's (2005) research revealed that organizational learning culture had positive strong relationship with employee job satisfaction. Egan, Yang, and Bartlett's (2004) research suggested that organizational learning culture had significantly positive contributions to job satisfaction (standardized path coefficients = .68, p ‹ .01) and the square multiple correlation for the construct of job satisfaction was .46 showing that nearly half of the variance of job satisfaction could be explained by organizational learning culture. The result of the structural equation analysis suggests that organizational learning culture is a valid construct in predicting employees' job satisfaction. Additional to research mentioned above, some other researchers found relationships between learning climate and job satisfaction (Mikkelsen, Ogaard & Lovrich, 2000); work climate and job satisfaction (Keller, Julian & Kedia, 1996); workplace learning and job satisfaction (Rowden & Ahmed, 2000) and organizational learning ability and job satisfaction (Chiva & Alegre, 2008).

References

Alp, A. (2007*). İlköğretim öğretmenlerinin öğrenen örgüt kültürüne ilişkin algıları: İstanbul ili örneği*. Yayınlanmamış, Yüksek lisans tezi. Istanbul: Beykent University Graduate School of Social Sciences.

Anderson, C. (1997). Values-based management. *Academy of Management Executive*, 11 (4), 25–46. http://www.jstor.org/stable/4165425

Ayan, S. & Kocacık, F. (2010). The relation between the level of job satisfaction and types of personality in high school teachers. *Australian journal of Teacher Education.* 35(1), 27-41. http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2010v35n1.4

Berry, A. B. (2012). The relationship of perceived support satisfaction and commitment for special education teachers in rural areas. *Rural Special Education Quarterly. 31*(1), 3-14. ??????

Bogler, R. (2002). Two profiles of schoolteachers: A discriminant analysis of job satisfaction. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18, 665–673. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(02)00026-4

Bowen, G. L., Ware, W. B., Rose, R. A., & Powers, J. D. (2007). Assessing the functioning of schools as learning organizations. *Children & Schools,* 29 (4), 199-208. http://cs.oxfordjournals.org/content/29/4/199.short

Bowen, G. L., Rose, R. A., & Ware, W. B. (2006). The reliability and validity of the School Success Profile Learning Qrganization measure. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 29, 97-104. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2005.08.005

Brandt, R. (2003). Is this school a learning organization? *Journal of Staff Development.* 24 (1), 10-16. http://www.useautah.org/images/Pdf/Para/Isthisschoolalearningorganization.pdf

Brunetti, G. J. (2001). Why do they teach? A study of job satisfaction among long-term high school teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly,* 28(3), 49-74. http://www.jstor.org/stable/23478304

Bui, K., & Baruch, Y. (2010). Creating learning organization in higher education: Applying a systems perspectives. *Learn Organ. 17*(3), 208-227.

Chang, S, C., & Lee, M. S. (2007). A study on relationship among leadership, organizational culture, the operation of learning organization and employees' job satisfaction. *The Learning Organization.* 14(2), 155-185.

Cheng, Y. W., & Ren, L. (2010). Elementary resource room teachers' job stress and job satisfaction in Taoyuan County, Taiwan. *Journal of Intellectual & Development disability.* 35(1), 44-47.

Chiva, R., & Alegre. J. (2008). Emotional intelligence and job satisfaction: the role of organizational learning capability. *Personnel Review*, 37(6), 680-701. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/00483480810906900

Coppieters, P. (2005). Turning schools into learning organizations. *European Journal of Teacher Education. 28*(2), 129-139. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02619760500093131.

Dinham, S., & Scott, C. (1996). *Teacher satisfaction, motivation, and health: Phase one of the teacher 2000 project.* Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Research Association. New York, NY.

Emami, R., Moradi, E., Idrus, D., & Almutairi, D. O. (2012). Investigating the relationship between organizational learning culture, job satisfaction and turnover intention in it SMEs. *International Journal of Innovative Ideas*. 12(1), 8-23. http://www.academia.edu/1538753/Investigating_the_Relationship_between_Organizational_Learning_Culture_Job_Satisfaction_and_Turnover_Intention_in_it_SMEs

Egan, T. M., Yang, B., & Bartlett, K. R. (2004). The effect of organizational learning culture and job satisfaction on motivation to transfer learning and turnover intention. *Human Resource Development Quarterly.* 15(3), 279-301. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.1104

Fenwick, W. E. (2006). *Encyclopedia of educational leadership and administration*. (Volume: 2). Thousand Oaks; California: Sage Publications.

Fuming, X., & Jiliang, S. (2007). Research on job satisfaction of elementary and high school teachers and strategies to increase job satisfaction. *Chinese Education and Society*. 40(5), 86-96. http://dx.doi.org/10.2753/CED1061-1932400509

Gardiner, P. & Whiting, P. (1997), Success factors in learning organizations: an empirical study. , *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 29(2), 41-48. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/00197859710165001.

Garvin, D. (1993). Building learning organizations. *Harvard Business Review*, 71, 78–91.

George, D., & Mallery, P. (2001). *SPSS for windows step by step a simple guide and reference 15.0 update.* Boston: Pearson Publishing.

Griego, O. V., Geroy, G. D., & Wright, P. C. (2000). Predictors of learning organizations: A human resource development practitioner's perspective. *Learning Organization*, 7 (1), 5–13. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09696470010313632

Griffin, D. K. (2010). A survey of Bahamian and Jamaican Teachers' level of motivation and job satisfaction. *Journal of Invitational Theory and Practice.* 16, 56-76. http://www.invitationaleducation.net/journal/index2.htm

Güçlü, N. & Türkoğlu, H. (2003). İlköğretim okullarında görev yapan yönetici ve öğretmenlerin öğrnen organizasyona ilişkin algıları *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi.* 2(1), 137-161. http://www.tebd.gazi.edu.tr/arsiv/2003_cilt1/sayi_2/137-161.PDF

Harris, M. M., & Tassel V. F. (2005). The professional development school as learning organization. *European Journal of Teacher Education. 28* (2), 179-194. http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02619760500093255#.U0b0-ag0EiI

Hiatt-Michael, D. B. (2001). School as learning communities: A vision for organic school reform. *School Community Journal, 11,* 113-127. ERIC Number: EJ640825 http://www.adi.org/journal/fw01%5CHiatt-Michael.pdf

Howell, D. C. (2010). *Fundamental statistics fort the behavioral sciences*. London: Thomson & Wadsworth Publishing.

Hsu, Hsiu-Yen, (2009). *Organizational learning culture's influence on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention among R & D professionals in Taiwan during economic downturn.* Unpublished Doctoral dissertation. Graduate School of University of Minnesota.

Keller, R., Julian, S. D., & Kedia. B. L. (1996). A multinational study of work climate, job satisfaction, and the productivity of R&D teams. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, 43(1), 48-55. http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/17.491268

Khasawneh, S. (2011). Learning organization disciplines in higher education institutions: An approach to human resource development in Jordan. *Innovative Higher Education.* 36 (4), 273-285. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10755-010-9170-8

Klassen, R. M., & Anderson, J. K. (2009). How times change: Secondary teachers' job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in 1962 and 2007. *British Educational Research Journal.* 35(5), 745-759. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01411920802688721

Klassen, R. M., Usher, E. L., & Bong, M. (2010). Teachers' collective efficacy, job satisfaction, and job stress in cross-cultural context. *The Journal of Experimental Education.* 78, 464-486. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00220970903292975

Kwong, J., Wang, H., & Clifton, R. A. (2010). Rethinking our assumptions about teachers' job satisfaction in China and the West. *Australian Journal of Education.* 54(2), 115-132. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/000494411005400202

Lim, T. (2011). Relationship among organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and learning organization culture in one Korean private organization. *Asia Pacific Educational Review.* 11, 311-320. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s12564-010-9087-z

Lippitt, M. (1997). Creating a learning environment. *Human Resources Professional*, 10 (5), 23–26.

Loermans, J. (2002). Synergizing the learning organization and knowledge management. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 6 (3), 285–294. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/13673270210434386

Luthans, F. (2005). *Organizational behavior.* New York: McGraw Hill.

Ma, X., & MacMillan, R. B. (1999). Influences of workplace conditions on teachers' job satisfaction. *The Journal of Educational Research,* 93, 39–47. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00220679909597627

Maele, V. D., & Houtte, M. V. (2012). The role of teacher and faculty trust in forming teachers' job satisfaction: Do years of experience make a difference? *Teaching and Teacher Education.* 28, 879-889.

Markow, D., Macia, L., Lee, H., & Interactive, H. (2013). *The metlife survey of the American teacher: Challenges for school leadership.* USA: Metlife, Inc.

Matzler, K., & Renzl, B. (2006). The relationship between interpersonal trust, employee satisfaction, and employee loyalty. *Total Quality Management,* 10, 1261-1271.

McConaghy, T. (1993). A profile of the teaching profession in Canada. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 74(6), 502-503.

Memduhoğlu, H. B. & Kuşci, E. (2012). Organizational learning in primary schools in the views of school administrators and teachers. *Elementary Education Online.* 11(3), 748-761. http://ilkogretim-online.org.tr/vol11say3/v11s3m14.pdf.

Mikkelsen, A., Ogaard, T. & Lovrich. N. (2000). Modeling the effects of organizational setting and individual coping style on employee's subjective health, job satisfaction, and Commitment. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 24(3), 371-397.

Mingers, J. (2006). *Realising system thinking.* New York: Springer-Verlag.

Ortenbald, A. (2002). A typology of the ideas of learning organization. *Management Learning,* 33 (2), 213–230.

Park, J. H., & Rojewski, J. W. (2006). The learning organization model across vocational and academic teacher groups. *Career and Technical Education Research.* 31(1), 23-48. http://dx.doi.org/10.5328/CTER31.1.23

Perrachione, B. A., Rosser, V. J., & Petersen, g. J. (2008). Why do they stay: elementary teachers' perceptions of job satisfaction and retention. *The Professional Educator.* 32(2), 1-17.

Phillips, B. T. (2003). A four-level learning organization benchmark implementation model. *Learning Organization*, 10 (2, 3), 98–105.

Pool, S. W. (2000). The learning organization: Motivating employees by integrating TQM philosophy in a supportive organizational culture. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal,* 21 (8), 373–378.

Rose, R. C., Kumar, N., & Pak, O. G. (2009). The effect of organizational learning on organizational commitment, job satisfaction and work performance. *The Journal of Applied Business Research.* 25(6), 55-66.

Rowden, R. W., & Ahmad, S. (2000). The relationship between workplace learning and job satisfaction in small to mid-sized businesses in Malaysia. *Human Resource Development International*. 3(3) 307-322.

Rowden, R. W. (2001). The learning organization and strategic change. S.A.M. *Advanced Management Journal,* 66 (3), 11–17.

Rowden, R. W., & Conine, J. (2005). The impact of workplace on job satisfaction in small US commercial banks. *Journal of Workplace Learning.* 17(4), 215-230. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/13665620510597176

Salner, M. (1999). Preparing for the learning organization. *Journal of Management Education,* 23 (5), 489–508. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/105256299902300504

Schultz, D. P. (1982). *Psychological and industry today.* New York: MacMillan Publishing.

Selen, W. (2000). Knowledge management in resource-based competitive environments: A roadmap for building learning organizations. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 4 (4), 346–353. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/13673270010379902

Senge, P. (1990). The fifth discipline: the art and practice of the learning organization. New York: Doubleday Publishing.

Senge, P., Cambron-McCabe, N., Lucas, T., Smith, B., Dutton, J., & Kleiner, A. (2000). *Schools that learn: A fifth discipline fieldbook for educators, parents, and everyone who cares about education.* New York: Doublday Publishing.

Silins, H., Zarins, S., & Mulford, B. (1998). *What characteristics and processes a school as a learning organization? Is this a useful concept to apply to schools?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Australian Association for Research in Education, Adelaide, Australia. (ERIC Document No: ED452588). http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0013161X02239641

Song, J. H., & Chermack, T. J. (2008). Assessing the psychometric properties of the dşmensions of learning organization questionnaire in the Korean business context. *International Journal of Training and Development.* 12 (2), 87-99. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2419.2008.00297.x

Taylor, D. L., & Tashakkori, A. (1995). Decision participation and school climate as predictors of job satisfaction and teachers' sense of efficacy. *Journal of Experimental Education,* 63, 217-230. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00220973.1995.9943810

US Department of Education. (1997). *Job satisfaction among America's teachers: Effects of workplace conditions, background characteristics, and teacher compensation.* Washington, DC: National Center for Educational Statistics, US Dept. of Education. Available at http://nces.ed.gov/pubs97/97471.pdf.

U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Statistics. (2007). Teachers report high job satisfaction. *The Educational Digest,* 73(1), 74-75.

Uysal, A. (2005). *Okul öncesi eğitim kurumlarında görev yapan yönetici ve öğretmenlerin öğrenen organizasyona ilişkin algıları* Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Selçuk Universitesi .

Yang, B., Watkins, K. E., & Marsick, V. J. (2004). The construct of the learning organization: Dimensions, measurement, and validation. *Human Research Development Quarterly.* 15 (1), 31- 55. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.1086

Wang, X. (2005). *Relationship among organizational learning culture, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment in Chinese state-owned and privately-owned enterprises*. Unpublished doctorial dissertation, University of Minnesota.

Watkins, K. E., & Marsick, V. J. (2003). Demonstrating the value of an organization's learning culture: The dimensions of the learning organization questionnaire. *Advances in Developing Human Resources,* 5(2), 132-151. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1523422303005002002

Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H. (1967). Manuel for the Minnesota satisfaction questionnaire. Minneapolis, MN: Work Adjustment Project of the University of Minnesota.

Wilkinson, B., & Kleiner, B. H. (1993). New developments in improving learning in organizations. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 25 (10), 17–21. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/00197859310046629

Zellars, K. L., & Perrewe, P. L. (2001). Affective personality and the content of emotional social support: Coping in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 86, 459 – 467. doi.apa.org/journals/apl/86/3/459.pdf