Journal of English Teaching
e-ISSN: 2622-4224 | p-ISSN: 2087-9628
http://ejournal.uki.ac.id/index.php/jet

Association of Organizational Learning with Leadership, Job Satisfaction, and Engagement in an EFL Setting

Meltem Huri BATURAY
meltem.baturay@atilim.edu.tr
Atılım University, Ankara, Turkey

Ahmet Erdost YASTIBAŞ
ahmeterdost@gmail.com
Atılım University, Ankara, Turkey

Abstract
The present study investigated the relationship between organizational learning, department leadership, teacher leadership, job satisfaction, and engagement in a Turkish higher education language institution. It was designed as a quantitative study. 96 Turkish English language instructors participated in the research. The data were collected with four scales and analyzed through independent samples t-test, one-way ANOVA, Pearson's r correlation, and multiple regression analysis. The findings indicated that there were no statistically significant differences between the participants in terms of their genders, Bachelor's degrees, the status of masters of art, and the departments they worked, but of their teaching experiences concerning organizational learning, department leadership, teacher leadership, job satisfaction, and engagement. They also showed that there were statistically significant relationships among these variables. Besides, they revealed that department leadership and job satisfaction could predict organizational learning positively and explain the 74% of the variance in organizational learning. Department leadership can have a central role in promoting organizational learning by creating a working environment supporting and valuing teacher leadership, so English language teachers/instructors can feel more engaged and satisfied.

Keywords:
department leadership, engagement, job satisfaction, organizational learning, teacher leadership,

How to cite:
Baturay, M.H. & Yastibaş, A.E. (2021). Association of Organizational Learning with Leadership, Job Satisfaction, and Engagement in an EFL Setting. *Journal of English teaching, 7*(2), 101=117. DOI: https://doi.org/10.33541/jet.v7i2.2513

INTRODUCTION

To meet the ever-changing needs of educational environments, higher education institutions constantly follow rapid changes in the competitive world (Holyoke, Storko, Wood, & Wu, 2012). These changes are mostly involved with the integration of technology into programs and their improvement/development. It is suggested that dynamic schools depend on complex adaptation systems which are based on knowledge management and learning (Coppieters, 2005). The ones designed in the form of learning organizations hold a decentralized management model that has systems and structures enabling staff at all levels to learn collaboratively and continuously while working, which means organizational learning (Silins, Mulford, & Zarins, 2002). In this type of organization, workers are supported as professionals, which encourages them for growth and success (Silins & Mulford, 2004). Effective school principals who have clear and well-articulated goals, delegate tasks to others, encourage staff to participate in decision-making, incorporate others in problem-solving, treat staff fairly and equitably, and provide staff with support in difficult situations are significant in this organization (Griffith, 2004).

Organizational Learning versus a Learning Organization

Organizational learning is defined as a field of study focusing on how an organization learns independently of the individuals it works with and builds on past knowledge and experience. Heijden (2004) also defined it as a process to explore and create new knowledge, together with the systematic infusion of the knowledge of organization input. It depends on organizational learning theory which explains the models of system learning. The level of learning for an organization is associated with the potentiality with which it can embrace change, innovation, and adaptation (Argyris, 1999). organizational learning and change are inseparable (Boyce, 2003).

The dimensions of organizational learning were defined differently by different researchers. For instance, Marks, Louis, and Printy (2000) identified its dimensions as the structure of school and participative decision-making which are grounded in empowering teachers, shared commitment, collaborative activity, knowledge, skills, leadership, feedback, and accountability. These themes include a school's commitment to and ownership of the transparent, inclusive, and collaborative efforts including the greater use of distributed leadership, taking the initiative rather than always reacting, focusing on the learning needs of all students, and recognizing and acting on the need for all staff to be continuously learning. Kurland and Hertz-Lazarowitz (2006) defined the elements of organizational learning mechanisms as staff involvement, evaluation, in-school professional development, and information management.

The concept of 'learning organization,' on the other hand, is a school reform which recognizes the value of learning as a collective process (Kurland, Peretz, & Hertz-Lazarowitz, 2010). Senge (1990) theoretically defined a learning organization as personal mastery (involved in individual learning), mental models (the theories about how things work in the organization), shared vision (clear communication and passion in an organization), team learning (sharing individual learning among all organizational

members), and systems thinking (thinking of the cause-effect associations in the institutional system). Business organizations started to use the core disciplines of a learning organization with an emphasis on knowledge accumulation and learning attitude (Chang & Lee, 2007). As Senge (1990) identified, members work together with mutual trust and supplementary aids to achieve common goals and reach excellent achievement in the teams of a learning organization.

Watkins and Marsick (1996) stated the dimensions of a learning organization as continuous learning, inquiry and dialogue, team learning, empowerment, embedded system, system connection, and strategic leadership. For this aim, a learning organization endeavors to facilitate the learning of all its members and continually transforms itself (Pedler, Burgoyne, & Boydell, 1991).

One of the barriers to becoming a learning organization is that faculty members in academia prefer working autonomously more and are rewarded mostly for their success and works more than for their organizational efforts and outcomes (Freed, 2001). This culture of higher education institutions may present barriers to organizational learning, and this individualism ends up with a collection of individuals more than an integrated team working for common goals (Holyoke et al., 2012). However, a learning organization requires both individual and collective learning.

Leadership at an Educational Institution

Leadership is another construct that contributes to the stimulation of organizational learning. It is indicated as another key to school improvement besides organizational learning (Kurland et al., 2010). Leadership highly correlates with organizational learning and is a critical factor to affect it. Kurland et al. (2010) found out that the transformational leadership style of the principals predicts it. To Burns (1978), effective leadership requires the leader's ability to make group members more interested in the group compared to themselves. Besides, leaders profoundly affect the organizational culture and organizational operation (the relationship between leadership and learning organization) (Kasper, 2002). Chang and Lee (2007) reported that leadership and organizational culture come with critical relationships to develop learning organizations and encourage employees to use the learning facilities.

Chang and Lee (2007) stated that leadership prevalently exists within people and organizations. It corresponds as well with some other constructs such as facilities and resources, professional development opportunities allocated, and the support available to teachers to improve instruction and enhance students learning (New Teacher Center [NTC], 2013).

In a learning educational institution, teachers are assumed as having informal leadership roles (Silins & Mulford, 2004). They are willing to work for the entire school, but not only for their classrooms or their success. Teachers' perceptions of school administration and its leadership style are indicated as one of the most influencing factors on teacher retention (Boyd et al., 2011). When responsibility in schools such as decision-making is delivered to teachers collaboratively, it is called collective responsibility, which is linked with the notion of leadership (Lambert, 1998). When teachers are empowered

by their principal or the school's administration, they become more positive about their school and a part of collaborative school culture, its organization, how it is run, and participatory decision-making. Teachers' taking of leadership roles promotes organizational learning (Silins & Mulford, 2004). Leadership, together with organizational culture, influences the operation of learning organizations positively and significantly (Chang & Lee, 2007).

Engagement

Engagement is defined as a positive, fulfilling, and work-related state of mind which is a more persistent and pervasive affective cognitive state that is not focused on any particular object, event, individual, or behavior (Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá & Bakker, 2002). Maslach and Leiter (1997) stated that engagement is characterized by energy, involvement, and efficacy. Engagement is associated with vigor (high activation) and dedication (high identification) (Schaufeli et al., 2002). Engaged employees have these feelings with their work activities and see themselves as capable of dealing completely with the demands of their job.

Work engagement which closely associates with burnout, turnout intentions, and leadership in the workplace is given prominent attention in the organizational behavior literature (Silman, 2014). For instance, authentic leadership improved the subordinates' trust in leadership which in turn contributed to their work engagement (Hassan & Ahmed, 2011).

Job Satisfaction

Hoppock (1935) defined job satisfaction as the mental, physical, and environmental satisfaction of an employee. It can make employees achieve organizational goals, take more interest in work, and feel honored to be part of their organization (Davis, 1951). It predicts work engagement considering the competency, relatedness, and autonomy needs of employees (Silman, 2014). It is influenced positively by the operation of learning organizations (Chang & Lee, 2007) and a principal's relationship with school staff (Griffith, 2004). The latter also affects mutual trust and understanding, collaboration, staff job performance, and organizational or school performance (Griffith, 2004).

Purpose of the Study

As the literature review has revealed, the associations among leadership, job satisfaction, engagement, and organizational learning have not been researched in terms of English language teachers/instructors in EFL contexts. Therefore, the present study has aimed to find out such associations of English language instructors in an EFL context through the following questions:

1. Are there any differences between the participants' engagement, job satisfaction, department leadership, teacher leadership, and organizational learning by the participants' demographics?

2. Is there a relationship between the participants' engagement, job satisfaction, department leadership, teacher leadership, and organizational learning?
3. Can engagement, job satisfaction, department leadership, and teacher leadership predict organizational learning?

METHOD

Research Design

A correlational study enables researchers to study possible relationships between different variables (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2000; Johnson & Christensen, 2004) without "trying to influence them" (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2000; p. 359). Therefore, the present study employed this design to investigate the possible relationships between engagement, department leadership, teacher leadership, job satisfaction, and organizational learning without influencing them.

Participants

96 Turkish English language instructors working in a Turkish university participated in the research. The demographics of these participants are given in Table 1.

Table 1:
The Demographics of the Participants

Category	Items	*f*	%
Gender	Female	76	79,2
	Male	20	20,8
Department	Department of modern languages (DML)	31	32,3
	Department of basic English (DBE)	65	67,7
Bachelor's degrees	English language teaching department (ELTD)	39	40,6
	English language and literature department (ELLD)	33	34,4
	English linguistics department (ELD)	5	5,2
	American culture and literature department (ACLD)	14	14,6
	English translation and interpretation department (ETID)	5	5,2
The status of master's of art	Graduated	36	37,5
	On-going	35	36,5
	None	25	26
Teaching experience	1-5	19	19,8
	6-10	36	37,5
	11-15	21	21,9
	16-20	12	12,5
	21 and more	8	8,3

As Table 1 shows, 76 participants were female, and 20 were male. 31 participants worked in the DML, and 65 worked in the DBE. 39 participants graduated from ELTDs, 33 from ELLDs, 14 from ACLDs, five from ELDs, and five from ETIDs. Though 25 participants did not do their MA, 36 had an MA degree, and 35 continued studying in an MA program. 37,5% of them had 6-10-year teaching experience, 21,5% had 11-20-year teaching experience, 19,8% had 1-5-year teaching experience, 12,5% had 16-20-year teaching experience, and 8,3% had 21-year and more than 21-year teaching experience.

Data Collection Tools

The data were collected through four scales:

1. *Engagement Scale:* It was developed and proved to be valid and reliable by Schaufeli et al. (2002). It is a 17-item seven-point Likert-type scale changing from "0: Never" to "7: Always." Its Cronbach's alpha coefficient was 0.928 in this study.
2. *Job Satisfaction Scale*: It was formed and proved to be valid and reliable by Griffith (2004). It is a three-item five-point Likert-type scale ranging from "1: Strongly disagree" to "5: Strongly agree". Its Cronbach's alpha coefficient was 0.895 in this study.
3. *Teaching, Empowering, Leading and Learning (TELL) Survey*: It was developed and found to be valid and reliable by the NTC (2013) to measure the effects of teaching and learning conditions on important outcomes including teacher retention. It is a five-point Likert-type scale changing from "0: Don't know" to "4: Strongly agree" with 71 items and eight sub-scales. In the present study, the school leadership and teacher leadership sub-scales of TELL were used. The first scale has 11 items and measures what teachers think about school leadership. The second scale has 8 items and measures what teachers think about their "involvement in decisions that impact classroom and school practices" (NTC, 2013, p. 2). Their Cronbach's alpha coefficients were 0.935 in the current study.
4. *Organizational Learning Scale*: Silins et al. (2002) developed it to measure what teachers think about organizational learning in their schools. It is a 26-item five-point Likert-type scale ranging from "1: Strongly disagree" to "5: Strongly agree." In this study, its Cronbach's alpha coefficient was 0.969.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed through:

1. independent samples t-test and one-way ANOVA for the first research question
2. Pearson's r correlation for the second research question, and
3. multiple regression analysis for the third research question by using SPSS 20 for MAC.

Before conducting multiple regression analysis, the assumptions for using it were checked. The relationship between independent variables and dependent variable was

checked through scatterplots. The scatterplots for each independent and dependent variable showed that the relationships between them were linear. The test value of the Durbin-Watson test was 1,764, which is close to 2, so the values of the residuals were independent because if it is lower than 1 or higher than 3, it may make multiple regression analysis invalid (Field, 2009). All Cook's distant values were lower than 1, so there were not any influential cases biasing the model suggested in this study as Field (2009) suggested. The plot of standardized residual vs. standardized predicted values did not indicate clear signs of funneling; therefore, the present study has met the assumption of homoscedasticity. To check multicollinearity in the data, the VIF values, tolerance scores, and correlations between variables were calculated. The VIF values of engagement, department leadership, teacher leadership, and job satisfaction were 1,679, 4,699, 3,751, and 2,362 in order, while their tolerance scores were 0,596, 0,213, 0,267, and 0,423 successively. Their VIF values were lower than 10, and their tolerance scores were above 0.2 as reported in Field (2009). Also, the correlation between variables was not higher than 0,90 as Field (2009) mentioned. Therefore, there was not any multicollinearity in the data in the present study. The p-p plot of the model in the present study indicated that the values of the residuals were normally distributed, so it met the assumption of the normality of the residuals.

FINDINGS

Table 2 shows that there are no statistically significant differences between male and female instructors in terms of five variables (engagement, department leadership, teacher leadership, job satisfaction, and organizational learning) (p>.05)

Table 2:
The Independent Samples T-Test Results of the Participants in Terms of Gender

Category	Group	*N*	$\bar{x}$	*Sd*	*t*	*df*	*p*
Engagement	Female	76	4,3111	,90437	-1,048	94	,297
	Male	20	4,5441	,80313			
Department leadership	Female	76	2,6304	,78685	-,167	94	,868
	Male	20	2,6636	,81103			
Teacher leadership	Female	76	2,4145	,89982	-,722	94	,472
	Male	20	2,5813	,99280			
Job satisfaction	Female	76	3,8465	,85625	-1,205	94	,231
	Male	20	4,1	,75781			
Organizational learning	Female	76	3,4529	,72807	-,504	94	,616
	Male	20	3,5462	,76828			

Table 3 indicates that no statistically significant differences were found between the participants depending on five variables in terms of their departments (p>.05).

Table 3:

The Independent Samples T-Test Results of the Participants in Terms of the Departments

Category	Group	*N*	$\bar{x}$	*Sd*	*t*	*df*	*p*
Engagement	DML	31	4,5674	,68221	1,799	79,741	,076
	DBE	65	4,2606	,95622			
Department leadership	DML	31	2,8358	,81088	1,722	94	,088
	DBE	65	2,5427	,76466			
Teacher leadership	DML	31	2,5403	1,01314	,67	94	,504
	DBE	65	2,4058	,76466			
Job satisfaction	DML	31	3,9247	,91777	,204	94	,839
	DBE	65	3,8872	,80639			
Organizational learning	DML	31	3,5434	,81078	,654	94	,515
	DBE	65	3,4385	,69772			

As Table 4 indicates, there are not any statistically significant differences between the participants depending on five variables in terms of their Bachelor's degrees (p>.05).

Table 4:

One-Way ANOVA Test Results of the Participants in Terms of Their Bachelor's Degrees

Category	Source	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*p*
Engagement	Between groups	4,68	4	1,17	1,526	,201
	Within groups	69,776	91	,767		
	Total	74,456	95			
Department leadership	Between groups	4,861	4	1,215	2,045	,095
	Within groups	54,089	91	,594		
	Total	58,95	95			
Teacher leadership	Between groups	2,348	4	,587	,689	,601
	Within groups	77,545	91	,852		
	Total	79,893	95			
Job satisfaction	Between groups	1,179	4	,295	,408	,802
	Within groups	65,736	91	,722		
	Total	66,916	95			
Organizational learning	Between groups	2,634	4	,659	1,236	,301
	Within groups	48,474	91	,533		
	Total	51,109	95			

As understood from Table 5, whether the participants were doing MA, had an MA degree, and did not have an MA degree did not create any statistically significant differences between the participants depending on five variables in terms of their bachelor degrees (p>.05).

Table 5:
One-Way ANOVA Test Results of the Participants in Terms of Their Status of MA

Category	Source	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*p*
Engagement	Between groups	3,194	2	1,597	2,084	,130
	Within groups	71,262	93	,766		
	Total	74,456	95			
Department leadership	Between groups	1,638	2	,819	1,329	,27
	Within groups	57,313	93	,616		
	Total	58,95	95			
Teacher leadership	Between groups	2,018	2	1,009	1,205	,304
	Within groups	77,875	93	,837		
	Total	79,893	95			
Job satisfaction	Between groups	1,039	2	,520	,734	,483
	Within groups	65,876	93	,708		
	Total	66,916	95			
Organizational learning	Between groups	1,414	2	,707	1,323	,271
	Within groups	49,694	93	,534		
	Total	51,109	95			

According to Table 6, teaching experience created statistically significant differences between the participants in teacher leadership and organizational learning ($p<.05$), while it did not lead to any statistically significant differences between them in engagement, department leadership, and job satisfaction ($p>.05$).

Table 6:
One-Way ANOVA Test Results of the Participants in Terms of Their Teaching Experiences

Category	Source	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*p*
Engagement	Between groups	4,992	4	1,248	1,635	,172
	Within groups	69,464	91	,763		
	Total	74,456	95			
Department leadership	Between groups	5,79	4	1,448	2,478	,05
	Within groups	53,16	91	,584		
	Total	58,95	95			
Teacher leadership	Between groups	8,473	4	2,118	2,699	,035*
	Within groups	71,420	91	,785		
	Total	79,893	95			
Job satisfaction	Between groups	2,886	4	,722	1,026	,398
	Within groups	64,029	91	,704		
	Total	66,916	95			
Organizational learning	Between groups	6,602	4	1,651	3,375	,013*
	Within groups	44,506	91	,489		
	Total	51,109	95			

* The difference is significant at the level of 0.05.

To understand the source of the statistically significant differences, Tukey HSD post-hoc tests were conducted. The analyses of Tukey HSD post-hoc tests are presented in Tables 7 and 8.

Table 7:
Tukey HSD Post-Hoc Test Results of the Participants Depending on Teacher Leadership in Terms of Their Teaching Experiences

Dependent variable	*Teaching experience (I)*	*Teaching experience (J)*	*MD*	*SE*	*p*
Teacher leadership	1-5	6-10	,72716*	,25121	,037
		11-15	,75345	,2805	,064
		16-20	,2966	,32666	,893
		21-25	,59868	,37338	,499
	6-10	1-5	-72716*	,25121	,037
		11-15	,02629	,24326	1
		16-20	-,43056	,29530	,592
		21-25	-,12847	,34627	,996
	11-15	1-5	-,75345	,2805	,064
		6-10	-,02629	,24326	1
		16-20	-,45865	,32059	,613
		21-25	-,15476	,36807	,993
	16-20	1-5	-,2966	,32666	,893
		6-10	,43056	,29530	,592
		11-15	,45865	,32059	,613
		21-25	,30208	,40436	,945
	21-25	1-5	-,59868	,37338	,499
		6-10	,12847	,34627	,996
		11-15	,45865	,32059	,613
		16-20	-,30208	,40436	,945

* The difference is significant at the level of 0.05.

Table 7 indicates that there is a statistically significant difference between the participants who have 1-5-year teaching experience and the ones having 6-10-year teaching experience ($p<.05$).

According to Table 8, a statistically significant difference was found between the participants with 6-10-year teaching experience and the ones with 16-20-year teaching experience ($p<.05$).

Table 8:
Tukey HSD Post-Hoc Test Results of the Participants Depending on Organizational Learning in Terms of Their Teaching Experiences

Dependent variable	*Teaching experience (I)*	*Teaching experience (J)*	*MD*	*SE*	*p*
Organizational learning	1-5	6-10	,50798	,19831	,086
		11-15	,43137	,22143	,3
		16-20	-,16616	,25787	,967
		21-25	,51493	,29475	,411
	6-10	1-5	-,50798	,19831	,086
		11-15	-,07662	,19203	,995
		16-20	-,67415*	,23311	,038
		21-25	,00694	,27335	1
	11-15	1-5	-,43137	,22143	,3
		6-10	,07662	,19203	,995
		16-20	-,59753	,25307	,136
		21-25	,08356	,29056	,998
	16-20	1-5	,16616	,25787	,967
		6-10	,67415*	,23311	,038
		11-15	,59753	,25307	,136
		21-25	,68109	,31921	,215
	21-25	1-5	-,51493	,29475	,411
		6-10	-,00694	,27335	1
		11-15	-,08356	,29056	,998
		16-20	-,68109	,31921	,215

* The difference is significant at the level of 0.05.

As Table 9 demonstrates, there are statistically significant relationships among the five variables (p<.001). Engagement is moderately correlated with department leadership, teacher leadership, and organizational learning in a positive way (*r*=0.523, 0.403, and 0.511 successively), while its correlation with job satisfaction is highly positive (*r*=0.614). Department leadership is highly positively correlated with teacher leadership, job satisfaction, and organizational learning (*r*=0.853, 0.698, and 0.844 respectively). Similarly, there are highly positive correlations between teacher leadership and job satisfaction and between teacher leadership and organizational learning (*r*=0.612 and 0.759 successively). Likewise, the correlation between job satisfaction and organizational learning is highly positive (*r*=0.716).

Table 9:
Pearson's R Correlation Coefficients among Five Variables

	1	2	3	4	5
Engagement	--				
Department leadership	,523**	--			
Teacher leadership	,403**	,853**	--		
Job satisfaction	,614**	,698**	,612**	--	
Organizational learning	,511**	,844**	,759**	,716**	--

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

According to Table 10, department leadership and job satisfaction can predict organizational learning ($F(4,91)=67.652$, $p<0.01$, $R=.865$, $R^2=.748$, $R^2_{adj}=.737$). Department leadership ($ß=.556$, $t=4.877$, $p<0.01$) and job satisfaction ($ß=.23$, $t=2.849$, $p<0.05$) predict organizational learning positively. Department leadership and job satisfaction can explain the 74% of the variance in organizational learning.

Table 10:
Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for the Variables Predicting Organizational Learning

Variables	*B*	*SE*	*ß*	*t*	*p*
(Constant)	,969	,21			
Engagement	,021	,056	,025	,373	,71
Department leadership	,518	,106	,556	4,877	,00**
Teacher leadership	,107	,081	,133	1,31	,193
Job satisfaction	,201	,071	,23	2,849	,005*

a. Dependent variable: Organizational learning. *p<0.05, **p<0.01

DISCUSSION

The findings of the study were discussed according to the research questions in order.

Differences between the Participants in Terms of Five Variables by Their Demographics

According to the study, there is not a statistically significant difference between female and male participants in terms of five variables, which can result from the number of female/male participants and the effect of the organizational culture of the research context on them. In Turkey, English language teaching is dominated by female teachers/instructors, so naturally, there are more female participants than male participants in this study. The averages of the female and male participants for each variable are very close to each other because the organizational culture of the research context may affect them to similar extents. The research context provides them with clear information about what they are expected to do, so this awareness can shape their attitudes toward their job and school in similar ways.

There are two departments in the research context: DML and DBE. Though both departments have different functions, their organizational patterns and expectations from the participants are the same. Both departments are led by one chair and two vice-chairs under the coordination of the school of foreign languages. In both departments, the participants follow and teach the syllabi, join professional development activities, and do the necessary assessment. Only the contents of the courses change in both departments. Therefore, such a similarity can influence the participants' attitudes toward their jobs, department leadership, and organizational learning similarly, which did not create a statistically significant difference between the participants in this aspect.

Graduating from five departments is a requirement to work as an English language teacher/instructor in Turkey. The participants graduated from one of these departments, but having different Bachelor's degrees did not create a statistically significant difference, which may be because the research context is a private institution, so renewing the

contract may encourage the participants to prioritize personal development and organizational culture more. To work effectively and efficiently, an employee should be engaged and satisfied in his/her job. This relates to the employee's state of mind (Hoppock, 1935; Schaufeli et al., 2002), which can be under the influence of several factors including organizational culture. Leadership can also affect an employee's efficient and effective work in a private institution because it can impact the employees' attitudes toward their job and organization (Chang & Lee, 2007; Kasper, 2002; Kurland et al., 2010). Consequently, working effectively and efficiently in the private sector can help the participants form similar attitudes toward their job and school, so having graduated from different departments did not become very effective in this process. Similarly, the master status of the participants did not create a statistically significant difference in terms of five variables. It may be because of the reasons mentioned in this paragraph.

Teaching experience created a statistically significant difference between the participants with 1-5-year teaching experience and the ones with 6-10-year teaching experience. The participants with less teaching experience may consider themselves as not effective leaders like the ones with 6-10-year teaching experience because they may think that they need to improve themselves more to participate in the decision-making process to solve problems and be considered as educational experts who can make sound decisions about their instruction, which according to NTC (2013), teachers with effective teacher leadership do. Besides, teaching experience created another statistically significant difference between the ones with 6-10-year teaching experience and the ones with 16-20-year of teaching experience. The participants with less experience may be more open to learning collaboratively and continuously while working (Silins et al., 2002) than the ones with more experience because the ones with more experience may form their way of teaching which may affect their attitudes toward organizational learning. They may use their way as a determiner to decide what may and may not work in an organization in case of different situations because they may believe that they experienced them before, so they know what may and may not work. However, organizational learning requires learning collaboratively and continuously (Silins et al., 2002), so it encourages employees for growth and success (Silins & Mulford, 2004). Yet, experience may hinder it. Being more experienced may also impact team working and learning (Serge, 1990; Watkins & Marsick, 1996) because teachers with more experience may help the ones with less experience, but the ones with less experience may not accept their help.

Relationships between Engagement, Job Satisfaction, Department Leadership, Teacher Leadership, and Organizational Learning

The research context has a centralized organizational structure which consists of two departments. This organizational structure is run by a general director with two vice directors. There are collaboration and cooperation between it and its departments. While each department makes their department-related decisions about their language teaching programs in collaboration with each other under the supervision of the administration of the school, other issues such as professional development are determined by the

administration of the school in collaboration with the departments. Therefore, the school and department administration is very effective in the research context. The administration promotes instructors' professional development and participation in the decision-making process related to language teaching. Such an attitude may increase the participants' job satisfaction and support their leadership in teacher leadership-related issues NTC (2013) mentioned. This may be the reason for the finding that department leadership was highly correlated with organizational learning as supported by the literature (Chang & Lee, 2007; Griffith, 2003; Kasper, 2002), with teacher leadership as mentioned by Lambert (1998), and job satisfaction as stated by Griffith (2004) in this study. Besides, job satisfaction was found to be highly correlated with organizational learning in the study. According to Davis (1951), job satisfaction enhances employees' goal achievement and makes them more interested in their job, so they feel themselves parts of the organization. Likewise, the participants were very satisfied with their jobs in this study, so this may help them feel a part of the organization, which may result in their positive attitudes toward and participation in organizational learning.

According to NTC (2013), teachers can be considered as effective leaders and educational experts in an organization so that they can take part in decision-making processes to solve instructional problems effectively and to improve instruction, which can increase teachers' job satisfaction (Chang & Lee, 2009; Davis, 1951; Griffith, 2003). Therefore, they can participate in organizational learning more (Chang & Lee, 2009; Davis, 1951; Griffith, 2003). Similarly, having a central but supportive administration can help the participants to consider themselves as effective leaders who can join in making decisions related to instruction and instructional problems, so this can make them more satisfied in their jobs. Considering themselves as effective leaders can increase their willingness to work for the school as Silins and Mulford (2004) stated, which can promote organizational learning in the research context because Lambert (1998) emphasized that empowering teachers results in promoting organizational learning. These reasons can explain why highly positive correlations were found between teacher leadership and job satisfaction and between teacher leadership and organizational learning.

Besides, the participants in this study were satisfied with their jobs. They were engaged in their work because they may have a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind which does not concentrate on any particular object, event, individual, or behavior as Schaufeli et al. (2002). This positive state of mind can provide them with energy, involvement, and efficacy which engagement includes and promotes (Maslach & Leiter, 1997), so such a positive state of mind among the participants can contribute to their mental, physical, and environmental satisfaction at work as Hoppock (1935) emphasized. This relation may create a highly positive correlation between engagement and job satisfaction in this study.

Predictors of Organizational Learning

According to the study, department leadership and job satisfaction predict organizational learning in this research context. Department leadership has a significant place in the school in the study. In addition to the centralized organizational structure of the school,

the administration makes decisions about instruction, professional development, and curriculum. Teacher autonomy in their classes is supported and promoted by the school and departments, but the participants can participate in the decision-making process related to instruction under the supervision of the administration. Therefore, department leadership is prioritized more than teacher leadership in the school. In addition, the participants in both departments are supposed to work as a team to achieve the goals set by the departments because there are centralized syllabi that they have to follow in their classes for the assessment and evaluation of the students and courses and for their instruction. Therefore, the participants' leaderships as teachers are somehow limited, which can avoid the issues resulting from individualism in academia (Freed, 2001; Holyoke et al., 2012). Thus, as Burns (1978) suggested, department leadership can make the participants interested more in the group compared to themselves, so they are encouraged to use learning facilities more in line with what Chang and Lee (2007) stated. Besides, job satisfaction has an important place in the participants' participation in organizational learning because job satisfaction is related to leadership which increases the participants' goal achievement, mutual trust and understanding between them, and their job performance (Davis, 1951; Griffith, 2003).

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION FOR FURTHER STUDIES

Like any higher education institution, organizational learning is significant for any school of foreign languages where students are taught any foreign language including English for general, academic and occupational purposes. To promote organizational learning among English language instructors, the study has indicated that the administration of the school and departments, if any, has a central role because as the study has shown, the administration of the school and departments plays key roles in creating a working environment in which instructors are valued and their leadership is promoted. Therefore, instructors can get more engaged in their jobs and feel satisfied in their workplaces. Consequently, a higher education language institution similar to the one in the study can be made a learning organization by the administration and teachers/instructors working there as the study has mentioned.

This study has limitations because of its research context and quantitative nature. Future studies can be made in other higher education language institutions by following the same methodology. Also, qualitative or mixed-methods research can be used as methodologies in such studies. The findings of such studies can be compared with the findings of this study and each other so that a more general understanding of the nature of organizational learning in higher education language institutions can be obtained.

REFERENCES

Argyris. C. (1999). *On organizational learning* (2nd ed.). Blackwell.

Boyce. M. E. (2003). Organizational learning is essential to achieving and sustaining change in higher education. *Innovative Higher Education, 28*(2), 119-136.

Boyd. D., Grossman. P., Ing, M., Lankford, H., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2011). The influence of school administrators on teacher retention decisions. *American Educational Research Journal, 48*(2), 303-333.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. Harper and Row.

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.

Coppieters, P. (2005). Turning schools into learning organizations. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 28*(2), 129-139.

Davis, R. C. (1951). *The fundamentals of top management*. Harper and Row.

Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (3rd Edition). Sage Publications Ltd.

Fraenkel, R. J., & Wallen, E. N. (2000). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (4th ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Freed, J. E. (2001). Why become a learning organization? *About Campus, 5*(6), 16–21.

Griffith, J. (2004). Relation of principal transformational leadership to school staff job satisfaction, staff turnover, and school performance. *Journal of Educational Administration, 42*(3), 333-356.

Hassan, A., & Ahmed, F. (2011). Authentic leadership, trust and work engagement. *International Journal of Human and Social Sciences, 6*(3), 164-170.

Heijden, K. (2004). Can internally generated futures accelerate organizational learning? *Futures, 36*(2), 145-59.

Holyoke, L. B., Sturko, P. A., Wood, N. B., & Wu, L. J. (2012). Are academic departments perceived as learning organizations? *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 40*(4), 436-448.

Hoppock, R. (1935). *Job satisfaction*. Harper and Row.

Johnson, R. B., & Christensen, L. B. (2004). *Educational Research: Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Approaches*. Allyn and Bacon.

Kasper, H. (2002). Culture and leadership in market-oriented service organizations. *European Journal of Marketing, 36*(9), 1047-57.

Kurland, H. & Hertz-Lazarowitz, R. (2006). Organizational learning as a lever for realizing an educational vision. *Dapim, 41*, 230-71.

Kurland, H., Peretz, H., & Hertz-Lazarowitz, R. (2010). Leadership style and organizational learning: the mediate effect of school vision. *Journal of Educational Administration, 48*(1), 7-30.

Lambert, L. (1998). *How to build leadership capacity. Educational leadership*. ASCD.

Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (1997) *The truth about burnout*. Jossey Bass.

Marks, H., Louis, K. S., & Printy, S. (2000). The capacity for organizational learning: Implications for pedagogical quality and student achievement. In K. Leithwood (ed.), *Understanding schools as intelligent systems* (pp. 239-266). JAI.

New Teacher Center, (2013). *TELL (teaching, empowering, leading, and learning) Kentucky survey*: *Validity and reliability report*. Retrieved from https://tellkentucky.org/uploads/File/KY13_val_rel.pdf

Pedler, M., Burgoyne, J., & Boydell, T. (1991). *The learning company: A strategy for sustainable development*. McGraw-Hill.

Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *3*(1), 71-92.

Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. Random House.

Silins, H. & Mulford, B. (2004). Schools as learning organisations - Effects on teacher leadership and student outcomes. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, *15*(3-4), 443-466.

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

Silman, F. (2014). Work-related basic need satisfaction as a predictor of work engagement among academic staff in Turkey. *South African Journal of Education*, *34*(3), 1-5.

Watkins, K. E., & Marsick, V. J. (1996). *In action: Creating the learning organization*. American Society for Training and Development.