

## Examining the Relationship between Leadership Styles of School Principals, Organizational Silence and Organizational Learning\*

Esra KARABAĞ KÖSE<sup>1</sup> and Nezahat GÜÇLÜ<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, Kırıkkale University, Turkey.

<sup>2</sup>Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, Gazi University, Turkey.

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article History:

Received 06.05.2016

Received in revised form

06.01.2017

Accepted 29.01.2017

Available online

09.02.2017

### ABSTRACT

This study examines the impact of leadership styles and organizational silence on the organizational learning according to the views of teachers. Using the associational research model, the study included totally 591 teachers employed in primary schools. In the study, "Multi-Factor Leadership Scale", "Scale for Employee Silence" and "Scale for the Dimensions of Learning Organizations" were used as measurement instruments. As well as descriptive analyses, correlation analysis and a stepwise multiple regression analysis were used in analyzing the data. As a result of the study; it was observed that there were positively or negatively significant relationships between the variables of transformational leadership, transactional leadership, organizational silence and organizational learning. The results of the regression analysis show that the leadership styles and organizational silence are both significant predictors of organizational learning.

© 2017 IOJES. All rights reserved

Keywords:

Leadership styles, organizational silence, organizational learning.

### Introduction

The concept of learning organization is among the concepts being intensely discussed in the public administration and educational administration within the context of sustaining the organizational change with inter-organizational processes. It is assumed that effective learning organizations have the capacity to notice the change required by the intensive competition processes on time and reorganize the purpose, structure and functioning of organizations. Recent studies like EQF, ISCED and PISA that have become widespread especially as from the 2000s take educational systems and schools in an intensive global competition. These applications enable countries to compare their own educational systems at the international level and help educational reforms accordingly. In addition to this, it is difficult to say that the changes being predicted in the context of macro policies especially in Turkey are corresponded at the school level as desired. In this context, it could be asserted that the concept of organizational learning or learning organization has an increased importance in terms of enabling all school organizations to create their own change capacities instead of dictating the change into the school organization from the outside. The concepts of learning organization and organizational learning are used in many studies due to their association especially with leadership (Dibbon, 1999; Decuyper, Dochy and Bossche, 2010; Gorman, 2004; Korkmaz, 2008; Kurland, Hilla Peretz and Lazarowitz, 2010; Psychos, 2012; Zagoršek, Dimovski and Škerlavaj, 2009), organizational commitment (Akpinar, 2007; Avcı and Küçükusta, 2009; Balay, 2012; Erdem and Uçar, 2013; Turan, Karadağ and Bektaş, 2011) organizational silence (Blackman and Sadler-Smith, 2009; Morrison and Milliken, 2000), organizational culture (Aydın, 2009; Jashapara, 2003), and organizational change (Lawson

\*This study partially reflects findings of a PhD thesis prepared by Esra KARABAĞ KÖSE.

<sup>1</sup> Corresponding author's address: Kırıkkale University, Faculty of Education, Yahşihan, Kırıkkale, Türkiye

Telephone: +90 (318) 357 24 86

e-mail: esrakarabag@gmail.com

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15345/iojes.2017.01.019>

and Ventriss, 1992). This study examines the relation of leadership at schools with organizational silence and organizational learning.

Organizations have to learn in order to develop their ability of orientation and survive (Garvin, 1993; Senge 2006). According to Pfeffer (1999), the necessity for developing new approaches, new skills and new relations due to the change of conditions and problems subjects the organizations to the concept of learning. By means of learning, the organizations adapt to changes, avoid repeating their mistakes, store and develop the required information (Senge 2006). Organizational learning is the most distinct feature of learning organizations. Learning organizations give learning prominence, aspire to the development of individuals within the institution, perpetuate the communication and exchange ideas for the constant development (Koçel, 2003; Özden, 2005) and have a consciousness in terms of producing and sharing the knowledge (Garvin, 1993). Senge (2006), on the other hand, emphasizes the importance of sharing the organizational vision and learning together in learning organizations. Learning organizations are originated from the idea of organizational learning. The concept of learning organization is used for organizations that develop processes deliberately for producing, using and sharing the knowledge (Hernandez, 2000). Organizational learning is a process where individuals in the organization develop their skills of communication and problem solving (Steiner, 1998) by extending the potential learning area in the organization (Huber, 1991).

The studies being conducted (Antonova and Gourova, 2006; Marsick and Watkins, 1993; Steiner, 1998) emphasize the importance of a strong inter-organizational communication and sharing in terms of the process of organizational learning. Thus, one of the variables that might be related to organizational learning is organizational silence. Organizational silence is defined as a concept causing the employees to keep silent regarding the organization and thus, decreasing their participation in the organizational processes (Morrison and Milliken, 2000). Being approached as a concept expressing the reluctance of institution employees to contribute in organizational subjects (Dyne, Ang ve Botero, 2003; Morrison and Milliken; 2000; Pinder and Harlos, 2001), the organizational silence disables the employees to contribute to their organizations as they think that it might pose a risk for them or have no effect at all (Bowen and Blackmon, 2003). It is emphasized that the organizational silence increases mainly due to the attitudes of administrators and the organizational communication opportunities (Mayhew, Grunwald and Dey, 2006). On the other hand, in order to increase the organizational learning level, it is required to efficiently involve all employees in organizational processes with a strong communication and interaction (Koçel, 2003; Senge, 2006). In this context, the relationship between the organizational learning and organizational silence is considered important. It is believed that the phenomenon of silence in which employees deliberately avoid their constructive ideas, suggestions, feelings and thoughts concerning their organization might hinder the inter-organizational communication and interaction that is very important in terms of organizational learning processes, as is mentioned above. Thus, it is considered very important for administrators to form an organizational climate where employees could easily express their feelings and thoughts. Considering the fact that the countries like Turkey have a higher power distance and culturally attach a great importance to authority (Hofstede, 1991; Wasti, 1995), it could be asserted that the phenomenon of organizational silence will be even more important within the context of organizational learning. Examining the relevant literature; there are studies examining the relation of the concept of organizational silence with different concepts like commitment (Eroğlu, Adıgüzel and Öztürk, 2011), performance (Zehir and Erdoğan, 2011) and justice (Taşkiran, 2010). In addition to this, according to Dyne, Ang and Botero (2003), even though the employees silence has a great effect in organizations, the number of studies on organizational silence is insufficient.

One of the key determining factors for the organizational silence and organizational learning in the organizational processes is leadership styles (Bogosian, 2012; Kurt, 2016; Özdemir, Karadağ ve Kılınc, 2013). Studies regarding the leadership styles are observed to focus on transformational and transactional leadership classifications. The concept of transformational and transactional leadership has been initially used by the political scientist Burns (1978). According to Burns and Bass, while the leadership aimed at future, innovation, change and reform is a transformational leadership, the leadership that is committed to traditions and past is a transactional leadership (Cited in: Owen, Hodgson and Gazzard, 2007). Transformational leadership involves the lower dimensions of idealized effect, motivation by inspiration, intellectual stimulation and personal support (Bass and Avalio, 1990). Idealized effect involves behaviors of leaders to prioritize the benefits of the organization over their own benefits, determine a vision and a mission

with employees (Karip, 1998). Intellectual stimulation signifies being careful in problem solving, developing the intelligence and having a rationalism (Çelik, 2003). Motivation by inspiration involves behaviors of leaders to create a strong sense of common purpose in employees by using various elements (Karip, 1998). Finally, the personal support is the process of providing support for the audience to increase their knowledge, skills and experiences (Erçetin, 2000). Transactional leadership is based on mutual interaction and the expectations of the audience to be rewarded or not punished (Owen et al., 2007). Transactional leadership involves the lower dimensions of conditional reward, administration with exceptions and making no intervention (Bass and Avolio, 1990). In the dimension of conditional reward, leaders motivate the employees with a reward to reach their goals (Karip, 1998). In the dimension of administration with exceptions, leaders make their presence felt when things go wrong in the organization or the determined standards cannot be met. Administration with exceptions consists of two dimensions as active and passive (Celep, 2004). In administration with active exceptions, leaders apply the rules to prevent mistakes (Korkmaz, 2007). In administration with passive exceptions, on the other hand, leaders apply the principle of “do not repair-touch unless it breaks down” by making no intervention before the problems become serious and a mistake is made (Hernandez, 2000; Huber, 1991; Karip, 1998).

Özden (2005) emphasizes the necessity of paving the way for personal learning in order to enable the organizations to learn. According to Özen-Kutaniş (2002), on the other hand, it is required to conduct some activities like the reinforcement of employees, process renewal and reengineering for learning organizations to be successful and efficient. In this context, a strong leadership effect could be asserted to be an important variable for the process of organizational learning. Attracting attention to the functions of leaders in the learning organization, Özden (2005) emphasizes the necessity for leaders to enable the employees to explicitly express their feelings and thoughts and learn in all ways. Examining the literature, there are studies suggesting that the leadership styles could determine the organizational silence (Bogosian, 2012; Detert and Burris, 2007; Mayhew et al., 2006) and organizational learning (Korkmaz, 2008; Kurland, Hilla Peretz and Lazarowitz, 2010; Psychos, 2012; Zagoršek et al., 2009).

This study seeks an answer to the basic problem regarding the hypothesis that the leaders directing their audience by forming a common vision with behaviors like idealized effect, motivation by inspiration, intellectual stimulation and personal support (Bass, 1990; Bass and Avolio, 1995) could maximize the organizational learning by decreasing the organizational silence (Huang, Van de Vliert and Van der Vegt, 2005). Within the context of organizational learning, examining the relationship between the leadership and organizational silence should be considered important in order to determine the strategies to be used in realizing new administrative mentalities in institutional structures. Being considered among the 7 primary conditions of organizational learning, the elements like communication and vision sharing (Senge, 2006) highlight the necessity for a strong environment of participants and sharers within the organization. In this context, it would be effective to have an approach of leadership that would enable all employees to participate in institutional processes with a polyphonic, participatory and democratic administrative mentality. The conceptual framework that poses the problem status of the study and is summarized above indicates that organizational silence and leadership styles could significantly predict the organizational learning. Being structured on these theoretical bases, this study aims to explore the impact of leadership styles and organizational silence on the organizational learning according to the views of teachers working at primary schools. Accordingly, the study seeks an answer to the following sub problems:

1. What are the leadership styles of school principals, organizational silence and organizational learning levels of school principals according to the views of teachers working at primary schools?
2. Are there significant relations between the leadership styles of school principals, organizational silence levels and organizational learning perceptions of teachers according to the views of teachers working at primary schools?
3. Do the leadership styles of school principals and organizational silence levels significantly predict the organizational learning according to the views of teachers working at primary schools?

## Methodology

As this study was conducted in an attempt to examine the relationship between the leadership styles, organizational silence and organizational learning, associational research model was used in the study. The target population of the study consisted of teachers working at primary schools of the Ministry of National Education in the province and district centers of Çankırı in 2012-2013 school year. As the schools and institutions had a large geographical distribution, it is studied on the entire population in the study instead of sampling in order to decrease the risk for the feedback number to be low and the population of the research was accepted as the population of the study. Accordingly, 1.171 teachers working at 121 primary schools in Çankırı comprised the study population.

Within the scope of the study, only 805 teachers can be reached and accepted to participate to the research. Among 591 questionnaires that were returned, 565 of them that were filled in accordance with the instruction were subjected to a statistical analysis. According to Büyüköztürk (2005), minimum feedback rates of the survey should be above 70%.

Examining the demographic structure of the sample group, it is observed that 59% of teachers that participated in the study are female, 41% male, 90% had received undergraduate, 6% associate and 3% postgraduate education, 49% are branch teachers, 44% classroom teachers and 7% preschool education teachers, 39% have a seniority of 1-5 years, 24% 6-10 years, 13% 11-15 years, 11% 16-20 years and 13% 21 years and above. Examining the demographic data, it is observed that an important part of teachers have just started their profession and have bachelor's degree, and the rate of receiving postgraduate education is very low.

### Instruments

Obtaining the required permissions, three measurement instruments were used in the study, which were; the Scale for the Dimensions of Learning Organizations, Scale for Employees Silence and the Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire.

**Scale for the dimensions of learning organizations.** It was used the "Scale for the Dimensions of Learning Organizations" that was developed by Marsick and Watkins (1997) in an attempt to determine the organizational learning as a five point Likert scale with 21 items. Firstly, the scale was adapted into Turkish and educational institutions. For the validity and reliability study of the scale, a preliminary application with the participation of 325 teachers working at 15 schools selected with the simple random sampling method was performed. An exploratory factor analysis was carried out in an attempt to determine the factor structure of the scale. As a result of the Kaiser-Meyer Olkin (KMO) test that was performed to test the convenience of the data structure for the factor analysis, the KMO value was determined as .96. Besides, the results of the Bartlett globosity test were determined to be significant. As a result of the factor analysis, the scale was observed to have a single factorial structure. While the variance being explained by the single factor was determined as 59.51%, the latent value was determined as 12.496. Within the scope of the reliability studies of the scale; the internal consistency coefficient was calculated as .97, whereas the total correlation coefficients of items were determined between .68 and .82. These values were considered a proof for the reliability of the scale. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was performed to see whether or not the data replicated the model. When it is examined the fit indices calculated with CFA ( $\chi^2/sd= 2,744$ ; GFI = .86; RMSEA = .07; CFI=.94; AGFI=.82; NFI= .91) it is seen that model data fitting is well when evaluated with the other indices even if GFI value is close the limit value (Çokluk, Şekercioğlu and Büyüköztürk, 2012).

**Scale for employees silence.** The "Scale for Employees Silence" was used, developed by Erenler (2010) to determine the level of organizational silence in a way to involve single dimensions one of which was reverse-coded and 12 items as a five point Likert scale. After adapting the Scale for Employees Silence into the educational field, a preliminary application for its validity and reliability was performed. The preliminary application of the Scale for Employees Silence was realized with the participation of 325 teachers working at 15 schools that were selected via the simple random sampling method. Exploratory factor analysis was performed to determine the factor structure of the scale. As a result of the Kaiser-Meyer Olkin (KMO) test that was performed to test the convenience of the data structure for the factor analysis, the KMO value was determined as .94. According to this finding, it could be asserted that the data structure is

“excellently” convenient for factor analysis (Şencan, 2005). Besides, as the results of the Bartlett globosity test were significant, it was accepted that the data were originated from a multivariate normal distribution. As a result of the analysis that was performed to determine the factor structure of the scale, it was observed that 12 items in the scale gathered under the single factor whose latent value was 6.669; the latent value of other factors was lower than 1 and their contribution to the total variance was both low and close to each other. This factor explains 55.57% of the total variance regarding the scale. According to Büyüköztürk (2003), the variance being explained by single factor is expected to be above 30% for the single factorial structure. Internal consistency coefficients and the total correlation coefficients of items were calculated for the reliability analysis of the scale. It was observed that the internal consistency coefficient regarding the scale was .92 and the corrected total correlation coefficients of items varied between .47 and .80. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was performed to see whether or not the data replicated the model. When it is examined the fit indices calculated with CFA ( $\chi^2/df=2,942$ ; GFI = .92; RMSEA = .07; CFI=.95; AGFI=.89; NFI=.93) it is seen that model data fitting is well (Çokluk et al., 2012).

**Multi-factor leadership questionnaire (MFLQ).** Being developed by Bass and Avolio (1995), the scale involves 36 items aiming to determine the transformational and transactional leadership styles of administrators. In order to test the validity and reliability of the scale that is used by a number of researchers in the educational field in Turkey (Cemaloğlu, 2007a, 2007b, 2007c; Karip, 1998; Korkmaz, 2005, 2007, 2008; Kurt, 2009; Okçu, 2011) In this study, MFLQ adapted into Turkish by Kurt (2009) was used. At the end of analyses conducted by Kurt (2009), this 5-Likert type scale had two sub-dimensions namely transformational leadership ( $\alpha=.95$ ) and transactional leadership ( $\alpha=.72$ ). Total variance that was explained by the two dimensions was 46.9%.

Within the scope of this research, the internal consistency coefficient and total correlation coefficients of items were calculated for the reliability analysis of the questionnaire. The internal consistency coefficient being calculated for the entire scale was .86. It was determined that the internal consistency coefficient was .95 for the first factor of the scale and the corrected total correlation coefficients of items varied between .41 and .79. On the other hand, the internal consistency coefficient was determined as .71 for the second factor and the corrected total correlation coefficients of items varied between .24 and .49. A reliability coefficient of .70 and above is generally considered sufficient for the reliability of the test (Büyüköztürk, 2003).

## Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using the descriptive statistics, correlation and multiple regression analyses and the analyses were performed using the SPSS 15 package software. Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient ( $r$ ) was calculated to determine the relations between the variables. Besides, Multiple Linear Regression Analysis was performed to determine the predicting levels of predictor variables. The regression analyses were interpreted using the standardized Beta ( $\beta$ ) coefficients and evaluating the results of the t-test concerning their significance.

## Results

Table 1 shows the views of teachers regarding leadership styles, organizational learning and organizational silence.

**Table 1.** The views of teachers regarding the study variables.

Variables	N	$\bar{X}$	S
1. Transformational Leadership	526	4.03	.67
2. Transactional Leadership	526	2.40	.58
3. Organizational Silence	526	1.82	.76
4. Organizational Learning	526	3.91	.70

As can be seen from Table 1, it is observed that school principals realize their transformational leadership behaviors ( $\bar{X}=4.03$ ) at a higher rate than the transactional leadership behaviors ( $\bar{X}=2.40$ ). It is observed that the organizational silence level ( $\bar{X}=1.82$ ) is the variable with the lowest arithmetic mean and the organizational learning levels are perceived at the level of ( $\bar{X}=3.91$ ).

A correlation analysis was performed to examine the relation of the leadership styles of school principals with organizational silence and organizational learning. Table 2 shows the correlation coefficients indicating the relation between the transformational leadership, transactional leadership, organizational silence and organizational learning that are involved in the study model.

**Table 2.** Relationship between Leadership Styles, Organizational Silence and Organizational Learning

Variables	1	2	3	4
1. Transformational Leadership				
2. Transactional Leadership	-.45			
3. Organizational Silence	-.62	.52		
4. Organizational Learning	.81	-.37	-.61	

N=526 \* p<.01

As is clear from Table 2, it is observed that all the relations between the variables are either positively or negatively significant. The strongest relation between the variables is observed between the transformational leadership and organizational learning ( $r = .81$ ;  $p < .01$ ). There is a negatively significant relation between the transformational leadership and organizational silence ( $r = -.62$ ;  $p < .01$ ). Similarly, there is a negatively significant relation between the organizational silence and organizational learning ( $r = -.61$ ;  $p < .01$ ), as well as the transactional leadership and organizational learning ( $r = -.37$ ;  $p < .01$ ).

Table 3 and 4 show the results of the stepwise multiple regression analysis regarding the prediction of the perception of organizational learning by the variables of leadership styles and organizational silence.

**Table 3.** Model summary: Stepwise multiple regression analysis for organizational learning

Step	Variable Entered	R	R <sup>2</sup>	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	SE
1	Transformational Leadership	,809	,655	,654	,412
2	Organizational Silence	,821	,675	,674	,400

**Table 4.** Coefficients: Stepwise multiple regression analysis for organizational learning

Predictors	B	Standard Error	$\beta$	T	P
(Constant)	,548	,108		5,075	,000
Transformational Leadership	,836	,027	,809	31,527	,000
(Constant)	1,308	,170		7,693	,000
Transformational Leadership	,722	,033	,699	22,101	,000
Organizational Silence	-,166	,029	-,180	-5,679	,000

A stepwise regression analysis was run to examine the relevant contribution of each of predictor variables to organizational learning. As seen in Table 3 and 4, predictor variables included transformational leadership and organizational silence, significantly correlated with organizational learning ( $R = .82$ ,  $p > .01$ ). Transformational leadership was the first variable and organizational silence was the second variable to enter the regression equation. Transformational leadership ( $\beta = .81$ ,  $p > .01$ ) predicts the perception of organizational learning in a positively significant way. Organizational silence ( $\beta = -.180$ ,  $p > .01$ ) predicts the organizational learning in a negatively significant way. These variables explain 67,5% of the total variance in the variable of the perception of organizational learning.

### Discussion and Conclusion

The study findings show that there are significant and strong relations between the leadership styles, organizational learning and organizational silence. The strong positive relation between the transformational leadership and organizational learning suggests that the transformational leadership behaviors of school principals may positively affect the organizational learning. This finding shows a parallelism with the

findings of some studies suggesting that transformational leaders strengthen the organizational learning and communication (Mayhew et al., 2006; Korkmaz, 2007). In the direction of the data, it can be said that organizational learning culture of schools will get stronger thanks to transformational leadership competencies of school principals get stronger.

Another result being propounded by the study findings is that there is a negatively significant relationship between the transformational leadership and organizational silence. As the transformational leadership behaviors incase, the organizational silence decreases. On the other hand, there is a positively strong relation between the transactional leadership behaviors and organizational silence. In other words, the increase in transactional leadership behaviors also increases the organizational silence. In his study examining the effects of leadership behaviors in group interaction, Bogosian (2012) states that autocratic and aggressive leadership models cause silence in employees and the human-centered democratic leadership model minimizes the possibility of silence. Thus, employees are able to assert themselves freely. Being revealed by this study, the positively significant relation between the transactional leadership behaviors and organizational silence where autocratic attitudes are prominent shows a parallelism with Bogosian's (2012) thesis asserting that a working environment dominated by autocratic leader behaviors disables the employees to explain their opinions and contribute to the solution of problems. Brinsfield (2009) emphasizes that organizational silence is a multi-dimensional and frequently-encountered phenomenon and it has a significant relation with organizational behavior styles. Some studies (Çakar and Yıldız, 2009; Erenler, 2010; Morrison and Milliken, 2000) suggest that attitudes and behaviors of administrators give ideas to the employees regarding how to behave in their work. In other words, behaviors of administrators significantly determine the behaviors of employees. According to the study being conducted by Bildik (2009), there is a reverse relation between the transformational leadership and organizational silence and a positive" relation between the traditional transactional leaders that pay minimum attention to the creative and innovative aspects of employees and the organizational silence. Huang et al. (2005) state that transformational leaders encourage and support their followers, whereas the transactional leaders focus on short-run goals and that transformational leaders are more successful in hindering the development of the organizational silence environment. Similarly, Detert and Burris (2007) who has determined a negative relation between the transformational leadership style and silence suggest that transformational leaders encourage the employees to freely share their feelings and thoughts, increase their sense of responsibility by strengthening their commitment, and consequently enable them to make a positive contribution to the future of the institution.

Morrison and Milliken (2003) state that the great distance between the administrators and employees may cause organizational silence. Aiming to determine the relations of cultural differences between different communities with behaviors of individuals, Hofstede (1991) uses the phenomenon of "power range" as an important variable in his studies. Hofstede approaches the power range in two groups as wide and narrow in this variable examining the relation of individuals and society with power. Accordingly, the width or narrowness of the power range in society is among the determinant differences between the cultures. Hofstede's findings suggest that eastern communities including Turkey have a wide power range, which causes individuals to easily submit the authority and remain abstaining in questioning the decisions of their superiors. Considering the findings of this study within the scope of these determinations, it is possible to associate the strong relation between the leadership styles and organizational silence with a social structure bearing a wide power range. Because the decisions and attitudes of administrators are not as determinant upon superiors in cultures with a narrow power range as in other cultures.

The study findings show a reverse and negative relation between the organizational silence and organizational learning. Accordingly, as the organizational silence increases, the organizational learning decreases and the decrease in silence increases the organizational learning. These findings are similar to the results produced by some other studies conducted in the different cultural context (Samadi, Sohrabi and Sarayvand, 2013; Yeloğlu, Fidanboy, Serphous and Öztürk, 2016). Morrison and Milliken (2003) state that employees feel inadequate in expressing their feelings and thus, the environments where they cannot express themselves hinder the organizational learning. In other words, one of the prerequisites of organizational learning is a strong inter-organizational communication and a sharing culture. In addition to this, Morrison et al. (2003) emphasize the necessity for leaders to struggle with the hierarchy tendency in order to transfer the knowledge in designing the learning organizations and state that the key step in

organizations is to remove the fear of being misunderstood from the minds of employees when they express their opinions. Keeping silent in significant matters may give us information about the skill of an organization to remove the mistakes and dealing in learning. Employees silence could also create stress, dissatisfaction, criticism and conflict among employees (Beer and Eisenstat, 2000; Morrison and Milliken, 2000; Nemeth, 1997; Tamuz, 2001; Cited by: Morrison et al, 2003).

Considering another dimension of the discussion, McGowan (2003) suggests that organizational silence is used as a means of hiding the problems in the organization. Silence culture could be considered to provide a more manageable institution for administrators. Being able to administer employees that become silent due to worries like protecting their position could enable us to establish a more manageable institution by primarily preventing some problems that may arise from divergences. In addition to this, since hiding the problems will not mean that they are solved, it may disable us to solve the problems of the organization and rise to another level of learning.

This study examines the relations between the leadership styles, organizational learning and organizational silence. As a result of the study; it has been observed that there are either positively or negatively significant relations between the variables of transformational leadership, transactional leadership, organizational silence and organizational learning. There are reversely significant relations between the transformational leadership and organizational silence; organizational silence and organizational learning, and transactional leadership and organizational learning. Evaluating the study results in terms of organizational silence, it is observed that as the transformational leadership behaviors increase, the organizational silence significantly decreases. Evaluating the study findings revealing the relation between the transactional leadership and organizational learning, it is concluded that the transactional leadership behaviors make no contribution to the learning culture. Evaluating the relations of the transactional leadership with organizational silence and organizational learning, It could be asserted that transactional leadership significantly determines the organizational silence. In other words, the increase of transactional leadership behaviors forms the silence culture in the organization. The results of the regression analysis show that the leadership styles and organizational silence significantly predict the organizational learning.

According to the study results, school principals are recommended to impose an influence on their employees in areas like being a source of inspiration, showing a personal interest and directing intellectually, which are among the characteristics of transformational leadership. On the other hand; they are recommended to avoid the transactional leadership styles like establishing a communication with employees based on their reward or punishment expectations and expecting obedience from the employees. Instead of an administration style and culture aimed at preventing the mistakes and applying the rules, the employees are required to adopt a sense of administration that mainly focuses on and highlights their creative and innovative aspects.

Considering the fact that the silence culture may interrupt the process of organizational learning at schools, it is suggested to establish a polyphonic, participative and institutional culture and take precautions to prevent the organizational silence. Approaching the relations between the leadership styles, organizational silence and organizational learning, this study involves teachers employed in primary education institutions and thus, it is restricted with these schools. In order to overcome this restriction of the study; it is suggested to extend the studies to be applied at private schools, secondary education and higher education institutions. These studies will enable us to make comparisons according to the levels of schools. The researchers could conduct more profound, qualified and even experimental studies aimed at determining different and alternative applications that would be performed to establish the participative and polyphonic organizational culture, which is recommended in accordance with the results of this study. Besides, considering the fact that the silence culture is an all-purpose sociological reality, it could be suggested to extend the study population in such a way to make regional comparisons in order to determine the cultural variations of the silence phenomenon at schools.

#### **References**

Akpınar, A. T. (2007). *Örgütsel öğrenme ile örgüte bağlılık arasındaki ilişki: Türkiye otomotiv lastik üretimi sektöründe bir araştırma*. Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi, Marmara Üniversitesi, İstanbul.

- Alparslan, A. M. (2010). *Örgütsel sessizlik iklimi ve işgören sessizlik davranışları arasındaki etkileşim: Mehmet Akif Ersoy üniversitesi öğretim elemanları üzerine bir araştırma*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi, Isparta.
- Avcı, N. ve Küçükusta, D. (2009). Konaklama işletmelerinde örgütsel öğrenme, örgütsel bağlılık ve işten ayrılma eğilimi arasındaki ilişki. *Anatolia: Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 20(1), 33-44.
- Aydın, B. (2009). *Örgütsel etkililiği arttırmada, örgütsel öğrenme kapasitesi, değer oluşturucu liderlik ve örgütsel kültürün etkisi*. Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi, Gebze İleri Teknoloji Enstitüsü, Gebze.
- Balay, R. (2012). Öğrenen örgüt algısının örgütsel bağlılığa etkisi: Özel ve devlet üniversitesi arasında bir karşılaştırma. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 12(4), 2461-2486.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 19(3), 19-31.
- Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. J. (1995). *MLQ-Multifactor leadership questionnaire*. California: Mind Garden.
- Bildik, B. (2009). *Liderlik tarzları, örgütsel sessizlik ve örgütsel bağlılık ilişkisi*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Gebze İleri Teknoloji Enstitüsü, Kocaeli.
- Blackman, D. & Sadler-Smith, E. (2009). The silent and the silenced in organizational knowing and learning, *Management Learning*. 40(5), 569-585.
- Bogosian, R. (2012). *Engaging organizational voice: A phenomenological study of employees' lived experiences of silence in work group settings*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The George Washington University, America.
- Brinsfield, C. T. (2009). *Employee silence: Investigation of dimensionality, development of measures, and examination of related factors*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus, USA.
- Brinsfield, C. T., Edwards, M. S. & Greenberg, J. (2009). Voice and silence in organizations: Historical review and current conceptualizations. In J. Greenberg & M. S. Edwards (Eds). *Voice and silence in organizations* (pp. 3-37). UK: Emerald Group.
- Bowen, F. & Blackmon, K. (2003). Spirals of Silence: The dynamic effects of diversity on organizational voice. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40(6), 1393- 1417.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2005). Anket geliştirme. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 3(2), 133-148.
- Celep, C. (2004). *Dönüşümsel liderlik*. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Cemaloğlu, N. (2007a). Okul yöneticilerinin liderlik stillerinin farklı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 5(1), 73-112.
- Cemaloğlu, N. (2007b). Okul yöneticilerinin liderlik stillerinin örgüt sağlığı üzerindeki etkisi. *TSA*, 11(2), 165-194.
- Cemaloğlu, N. (2007c). Okul yöneticilerinin liderlik stilleri ile yıldırma arasındaki ilişki. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 33, 77-87.
- Çakar, N. D. ve Yıldız, S. (2009). Örgütsel adaletin iş tatmini üzerindeki etkisi: Algılanan örgütsel destek bir ara değişken mi? *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 8(28), 68-90.
- Çelik, V. (2003). *Eğitimsel liderlik*. Ankara: Pegem Yayınları.
- Çetinkaya, İ. (2011). *Ortaöğretim okul müdürlerinin liderlik stilleri ile iletişim becerileri arasındaki ilişki*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Çokluk, Ö., Şekercioğlu, G. ve Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2010). *Sosyal bilimler için çok değişkenli istatistik*. Ankara: Pegem A.
- Decuyper, S., Dochy, F. & Bossche, P. V. (2010). Grasping the dynamic complexity of team learning: An integrative model for effective team learning in organisations. *Educational Research Review*, 5, 111-133. doi:10.1016/j.edurev.2010.02.002.

- Detert, J. R. & Burris, E. R. (2007), Leadership behavior and employee voice: Is the door really open? *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(4), 225-241.
- Dibbo, D. C. (1999). *Assessing the organizational learning capacity of schools*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Toronto University, Canada.
- Dyne, L. V., Ang, S. & Botero, I. C. (2003). Conceptualizing employee silence and employee voice as multidimensional constructs. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40(6), 1359-1392. doi: 10.1111/1467-6486.00384.
- Erçetin, S. S. (2000). *Liderlik sarmalında vizyon*. Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık.
- Erdem, M. ve Uçar, İ. H. (2013). Öğretmenlere göre ilköğretimde öğrenen örgüt algısı ve öğrenen örgütün örgütsel bağlılığa etkisi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 13(3), 1515-1534. doi:10.12738/estp.2013.3.1693.
- Erdoğan, E. (2011). *Etkili liderlik örgütsel sessizlik ve performans ilişkisi*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Gebze İleri Teknoloji Enstitüsü, Gebze.
- Erenler, E. (2010). *Çalışanlarda sessizlik davranışın bazı kişisel ve örgütsel özelliklerle ilişkisi: Turizm sektöründe bir alan araştırması*. Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Erol, G. (2012). *Liderlik tarzları ve örgütsel sessizlik ilişkisi: Otel işletmelerinde bir araştırma*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Balıkesir Üniversitesi, Balıkesir.
- Garvin, D. A. (1993). Building a learning organization. *Harvard Business Review*, 71(4), 78-91.
- Gorman, L. L. (2004). *Leadership organizational cultural values that influence organizational learning: Fostering double loop learning*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Phoenix University, America.
- Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. London: McGraw Hill.
- Huang, X., Van De Vliert, E. & Van der Vegt, G. (2005). Breaking the silence culture: Stimulation of participation and employee opinion withholding cross-nationally. *Management and Organization Review*, 1(3), 1740-8776. doi: 10.1111/j.1740-8784.2005.00023.
- Jashapara, A. (2003). Cognition, culture and competition: An empirical test of the learning organization, *Learning Organization*, 10(1), 31-50.
- Kale, M. (2004). Resmi ve özel liselerin örgütsel öğrenme açısından karşılaştırılması. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2, 159-177.
- Karacaoğlu, K. ve Cingöz, A. (2009). *İşgören sessizliğinin kaynağı olarak liderlik davranışı ve örgütsel adalet algısı*. 17. Ulusal Yönetim ve Organizasyon Kongresi, Eskişehir.
- Karasar, N. (2007). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi*. Ankara: Nobel.
- Karip, E. (1998). Dönüşümcü liderlik. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 4(16), 443-466.
- Koçel, T. (2003). *İşletme yöneticiliği*. İstanbul: Beta.
- Korkmaz, M. (2005). Duyguların ve liderlik stillerinin öğretmenlerin performansı üzerinde etkisi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi*, 43, 401-422.
- Korkmaz, M. (2007). Örgütsel sağlık üzerinde liderlik stillerinin etkisi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 49, 57-91.
- Korkmaz, M. (2008). Okul müdürlerinin liderlik stilleri ile öğrenen örgüt özellikleri arasındaki ilişki üzerine nicel bir araştırma. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 53, 75-98.
- Kurland, H., Hilla-Peretz, H. & Lazarowitz, R. H. (2010). Leadership style and organizational learning: The mediate effect of school vision. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 48(1), 7-30. doi:10.1108/09578231011015395.

- Kurt, T. (2016). Öğretmen liderliğini açıklamaya yönelik bir model: Dağıtımçı liderlik, örgütsel öğrenme ve öğretmenlerin öz yeterlik algısının öğretmen liderliğine etkisi. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 41(183), 1-28. doi:10.15390/EB.2016.5081.
- Kurt, T. (2009). *Okul müdürlerinin dönüşümcü ve işlemci liderlik stilleri ile öğretmenlerin kolektif yeterliği ve öz yeterliği arasındaki ilişkilerin incelenmesi*. Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Lawson, R. B. & Ventriss, C. L. (1992). Organizational change: The role of organizational culture and organizational learning. *Psychological Record*, 42(2), 205-220.
- Marsick, V. J. & Watkins, K. E. (2003). Demonstrating the value of an organization's learning culture: The dimensions of the learning organizations questionnaire. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 5(2), 132-151. doi: 10.1177/1523422303251341.
- Mayhew, M. J., Grunwald, H. E. & Dey, E. L. (2006). Breaking the silence: Achieving a positive campus climate for diversity from the staff perspective. *Research in Higher Education*, 47(1), 63-88. doi:10.1007/s11162-004-8152-z.
- McGowan, R. A. (2003). *Organizational discourses: Sounds of silence and voice in organizational life stream*. 3rd International Critical Management Studies Conference UK.
- Milliken F. J., Morrison E. W. & Hewlin P. F. (2003). An exploratory study of employee silence: Issues that employees don't communicate upward and why. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40(6), 1453-1476.
- Milliken, F. J. & Morrison, E. W. (2003). Shades of silence: Emerging themes and future directions for research on silence in organizations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40(6), 1563-1568.
- Morrison, E. W. & Milliken, F. J. (2000). Organizational silence: A barrier to change and development in a pluralistic world. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(4), 32. doi: 10.5465/AMR.2000.3707697.
- Okçu, V. (2011). *Okul yöneticilerinin liderlik stilleri ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılıkları ve yıldırma yaşama düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkileri incelenmesi*. Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Owen, H., Hodgson, V. ve Gazzard, N. (2007). *Liderlik elkitabı-etkin liderlik için eksiksiz ve patirik bir klavuz*. (M. Çelik, Çev.). İstanbul: Optimist.
- Özdemir S., Karadağ, N. ve Kılınç A. Ç. (2013). Leadership in learning organizations: A qualitative research on school principals. *Inonu University Journal of the Faculty of Education*, 14(2), 17-34.
- Özden, Y. (2005). *Eğitimde yeni değerler*. Ankara: Pegem A.
- Özen Kutanis, R. (2002). Öğrenen organizasyonlar. İ. Dalay, R. Çoşkun, ve R. Altunışık (Eds.), *Stratejik boyutuyla modern yönetim yaklaşımları içinde* (257-279). İstanbul: Beta.
- Pinder C. C. & Harlos, K. P. (2001). Employee silence: Quiescence and acquiescence as responses to perceived injustice. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 20, 331-369.
- Psychos, D. L. (2012). *Teachers teaching teachers: A case study of the 2011 proed professional learning community and its influence on creating a culture for organizational learning in schools in The Republic of Panama*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Missouri University, America.
- Samadi, A., Sohrabi., R and Sarayvand, E. (2013). The study of organizational learning influence on organizational silence. *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*. 3(8), 556-561.
- Senge, M. P. (2006). *Beşinci disiplin* (A. İldeniz ve A. Doğukan, Çev.). İstanbul: Yapı Kredi.
- Steiner, L. (1998). Organizational dilemmas as barriers to learning. *The Learning Organization*, 5(4), 193.
- Şencan, H. (2005). *Sosyal ve davranışsal ölçümlerde güvenilirlik ve geçerlilik*. Ankara: Seçkin.
- Tangıralla, S. & Ramanujam, R. (2008). Employee silence on critical work issues: The cross level effects of procedural justice climate. *Personnel Psychology*, 61(1), 37-68.
- Taşkıran, E. (2010). *Liderlik tarzının örgütsel sessizlik üzerindeki etkisinde örgütsel adaletin rolü ve bir araştırma*. Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi, Marmara Üniversitesi, İstanbul.

- Turan, S., Karadağ, E., ve Bektaş, F. (2011). Üniversite yapısı içerisinde öğrenen örgüt ve örgütsel bağlılık ilişkisi üzerine bir araştırma. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 17(4), 627-638. doi:10.17051/io.2015.98919.
- Wasti, S. A. (1995). Kültürel farklılaşmanın örgütsel yapı ve davranışa etkileri: Karşılaştırmalı bir inceleme. *ODTÜ Gelişme Dergisi*. 22(4), 503-529.
- Yeloğlu, H.O., Fidanboy, Ö., Serphous, and Öztürk, A. (2016). *The effects of organizational silence on organizational learning: The mediating effect of perceived organizational support*. European Academy of Management Conference. Managable Corporation, 01 - 03 June 2016. Paris.
- Yıldız, K. (2013). Örgütsel bağlılık ile örgütsel sinizm ve örgütsel muhalefet arasındaki ilişki. *Turkish Studies*, 8(6), 853-879.
- Zagoršek, H., Dimovski, V. & Škerlavaj, M. (2009). Transactional and transformational leadership impacts on organizational learning. *Journal of East European Management Studies*, 14(2), 144-165.