

THE STUDY ON ORGANIZATIONAL LEARNING ACTIVITY: COMPARISON OF LARGE ENTERPRISES AND SMEs

¹Adnan Celik, ²Esra Yildiz, ³Tahir Akgemci

¹Prof. Dr., Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Selcuk University, Turkey.

²Lecturer, Karaman Vocational School, Karamanoglu Mehmet Bey University, Turkey.

³Prof. Dr., Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Selcuk University, Turkey.

ABSTRACT

Learning at organizational dimension can be defined as "looking for competitiveness, productivity and innovation in uncertain technology and market conditions". But we can make plans in an ambiguous environment with knowledge, and we can make the change in today's changing conditions. Organizations need new and flexible structures in the environment where this change is a constant condition. One of the most important of such organizations is the "learning organization". The learning organization is an organization that is active in the fields of information production, discovery and communication and transforms institutional behaviors within the framework of new knowledge and foresight (Dodgson, 1993: 375-375, Senge, 1996: 23, Şimşek, Çelik and Akgemci, 2016: 125). Theoretical dimension, the concept of learning and scope with the concept of organizational learning and basic dimensions. The other part has been research. In this study, participants were chosen via convenience sampling method among managers working in Small and Medium Industrial Enterprises (SMEs) and large scale firms operating in various sectors within the boundaries of Konya city. The perceptions of the managers regarding organizational learning were examined. 59 managers have participated in the study. The questionnaire consists of questions regarding demographical information about the participants and "Organizational Learning Scale". Organizational learning scale involves 17 items and it is a Likert-5 type scale. It consists of 4 dimensions. The data were analyzed via Mann Whitney U and Kruskal Wallis tests. $p < 0.05$ value was used for statistical meaningfulness measure. As a result of the analysis, no meaningful difference was found in perceptions of managers of SMEs and large scale firms regarding organizational learning.

Keywords: Organizational Learning, Learning Organization, Large Enterprises, SMEs

1. INTRODUCTION

Learning in today's information society has a vital proposition for organizations. Since it is now possible to access the information quickly and in the desired place, the element that will provide competitive advantage for organizations is not the realization of individual learning in all hierarchical levels but sharing of this information throughout the organization, the analysis of information and the learning of the information and the emergence of synergy (Şimşek, Çelik and Akgemci, 2016: 125).

In competitive environment of today, organizations, in their visions and missions, also considering the changing environmental conditions, must continuously modify their structures and make effort about this issue. The increasing competition leaves organizations face to face to searching for the new methods to increase their performances (Noruzy et al., 2013: 1073). That an organization can survive for long time depends on that it arranges its aims, targets, and culture according to the conditions of the environment, in which it competes. The managers and employees, constituting an organizational culture based on principle of organizational learning in cooperation, can provide the continuity of organization (Kapucu, 2012: 1). Organizational learning is defined as the ability of organizations to realize performance based on experience (Radzi et al., 2013: 1051).

Since an organization open to learning is in continuous communication with its environment, in which it is in active, it exchanges information and applies this information in its processes (Naktiyok,2012:2). With organizational learning activities, realized toward all employees, organizations show improvement and, employees, with information they learn from each other, become more productive (Özer, 2013: 1). With organizational learning activities, as a result of that the individuals in organizations learn and transfer the information they learn to the organization they are in, it is expected for organizations to renew itself and change. In this direction, employees form the basis of organizational learning (Ünalır, 2013: 1).

The strengthening of organizations depends on the continual renewal of the continuity of assets. In this process, organizational learning activities take place. This study compares organizational learning activities in large enterprises and SMEs. The study was prepared in two different dimensions as theoretical and research. The theoretical dimension includes the concept of learning and scope with the concept organizational learning and basic dimensions. In the research part is heading "comparison of organizational learning activities in large enterprises and SMEs in Konya". This section is divided into the following subheadings; "The subject, aim, and importance of the study, the universe and sample of the study, data collecting instrument and

scales, data analysis and findings". Work is important when considering that the studies related to learning vary according to the organization capacity and the number of employees. The study ended with conclusions and recommendations.

2. THE CONCEPT OF LEARNING AND SCOPE

Significant scientific studies on learning, dating back to ancient Greek thinkers, have been shaped since the 19th century. Businesses with open systems are learning just like people. Learning is a wide-ranging behavioral phenomenon involving education, acquiring skills, learning, management development, and so on (Kaynak, 1995: 86; Çelik and Şimşek, 2016: 320).

Learning is a process lasting from the birth of human to the end of his/her life and playing effective role in the change of the behaviors and thought. The underlying reasons for learning are the emotional factors that enable individuals to continue their lives and satisfy their needs to realize themselves (Uzuntarla et al., 2015: 190).

Learning is repetition and permanent change that takes place in behavior as a result of experiences (Yavuz, 2014: 32). Learning is the constant change that takes place in behavior as a result of knowledge and experience (Naktiyok, 2012: 6). Learning is defined as a basic process supporting innovativeness to provide and support organizational success (Wang and Ellinger, 2011: 512).

Learning takes an important place in human life. When the definitions of learning are examined (Naktiyok, 2012: 6), it is seen that the individual has the characteristics such as the end result of the individual, the change of the permanent behavior, the observability of change, and the constant change in the result of learning. Learning is a process at the same time. This process is carried out by researchers; Preparing for learning, motivating learning, assessing the situation, learning action, and evaluating the learning outcome. There are three separate learning levels, in which there is a relationship between them. These are individual learning, learning at group level, and organizational learning (Tan, 2011: 189-190).

In organizations, learning begins from employees (Bakan, 2015: 443). While the concept learning in organization previously took place among the activities toward developing staff, in time, together with the pass to human resources management, learning has been begun to be dealt with as a separate subject (Koçel, 2013: 427).

Learning is a neurophysiological phenomenon and there are chemical and electrical changes in learning and brain, and new connections are established in the nervous system. Researchers are prioritizing four stages in the learning process. These can be explained as follows (ITU, 2014: 3):

-Input: Incoming information is perceived by the sensory organs to enter the brain.

-Entegration (Transaction): Recording, organizing, understanding and processing of incoming information. In this phase, the sequencing of knowledge, abstraction, organizing takes place.

-Memory (Storage): Apparently the information is stored for reuse.

-Output: The period during which the brain transmits information as messages to cells, muscles, tongue or motor activity areas.

3. THE CONCEPT OF ORGANIZATIONAL LEARNING AND BASIC DIMENSIONS

For a successful organizational structure, learning, due to the fact that it helps new ideas and processes develop, has a critical importance (Sanz-Valle et al., 2011: 997). The approach and book of Senge has been used in many applied academic literatures and studies and has gained popularity (Elgar, 2013: 4).

The concept of learning organization began to become widely accepted in 1990 when it was used by Peter Senge in his work entitled "The Fifth Discipline". Along with the transition from the industrial society to the information society, it has begun to play a role as a key factor in the success and development of knowledge, businesses and societies. Knowledge and institutional learning are important elements in the study of technological and institutional change. It is of utmost importance to be equipped with institutional learning provider skills for organizations that want to succeed in the fast changing environment we live in (Koçel, 2013: 427; Şimşek and Çelik, 2016: 367). Senge, fixed learning organizations on the five basic structure as system thought, personal mastery, shared vision, learning in team, and share of mental models (Ali, 2012: 57).

Systemic viewpoint is that individual comprehends again himself/herself and his/her environment; the results, obtained by individuals, whose level of individual mastery is high, are reliable; mental models are that employees have opportunities toward changing viewpoint of system; shared vision motive employees, and enables them to be focused on; and learning in team is an ability possessed toward the solution of problems and development of learning (Tibet, 2015: 23-24).

According to the literature, organizational learning can support some organizational and managerial factors such as experience, taking risk, experience, interaction with external environment, and participation (Chiva vd., 2014: 689).

According to the researchers making the first studies regarding organizational learning, organization learning is a process actualizing with revealing faults and correcting them

(Özer, 2013: 4). In the system formed toward learning organization, the elements of employees, technology, organization, and information take place (Marquardt, 2011: 38). Organizational learning is a key element in achieving sustainable competitive advantage and responding to environmental changes by finding and correcting mistakes in behavioral patterns that employees are using to improve organizational performance (Jiménez-Jiménez and Sanz-Valle; 2011: 409). When employees act as individuals finding faults in behavioral patterns, which are used in organization, correcting them, and responding to the environmental changes, learning in organizational dimension actualizes (Nayir, 210: 43).

Researchers engaged in organizational learning have adopted a scientific approach to the study of information and cognitive level interpretations to answer important questions about why and how organizations learn (Chadwik and Raver; 2015: 958).

Organizational learning is based on learning of individuals forming organization (López-Cabrales et al., 2011: 345). The right people, right environment, and right processes are the necessary conditions for high performance organizations to occur (Hess, 2014: 7). At the same time, culture formed toward organizational learning, has an important effect on work satisfaction (Pantauvakis and Bauranta, 2013: 50). For obtaining positive organizational outputs based on learning, it is an important point to form an organizational culture giving support to learning (Song et al., 2011: 471). Organizational learning also gives direction to entrepreneurship activities (Zahra, 2012: 60).

Formation of culture toward organizational learning, first of all, occurs with realization of learning in group and organizational level in systematic way after learning at individual level (Kapucu, 2012: 7). The studies carried out reveal that sort of leadership affect learning and, the components of transformational leadership especially occurring in the last times can positively affect the five basic discipline of learning organization (Soliman, 2015: 4).

There are some barriers in the front of organizational learning process. These barriers are put in order as “I keep my position”, “Enemy is outside”, “Illusion of Undertaking Responsibility”, “lodging in the events”, “Boiling Frog Syndrome”, “State of learning with experience”, and “Manager Team Myth” (Naktiyok, 2012: 20). A learning organization is a place where people discover how they can create and change their own reality.

4. COMPARISON OF ORGANIZATIONAL LEARNING ACTIVITY IN LARGE ENTERPRISES AND SMEs IN KONYA

4.1. The Subject, Aim, and Importance of the Study

In this study, in large enterprises and small and medium sized enterprises being in active in Konya, the state of activities toward organizational learning is examined. The main aim of the study is to analyze the state of organizational learning activities in SMEs and large enterprises. In this direction, the main and sub hypotheses of the study were developed as follows.

H₁: Organizational learning activities differentiate in SMEs and large enterprises

H₂: Organizational learning activities does not differentiate in SMEs and large enterprises according to gender and marital status.

H₃ Engaging in learning, shared vision, open mindedness, perceptions toward in-system information sharing among sub dimensions of organizational learning, differentiate between SMEs and large enterprise.

4.2. The Universe and Sample of the Study

Universe of Study consist of the middle and top level managers of the large enterprises and small and middle sized enterprises being in active in the borders of Konya City. 62 returns were obtained from questionnaires sent to 100 people consisting of the top and middle level managers of 25 large enterprises and 25 SMSEs in internet media and 59 of them were found convenient for conducting the necessary analyses. The study was limited with the top and middle level managers of large enterprises and large and middle sized enterprises being in active in the various sectors in Konya City.

4.3. Data Collecting Instrument and Scales

The study has a quality of empirical study and survey method was used as data collecting instrument. Questionnaire consists of two sections. In the First Section, demographic information, which consists of 10 questions toward knowing enterprise and person, takes place, while in Second Section, Organizational Learning Scale consisting of 17 questions, used by Nayır (2010) in the postgraduate study titled “A Study toward the Relationships between Institutional Culture and Organizational Learning Processes ” and formed by utilizing the scales taking place in the literature. The questions in organizational learning scale were examined in four sub dimensions as engagement in learning, shared vision, open mindedness, and in-system information sharing. The surveys were analyzed in SPSS 23 Program. As a result of reliability analysis carried out for the survey, Cronbach alpha was found 0.904 as the answers given to 17 expressions for

Organizational Learning Scale. According to this result, it is seen that there is internal consistency between the expressions taking place in the survey scale.

Cronbach alpha values regarding engagement in learning, shared vision, open mindedness, and in-system information, which are four sub dimensions of organizational learning, are as follows:

Table-1: The Results of Reliability Analysis Regarding the Scale and Sub Dimensions

Organizational Learning Scale and Sub Dimensions	Cronbach Alpha
Organizational Learning Scale	0.904
Sub Dimension of Engagement in Learning	0.891
Sub Dimension of Shared Vision	0.812
Sub Dimension of Open Mindedness	0,621
Sub Dimension of In-System Information Share	0,637

When the reliability coefficients are examined regarding sub-dimensions, it is seen that the dimensions of open-mindedness and in-system information share are lower value compared to the other dimensions. Regarding this result, an interpretation that the participants could not enough the questions representing this dimension understand can be made.

4.4. Data Analysis and Findings

4.4.1. Demographic Findings

Table-2: Demographic Findings (n = 59)

		n	Oran (%)
Gender	Male	51	86,4
	Female	8	13,6
	No answer	-	-
	Total	59	100
Marital Status	Married	46	79,3
	Single	12	20,7
	No answer	1	-
	Total	59	100
Age	Between 18-29	7	11,9

	Between 30-39	27	45,8
	Between 40-49	17	28,8
	Between 50-65	8	13,6
	Total	59	100
Educational Level	Secondary School	1	1,7
	High School	7	11,9
	Vocational High School	1	1,7
	Two-Year School	3	5,1
	Undergraduate	29	49,2
	Postgraduate	16	27,1
	Doctorate	2	3,4
	Total	59	100
Title	Director	1	1,7
	Manager	1	1,7
	CEO	1	1,7
	Foreign Trade Director	1	1,7
	Foreign Trade Director	2	3,4
	Import Depot Supervisor	1	1,7
	Veterinary Surgeon	1	1,7
	Firm Owner	2	3,4
	Firm Owner	1	1,7
	General Director	2	3,4
	General Director	3	5,1
	Unit Director of Purchasing	1	1,7
	Export Director	1	1,7
	Export Director	1	1,7
	Human Resources Specialist	1	1,7
	Human Resources Manager	1	1,7
	Workplace Owner	1	1,7
	Import Director	1	1,7
	Import-export Director	1	1,7
	Quality Management Director	1	1,7
Categorical Sale Director	1	1,7	

	Logistics Deputy General Director	1	1,7
	Mechanical Engineer	1	1,7
	Superintendent of Financial and Administrative Affairs	1	1,7
	Factory Director	1	1,7
	Superintendent of Fruit and Vegetable Rayon	1	1,7
	Accounting Superintendent	1	1,7
	Accounting Superintendent Director	1	1,7
	Employer	1	1,7
	Marketing Director	1	1,7
	Marketing Manager	1	1,7
	Project-Sale Director	1	1,7
	Purchasing Director	1	1,7
	Purchasing Director	1	1,7
	Sale Director	1	1,7
	Firm Director	1	1,7
	Region Manager	1	1,7
	Sale Director	1	1,7
	Sale/Marketing Director	1	1,7
	Sale/Marketing Engineer	1	1,7
	Chief	1	1,7
	Factory Director	1	1,7
	Manager	1	1,7
	Manager	2	3,4
	Manager	1	1,7
	Manager	1	1,7
	General Coordinator	1	1,7
	Sale/Marketing Director	1	1,7
	Total	59	100
	Packing	1	1,7
	Casting and Motor	1	1,7
	Iron-Steel	1	1,7
	Industrial	1	1,7
	Fair Organization	1	1,7
	Food	3	5,1
Department Worked in	Food –Wholesale	1	1,7
	Food- Production	1	1,7
	Gross Market	1	1,7
	Building	1	1,7
	Building	2	3,4

	Building materials /Auto Part Chemicals	1	1,7
	Cosmetics	1	1,7
	Machinery-Manufacturing Market	1	1,7
	Automotive	2	3,4
	Automotive Spare Part	1	1,7
	Automotive	3	5,1
	Automotive	1	1,7
	Automotive Spare Part	1	1,7
	Automotive	9	15,3
	Automotive	7	11,9
	Automotive consumable materials	1	1,7
	Automotive Service Equipment	1	1,7
	Automotive Sub-Industry	2	3,4
	Automotive Sub-Industry	2	3,4
	Automotive Spare Part	2	3,4
	Automotive Spare Part	1	1,7
	Retailing	1	1,7
	Retailing	1	1,7
	Retailing -Wholesale	1	1,7
	Advertisement	1	1,7
	Soap/Cosmetics	1	1,7
	Software	1	1,7
	Total	59	100
Activity Length of Enterprise	1-3 years	3	5,1
	4-6 years	2	3,4
	7-9 years	4	6,8
	10 years and more	50	84,7
	Total	59	100
Number of Personnel Working in Enterprise	Less than 10	9	15,5
	10-49	18	31
	50-99	7	12,1
	100-249	11	19
	250 and more	13	22,4
	No answer	1	-
	Total	59	100

Borders of Activity Area of Enterprise	Regional	9	15,3
	National	14	23,7
	Global	8	13,6
	International	28	47,5
	Total	59	100
Legal Status of Business	Stock Company	29	50
	Collective Company	1	1,7
	Limited Company	26	44,8
	Other(State)	2	3,4
	No answer	1	-
Total	59	100	
Legal Status of Enterprise (other)	Sale Firm	1	1,7
	Sale	1	1,7
	Total	59	100

When the findings regarding demographic characteristics of the individuals having the title of manager, who participated in the survey study, are examined, it is seen that the majority of participants are male and married. It was identified that age group of 30-39 predominantly answered the questions and that their educational statuses are undergraduate level. Participants are in the position of top and medium level manager in many different sectors from automotive to building sector and from retailing to food sector. As a result of analysis of data, another finding obtained is that a large part of those responding questionnaire have the title of general manager.

When the demographic findings regarding the features of the enterprises, in which the managers participating in the study serve, are examined, it was identified that the activity length of their majority was 10 years and more; that the number of personnel were between 10-49; that sectors, which were in active in international area, shopping center; and that their legal statuses were stock corporation. According to these findings, it is observed that toward the aim of our study, 13 managers of large enterprises and 46 managers of SMSEs participated in the study. The most important ones among the reasons for mostly the managers of small and medium sized enterprises to include in the study are easy transportation and ability to be able to send one-to-one questionnaire. Especially intensive working conditions of the managers of large enterprises and their negative viewpoint they exhibited toward survey administrations became effective in the emergence of such a result toward data.

4.4.2. Statistical Analysis and Evaluation

The values of mean and standard deviation regarding the questions taking place in Organizational Learning scale are presented in Table 3. In the scale the expression “In order to keep vivid in the memory the lessons drawn from history, systemic speeches become useful” has the highest mean value with 4.04. the expression having the lowest mean value was the one “We make less effort in sharing the lessons and experiences drawn” with the mean of 2.82. When regarding to these results, it is seen that most of the managers agree with the necessity of making the necessary efforts for the lessons drawn not to be forgotten and not making the necessary effort in sharing the lessons drawn and experiences .While the general mean of questions taking place in the scale formed for measuring organizational learning, is 3.58, standard deviation is 0.73. When rating scale is based on, this result shows that the perception associated with learning is at the middle level.

Table-3: Descriptive Statistics Regarding the Questions Taking Place in Organizational Learning Scale

	<i>Mean.</i>	<i>SD</i>
<i>Engagement in learning</i>		
The managers generally agree with that learning ability of our organization brings competitive advantage.	3.76	1.11
The main values of this organization give place to learning in terms of development.	3.84	1.05
The mentality here is in the direction that learning of worker is an investment not expenditure.	3.86	1.11
Learning in organization is seen as the necessary and vital meta to guarantee our existence in the system.	3.78	1.02
Overall Sub Dimension	3.78	0.97
<i>Shared Vision</i>		
There is commonality in organization in terms of aim.	3.75	0.95
In our view related to all stages, functions, and section of our system, there is a full consensus	3.47	1.02
All workers are responsible for the aims of the system.	3.75	1.16
In determining the direction of system, the workers view themselves as partner.	3.09	1.10
Overall Sub Dimension	3.53	0.86
<i>Open Mindedness</i>		
We do not have any hesitation about reflecting the assumptions we critically make about our customers.	3.56	0.96
The staff in this enterprises should be continuously questioned about the ways of perceiving our place in the market.	3.64	1.06

We rarely collectively question our prejudgments about interpreting ways the customer information	3.45	0.98
We continuously judge the qualities of decisions made and activities carried out in certain time intervals.	3.66	0.95
Overall Sub Dimension	3.58	0.69
<i>In-System Information Sharing</i>		
In order to keep vivid in the memory the lessons drawn from history, systemic speeches become useful	4.04	0.97
We continuously analyze the effort of failed organization and we widely discuss the lessons drawn.	3.80	0.98
We have certain mechanisms about sharing the lessons learnt in systemic activities carried out from department to department, (from unit to unit, from team to team)	3.43	0.93
.Top management in our company repeatedly emphasizes the importance of sharing information	3.87	1.01
We make less effort in sharing the lessons drawn.	2.82	1.02
Overall Sub Dimension	3.59	0.62
General Sum of Scale	3.58	0.73

SD: Standard Deviation

Table-4: The Results of Kruskal Wallis-H Test, Carried Out to Determine Whether or Not Organizational Learning Differentiates According to SME’s and Large Enterprises

Score	Groups	<i>N</i>	\bar{x}_{sira}	x^2	<i>sd</i>	<i>p</i>
Organizational Learning	Less than 10	9				
	10-49	18	30,22			
	50-99	7	31,42			
	100-249	11	29,50	2,227	4	0,694
	250 and more	13	22,86			
	Total	58	31,96			

As a result of Kruskal Wallis-H Test, carried out to determine whether or not organizational learning activities differentiate according to SMSEs and large enterprises, any difference was not identified ($p > 0.05$). According to this situation, the perceptions and applications toward learning are not different according to the scale of enterprise. According to this finding H_1 was confirmed (H_1 : Organizational learning activities differentiate in SMSEs and large enterprises).

Table-5: The Results of Mann Whitney-U Test, Carried Out to Determine Whether or Not Organizational Learning Differentiates According to Marital Status in SME’s and Large Enterprises

Score	Groups	<i>N</i>	\bar{x}_{sira}	\sum_{sira}	<i>U</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>p</i>
Organizational Learning	Married	46	31,10	1430,50	202,500	-1,412	0,158
	Single	12					
	Total	58	23,38	280,50			

Table-6: The results of Mann Whitney-U Test, carried out to determine whether or not organizational learning differentiates according to gender in SMSEs and large enterprises

Scores	Groups	<i>N</i>	\bar{x}_{sira}	\sum_{sira}	<i>U</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>p</i>
Organizational Learning	Male	51	30,85	1573,50	160,500	-,964	0,335
	Female	8	24,56	196,50			
	Total	59					

As stated in Table 5 and Table 6, as a result of analysis of Mann Whitney-U Test, carried out to determine whether or not organizational learning differentiates according to gender and marital status in SMSEs and large enterprises, any difference was not identified ($p > 0.05$). According to this situation, the perceptions and applications toward learning are not different in both sort of enterprise in terms of the factors of gender and marital status. According to this finding, H_2 was confirmed (H_2 : Organizational learning activity does not differentiate in SMSEs and large enterprises according to gender and marital status.).

Table-7: The Results of Kruskal Wallis-H Test, Carried Out to Determine Whether or Not the Level of Engagement in Learning, Among Sub Dimension of Organizational Learning Differentiates According to SME's and Large Enterprises

Score	Groups	<i>N</i>	\bar{x}_{sira}	x^2	<i>sd</i>	<i>p</i>
Engagement in Learning	Less than 10	9	28,67	0,939	4	0,919
	10-49	18	27,92			
	50-99	7	29,93			
	100-249	11	28,05			
	250 and more	13	33,27			
	Total	58				

Table-8: The Results of Kruskal Wallis-H Test, Carried Out to Determine Whether or Not the Level of Shared Vision, Among Sub Dimension of Organizational Learning, Differentiates According to SME's and Large Enterprises

Score	Groups	<i>N</i>	\bar{x}_{sira}	x^2	<i>sd</i>	<i>p</i>
Shared Vision	Less than 10	9	28,28	0,653	4	0,957
	10-49	17	30,97			
	50-99	7	26,21			
	100-249	10	26,90			
	250 and more	13	27,88			
	Total	56				

Table-9: The Results of Kruskal Wallis-H Test, Carried Out to Determine Whether or Not The Level of Open Mindedness, Among Sub Dimension of Organizational Learning Differentiates According to SME's and Large Enterprises

Score	Groups	<i>N</i>	\bar{x}_{sira}	x^2	<i>sd</i>	<i>p</i>
Open Mindedness	Less than 10	9	30,17	2,804	4	0,591
	10-49	18	29,83			
	50-99	7	26,43			
	100-249	10	22,45			
	250 and more	13	33,46			
	Total	57				

Table-10: The Results of Kruskal Wallis-H Test, Carried Out to Determine Whether or Not the Level of In-System Information Sharing, Among Sub Dimension of Organizational Learning Differentiates According to SME’s and Large Enterprises

Score	Groups	<i>N</i>	\bar{x}_{sira}	x^2	<i>sd</i>	<i>p</i>
In-System Information Sharing	Less than 10	9	31,39	2,196	4	0,700
	10-49	18	30,92			
	50-99	7	31,79			
	100-249	10	22,55			
	250 and more	13	28,15			
	Total	57				

As a result of Kruskal Wallis-H Test, carried out to determine whether or not the perceptions toward engagement in learning, shared vision, open mindedness, and in-system information share, among sub dimension of organizational learning, differentiates according to SMSEs and large enterprises, any difference was not identified ($p > 0.05$). According to this situation, perceptions toward sub-dimensions of learning are not different according to enterprise scale. According to this finding, H_3 was not confirmed (H_3 : Engaging in learning, shared vision, open mindedness, perceptions toward in-system information sharing among sub dimensions of organizational learning, differentiate between SMSEs and large enterprise).

5. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

The learning situation is important in the aspect of individual behavior displayed in organizational structures. Individual learning and continuing organizational learning are getting more and more important every day (Şimşek, Çelik and Akgemci, 2013: 286).

Learning is crucial for the company in every measure. The learning function is as closely related to large scale enterprises as well as to businesses of other dimensions. A large firm needs organizational learning, and if it is different, a SMEs management is also needed. SMEs form the backbone of any economy. A strong SMEs sector helps achieve many important socio-economic objectives of a country. For example (Çelik and Akgemci, 2010: 125-126): “SMEs are the biggest source of low cost employment; SMEs help in regional and local development; SMEs respond to market fluctuations more easily; SMEs help achieve fair and equitable distribution of wealth; SMEs are key drivers for value-added exports; SMEs assist in fostering a self- help and entrepreneurial culture in the country; SMEs support and complement large scale industries”.

This study, titled "The study on organizational learning activity: comparison of large enterprises and SMEs", consists of two parts as theoretical and empirical dimension. Firstly, "The concept of learning and scope" and "The concept of organizational learning and basic dimensions" are explained according to the information in the literature. Then, the empirical dimension of "The comparison of organizational learning activity in large enterprises and SMEs in Konya" is given.

In the study, an analysis was conducted on SMSEs and large enterprises toward whether or not the perceptions and activities regarding learning differentiate according to the size of enterprise. Analyses revealed that there was no difference between SMSEs and large enterprises in terms of organizational learning. With the responses given to the expressions related to learning, It was identified that that they expressed that learning was generally necessary; that forming institutional memory was important; that learning ability made enterprise productive; that learning was an investment not a cost item; that the common and values were adopted in enterprise; that all studies carried out was questioned, and ideas were clearly voiced; and that the necessary efforts were made about drawing lesson from experience and taking them into memory. As a conclusion, learning is an important and necessary process for all enterprises. Setting out the limitations of this study, in the future studies, increasing the number of participant and including the other provinces in sample can cause the different results to be obtained.

Regardless of size scale; every business management has shown the importance of "learning organization principles"; should learn to "learn to learn". All problems in learning to learn must be solved. In addition, principles such as "as system thought, personal mastership, shared vision, learning in team, and share of mental models" should be done. We reach the learning organization with a learning person. With the learning organization we build a learning society.

REFERENCES

- Bakan, İ. (2015). *Çağdaş Yönetim Yaklaşımları (İlkeler, Kavramlar ve Yaklaşımlar)*. Beta Yayınevi, İstanbul.
- Chadwick, I. C. veRaver, J. L. (2015). "Motivating Organizations to Learn Goal Orientation and its Influence on Organizational Learning". *Journal of Management*, 41(3), pp.957-986.
- Chiva, R., P. Ghauri and J. Alegre (2014). "Organizational Learning, Innovation And Internationalization: A Complex System Model". *British Journal of Management*, 25(4), pp.687-705.

- Çelik A. ve T. Akgemci (2010). *Girişimcilik Kültürü ve KOBİ'ler*. 3.Baskı, Gazi Kitabevi, Ankara.
- Dodgson, M. (1993). "Organizational Learning: A Review of Some Literatures", *Organization Studies*, Vol.14, Issue.3, pp.375-394.
- Elgar, E. (2013). *Handbook of Research on the Learning Organization*. East Dane, Edward Elgar.
- Hess, D. E. (2014). *Learn or Die: Using Science to Build A Leading-Edge Learning Organization*. Columbia, Columbia Business School Publishing.
- Hoon S. J., C. W. Jeung and S. C. Hyung (2011). The Impact Of The Learning Organization Environment On The Organizational Learning Process In The Korean Business Context. *The Learning Organization*, 18(6), pp.468-485.
- ITU Geliştirme Vakfı Okulları (2014). "Öğrenme Süreçleri ve Öğrenmenin Psikolojisi". http://www.itugvo.k12.tr/ilkogretim/Rehberlik_bultenler/Ogrenme_surecleri.pdf, Erişim: 12.05.2016
- Jiménez-Jiménez, D. and R. Sanz-Valle (2011). Innovation, Organizational Learning, And Performance. *Journal of Business Research*, 64(4), 408-417.
- Kapucu, A. (2012). "Örgütsel Öğrenme Kültürü, Yenilikçi Kültür ve Yenilikçiliğin Firma Performansı Üzerine Etkisi". Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Gebze Yüksek Teknoloji Enstitüsü Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Kocaeli.
- Tuğray K. (1995). *Organizasyonel Davranış ve Yönlendirilmesi*, 2.b., Alfa Basım Yayım Dağıtım, İstanbul.
- Khamis Ali, A. (2012). Academic Staff's Perceptions Of Characteristics Of Learning Organization In A Higher Learning Institution. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 26(1), pp.55-82.
- Koçel, T. (2013). *İşletme Yöneticiliği*. 14.Baskı, Beta Yayınevi, İstanbul.
- López-Cabrales, Á., J. C. Real and R. Sanz-Valle (2011). Relationships Between Human Resource Management Practices and Organizational Learning Capability: The Mediating Role of Human Capital. *Personnel Review*, 40(3), pp.344-363.

- Marquardt, M. J. (2011). *Building The Learning Organization*, Mc Graw Hill, New York.
- Naktiyok, S. (2012). "Örgütsel Öğrenme ve Örgütsel Bağlılık İlişkisi". Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Erzurum.
- Nayır, S. (2010). "Kurum Kültürü ile Örgütsel Öğrenme Süreçleri Arasındaki İlişkilere Yönelik Bir Araştırma". Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Beykent Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Noruz, A. et al. (2013). "Relations Between Transformational Leadership, Organizational Learning, Knowledge Management, Organizational Innovation, And Organizational Performance: An Empirical Investigation Of Manufacturing Firms". *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, 64(5-8), pp.1073-1085.
- Özer, P. (2013). "Özel Hastanelerin Örgütsel Öğrenme Düzeyleri ile Sağlık Profesyonellerinin İş Tatminleri ve İş Yaşam Kaliteleri Arasındaki İlişki". Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Beykent Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Pantouvakis, A. and N. Bouranta (2013). "The Link Between Organizational Learning Culture and Customer Satisfaction: Confirming Relationship and Exploring Moderating Effect". *The Learning Organization*, 20(1), pp.48-64.
- Radzi, C. et al. (2013). "The Relationship Among Transformational Leadership, Organizational Learning, and Organizational Innovation: A Case Study in Asian Manufacturing Food Industry". *Asian Journal of Empirical Research*, 3(8), pp.1051-1060.
- Sanz-Valle, R. et al. (2011). "Linking Organizational Learning with Technical Innovation and Organizational Culture". *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 15(6), pp.997-1015.
- Senge, P. M. (1996). *Beşinci Disiplin (The Fifth Discipline)*, Doubleday, New York, 1990). Çev.Ayşegül İldeniz ve Ahmet Doğukan, Yapı Kredi Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Soliman, F. (2015). *From Knowledge Management to Learning Organization to Innovation: The Way Ahead*, Cambridge. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Şimşek, M. Ş. ve A. Çelik (2016). *Yönetim ve Organizasyon*. 18.Baskı, Eğitim Kitabevi, Konya.
- Şimşek, M. Ş., A. Çelik ve T. Akgemci (2008). *İşletme Becerileri Grup Çalışması*. Gazi Kitabevi, Ankara.

- Şimşek, M. Ş., A. Çelik ve T. Akgemci (2016). *Davranış Bilimlerine Giriş ve Örgütlerde Davranış*. 9.Baskı, Eğitim Yayınevi, Konya.
- Tan, F. Z. (2015). "Öğrenme, Örgütlerde Öğrenme, Öğrenen Organizasyonlar Terimlerinin Tanımı ve Kavramsal Ayırımı". *Business and Management Studies: An International Journal*, 2(2), ss.188-217.
- Tibet, B. (2015). "Predictors of Organizational Learning Capability in Primary and Secondary Schools". Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, Middle East Technical University Social Sciences Institute, Ankara.
- Uzuntarla, Y. vd. (2015). "Örgütsel Öğrenme Yeteneği: Bir Üniversite Hastanesi Örneği". *Çankırı Karatekin Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 5(1), ss.189-208.
- Ünalır, Ö. H. (2013). "Örgütsel Öğrenme Ortamı Oluşturmada Kurum İçi İletişimin Rolü". Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Wang, Y. L. and A. D. Ellinger (2011). "Organizational Learning: Perception of External Environment and Innovation Performance". *International Journal of Manpower*, 32(5/6), pp.512-536.
- Yavuz, M. (2014). "Kriz Hazırlık Yeteneğinde Örgütsel Öğrenmenin Rolü ve Firma Performansına Etkileri". Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Gebze Teknik Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Kocaeli.
- Zahra, S. A. (2012). "Organizational Learning and Entrepreneurship in Family Firms: Exploring the Moderating Effect of Ownership and Cohesion". *Small Business Economics*, 38(1), pp.51-65.