

# A Qualitative Investigation of Existing Learning Organization Prototypes

Kumkum Saxena<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Madhuri Rao<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Research Scholar, IT Department, Thadomal Shahani Engineering College, Mumbai-400050

<sup>2</sup> Professor, H.O.D (IT Department), Thadomal Shahani Engineering College, Mumbai-400050

\*\*\*

**Abstract** - Knowledge and specialized expertise learned over the years by companies are essential for growth and change, thereby offering a competitive advantage. As the learning institution develops and reinvents itself in response to the external environment, this experience is preserved and disseminated within the institution. Individual learning is transformed into organizational learning through the use of shared mental models and effective experimentation facilitation. This paper draws together the ideas put forward by numerous researchers on Learning Organizations and attempts to explain their applicability and significance in a globalized environment where the globalization of educated people, access to business knowledge, and continuously evolving technologies define the rules of the game. In an unpredictable, unstable, dynamic, and contradictory world, companies are gearing up to cope with economic instability, contend with internal chaos created by a pool of capital, and continue to thrive in the face of volatility. A learning organization that survives in such circumstances would have a honeycomb system's strength, reflecting performance, allowing for the free flow of knowledge, is lean, and its devoted members are working toward a single shared vision.

**Key Words:** Knowledge Management (KM), Learning Organization (LO), competitive advantage, Organizational Learning(OL).

## 1. INTRODUCTION

As early as 1959, strategists understood human capital's value in driving knowledge management when designing a business growth strategy. They Re-emphasized the connection between organizational capital, organizational learning, and competitive advantage twenty-five years later, in 1984. In the early 1990s and early twentieth century, there was a wave of academic papers and posts. The Learning organization concept started to gel and take shape in the early '90s by examining the dualistic relation between individual and organizational learning and what characteristics constitute a Learning organization.

Peter Senge introduced a systematic Learning Organization model in his book entitled The Fifth Discipline, in which he used -systems Thinking to integrate a Learning Organization's essential characteristics.[1]. Senge offered guidance to help organizations invest in learning, promote collaboration, exchange experiences, adjust to changing situations, and work toward a shared vision. In the last two decades, multiple models inspired by Senge have been

proposed, each one adding to the established literature and exploring additional dimensions that makeup learning organizations.

Some previous research has taken a descriptive approach, relying on generalized principles to determine how organizations learn. Some have called for a more prescriptive approach, advising on "how does an organization learn?".

Organizational culture, structure, strategies, leadership, and vision affect successful learning organizations' development by scholars. The dynamic, unpredictable, complex, and ambiguous environment we now live and work in necessitates creativity, performance, and agility through personalized products and services. A leader must find new ways to communicate with their teams, clients, and stakeholders to satisfy this demand by developing external knowledge, reflection on experiences, the stimulation of transformational ideas, and the use of resources and technologies that are rapidly emerging. Levitt and March describe organizational learning as the collective learning of its representatives, proposals, practices, programs, and frameworks.

## 2. ORGANIZATIONAL LEARNING AND LEARNING ORGANIZATIONS

Organizations do not necessarily react the same way as people do, and they are not limited to collaborative learning between individuals and their stakeholders. However, personal conceptual development happens whether or not an entity is a learning organization is determined by archiving and leveraging at the organizational level. It brings us the new definition that defines a learning organization into a sharper focus. The term "learning" was coined by Tsoukas to describe the process of information transfer from the source domain (individual) to the target domain (organization).[3]

Since individual learning is challenging in itself, researchers warn against using comparisons. Understanding, belief formulation, and mindset are included in the psychological construct of knowledge. Simultaneously, the behavioral dimension examines the impact of learning on progress and the ability to adapt to new environments. So, how else would Organizational Learning and Learning Organizations relate to one another? The procedure and technique by which organizations eventually become learning organizations are known as organizational learning. Thus, it is the mechanism by which a company develops its expertise and management

structures to boost its competitiveness in some conditions and cultures.

The variation between a Learning Organization and Organizational Learning, according to Garvin, is significant. While learning organizations demonstrate or have desired to teach continuous learning and adaptive characteristics, organizational learning only refers to collaborative learning for gaining knowledge. Organizational learning, according to Garvin, is a methodology, while the Learning Organization is a structure. [4]. Organizational learning refers to the firm's particular activities while learning organizations refer to a specific organization type. As a result, a learning firm excels in the practice of industrial learning.

Consequently, a learning organization (LO) is a form of a corporation, and organizational learning (OL) is a series of activities that assist people in learning. These frameworks have a few things in common: using employees' willingness to learn at all levels, leaders' role, the ready to change based on experiences, strengthening their type of excellence, and being more competitive.

### 3. MODELS OF LEARNING ORGANIZATION

Learning organizations are those organizations that react to the changing external environment. They are continually reinventing themselves to keep ahead of the competition and offer added value to consumers. An examination of the various learning organization models suggested by various researchers over the last two and a half decades reveals some common characteristics: leadership, a supportive atmosphere, knowledge sharing, and knowledge management are all necessary for success.

#### 3.1. Examining the strengths and attributes of other learning organization model

The fifth building block, Systems thinking, was initiated by Peter Senge and involves personal mastery, team learning, mental models, and shared vision.[3] It also allows for a comprehensive view of the situation, with relationships and patterns across disciplines, enhancing each individual's combined efficiencies as people agree on and embrace a common goal. When trying to concentrate on others, Senge tends to freeze a few variables that affect learning behavior. The model is based on a hypothetical, ideal organization that can easily absorb and adjust to evolving external circumstances. There is also a hypothetical employee who is loyal to the growth of the company. Whose professional life best reflects their particular interests and personalities? Individuals in the organization are seen as equally fair and involved in the pioneering efforts to develop, adapt, and alter in response to changing external events.[5] It ignores the role of the group in affecting the individual participants' actions and reactions. With this strategy, what is in it for me? It is set aside entirely when contemplating the new employer-employee relationship. As a result, there's a desire to think of the corporation as a single flawless entity that's immune to both the outside world and human life. Senge offers no guidance about how to build a learning organization [6]. The leader's function in a learning

organization is to understand gravity through his mental model. Harmful interactions or competency traps that the leader might be guilty of are not considered in this expectation. As the economic situation and internal structures, processes, and resources grow more dynamic and keep pace with technology, leaders' insights need to be in sync with new learnings and tools. Leaders are seasoned professionals who never make bad decisions, while their teams are a collection of workers who lack the capacity and ambition to adapt to changing circumstances on their own.

The team and external stakeholders are part of Pedler's e-Flow model, known as the Participative decision-making mechanism, to improve the sense of transparency ownership.[7] The E-Flow model performs better when it emphasizes the external and internal exchanges that occur within the business. The boundary staff's job is to keep the company focused on events that may be opportunities or threats by scanning the external environment. Internal exchanges in everyday work offer opportunities to learn and develop implicit information that ultimately becomes ingrained in organizational culture. Pedler's eleven characteristics were systematic, and they are used to survey the enterprise and introduce the Learning organization structure in companies including ABB, Billiton, Motorola, Pilkington, Rover, and SEMCO. When Pedler refers to Information to use the public domain to speed up knowledge flow, he almost seems ahead of time.

A learning organization will concentrate on learning—also known as the double loop mental process—until mental model transitions successfully apply collective learnings. The OADI-SMM model is an excellent place to start when it comes to integrating cognitive processes into organizational knowledge.[8] It incorporates concepts of double-loop learning. Kim's OADI-SMM model has four stages: observe (from experience), evaluate (from observations), design (from abstract concepts), and implement (testing the ideas). It distinguishes between the organization and individual learning, taking into account organizational dynamics and individual learning efforts. It shows how organizational awareness is built through special education, double-loop learning, and collaborative conceptual models. The organization's information flow phase [9] was brought up by Garvin. The three core components questionnaire assisted leaders in evaluating the learning organization and taking corrective action by emphasizing the importance of psychological safety, a standardized learning process, and an effective learning environment.

O'Brien established the twelve fundamental blocks that promote organizational learning, including behavioral dimensions and strategy, visions, managerial practice, team learning, and knowledge flow. [10]The INVEST model by Pearn was also well-received by the industry, including 3M, British Airways, and Southern Life Assurance all endorsing it[11]. The skills and knowledge needed to construct a learning organization and drive organizational learning, as well as the interconnections and dynamics between all six factors, were correctly stated. It did not, though, go further

than strengthening skills development to enhance organizational performance. Goh reframes the corporate design, which also has an impact on the appropriate skillsets. [12]. Through a synthesis of existing models, Marquardt connects the attention to learning with a strategic advantage.[13] He concentrated on the organization's mutual intellect and experience and the driving power they created. He backed up his theory with a second publication that provided further evidence. Methods and strategies to make action learning more effective.[14]

Employees should be able to try new things without fear of consequences, reflect on their experiences, share whatever they've learned, and work together to achieve. Managers who are preoccupied with client management, service/product distribution, and people are skeptical of excessive equality and justice because it raises many issues. A common source of concern is a lack of authority, which leads to indiscipline and unmanageable demands. In a disgruntled company, workers may choose not to engage in the decision-making process actively.

When money and reputation are on the line, experimentation comes at a price. Leaders who must contend with the realities of business have little time and money for fanciful experiments. On the other hand, a learning organization should bridge the gap by coaching and mentoring its employees and identifying the company's appetite for risk.

Gephart and Marsick address interconnected processes and first mention a people-centered approach.[15] The Learning Organization Dimensions revisited this model. At the individual, team, and organizational levels, it captured seven interrelated dimensions of learning organizations. These include continuous learning that encourages everyone to learn, a culture of questioning, input, creativity, and team learning representing teamwork and collaborative skills. Transformational leadership is an embedded mechanism that lets the organization capture and exchange learning, strategic thinking that binds internal and external contexts, and leadership effectiveness. It culminated in a mutual common vision and intelligence on the underlying gaps that must be overcome in order to achieve this future scenario. The DLOQ paradigm has found widespread application since it goes beyond learning to examine how learning and information translate into organizational changes in three dimensions: lifelong development, knowledge consequences, and operational performance in a continuous phase. The survey results assist us in determining whether the company uses learning to improve productivity and taking strategic measures to address the data's issues. DLOQ has been adopted by executives at Columbia Business School, non-profit organizations, financial and high-tech firms, for-profit organizations, government agencies, and academic institutions. It took into account the person's status and environment, employee expectations, and a high level of accuracy, range, and scale. DLOQ can be coupled with other validated assessment instruments [16].

### 3. CONCLUSIONS

The concept of a learning company has never been more relevant than it is now. Knowledge-intensive businesses, technological advancements, and the reduced shelf life of value propositions allow businesses to adapt their frameworks and processes on a regular basis to meet this challenge. Knowledge is one of the most valuable weapons for gaining a competitive advantage since it is the only weapon in the strategic arsenal that is special and difficult to duplicate. As organizations create the supportive environment needed to optimize skills learned over time, it is important to explore the behavioral and cognitive elements that drive individual and team behaviors. This can be accomplished by investing in internal talent development, communicating the program, and presenting the results. Through a collaborative approach that embraces the reality of individual desires, the learning organization will harness its participants' conceptual models and invest in teamwork and team learning that will propel organizational learning. The traits of a learning organization are not static, and interconnectedness bind together the different attributes to create a 'bee-hive,' which helps it maintain its market place. In a Learning Organization, learning is a complementary, collaborative, all-inclusive, and comprehensive process beyond preparation and affects common beliefs and vision.

### REFERENCES

- [1] Senge, P. M. (2006). *The Fifth Discipline: The Art & Practice of The Learning Organization* (Revised&Updated ed.). Doubleday.
- [2] Nonaka, I. (1994). A Dynamic Theory of Organizational Knowledge Creation. *Organization Science*, 5(1), 14–37. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.5.1.14>
- [3] Tsoukas, H. (1991). The Missing Link: A Transformational View of Metaphors in Organizational Science. *The Academy of Management Review*, 16(3), 566. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258918>
- [4] Building a Learning Organization. (2014, August 1). Harvard Business Review. <https://hbr.org/1993/07/building-a-learning-organization>
- [5] Friedman, V. J., Lipshitz, R & Popper, M., (2005) The Mystification of Organizational learning. *Journal of Management Inquiry*. Volume: 14 issue: 1, page(s):19-30 Issue published: March 1, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1056492604273758>
- [6] Senge, P. (1994) *The Fifth Discipline Fieldbook: Strategies and Tools for Building a Learning Organization*. Currency, Doubleday. ISBN. 0385472560, 9780385472562
- [7] Pedler, M., Burgoyne, J. & Boydell, T. 1991. *The Learning Company*. Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill
- [8] Argyris, C. (2002). Double-loop learning, teaching, and research. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 1, 206-218.

- [9] Kim, D.H. (1993). The link between individual and organizational learning, Sloan Management Review, 37-50.
- [10] Bennett, J. K., & O'Brien, M. J. (1994). The building blocks of the learning organization. Training 31(6):41-9
- [11] Pearn, M., Roderick, C. & Mulrooney, C. (1995). Learning Organizations in Practice. McGraw-Hill, Maidenhead
- [12] Goh, S. C. (1998). Toward a learning organization: The strategic building blocks. SAM. Advanced Management Journal 63(2):15-20
- [13] Marquardt, M. J. (1996). Building the learning organization: a systems approach to quantum improvement and global success. New York: McGraw-Hill
- [14] Marquardt MJ (2002). Building the LO: Mastering the five elements for corporate learning. Davies-Black Publishing, Palo Alto, California
- [15] Gephart, M. A., and Marsick, V. J. (1996), Learning organizations come alive. Training & Development 50 (12): 34-44
- [16] Yang, B., Watkins, K. E., & Marsick, V. J. (2003) 'The construct of the learning organization: Dimensions, measurement, and validation,' Human Resource Development Quarterly, 15(1):31-55