The Relationship Between Teachers' Intergenerational Knowledge Sharing and Schools' Learning Organization Profiles

Tuğba Zişan Şensoy | iD | tzisansari07@gmail.com
Kocaeli University, Faculty of Education, Educational Sciences Department, Kocaeli, Turkiye
Soner Polat [1] | iD | spolat@kocaeli.edu.tr
Kocaeli University, Faculty of Education, Educational Sciences Department, Kocaeli, Turkiye

Abstract
The study aims to explore the relationship between teachers' perceptions of intergenerational knowledge sharing and the learning organization profile of schools. This study employed a correlational research design. The data were collected through "Intergenerational Knowledge Sharing Scale" and "Learning Organization Profile Scale". Data were collected using online survey. A total of 683 teachers participated in the survey and after removing outliers, 636 responses were analysed. The research findings indicate teachers' perception level of the intergenerational knowledge sharing and level of organizational profile of school's variables are above the moderate level. The results of correlation analysis showed a low but significant relationship between the levels of knowledge sharing across generations and the learning organization profile of schools.

Keywords: Intergenerational knowledge sharing, Learning organization, Learning, Teacher, Generation.

---

[1] Corresponding Author

Introduction

Recent developments have led many organizations to understand the needs of both older and younger employees. This understanding extends not only to knowledge needs, personal characteristics, and learning habits but also to various contingencies and situational issues. Consequently, we have begun developing various opportunities for intergenerational knowledge sharing. Organizations can choose options that combine both social and technical approaches to sharing knowledge, enable the exchange of both explicit and tacit knowledge. Technical approaches are often invaluable in conveying explicit knowledge that can be used as needed, whereas social approaches are better suited for conveying tacit knowledge (Rupčić, 2018).

Today's workplace comprises of different generations, including baby boomers generation and members of generation X, generation Y, and generation Z. These groups use their experiences and knowledge within the organization to shape their own career paths (Rupčić, 2018). The lack of willingness of employees of different ages to share knowledge is costly for companies (Fasbender, Gerpott & Unger, 2021).

The term "generation" was first mentioned as a concept by the German Sociologist Karl Mannheim in a book written in 1928 (Taylor, 2008). When the literature is examined, it is observed that scientists have not reached a clear consensus on the age ranges and names of generations. One of the most common classifications today is as follows: 1925-1945: The Silent (Traditional) Generation, 1946-1964 Baby Boomers Generation, 1965-1980 Generation X, 1981-2000 Generation Y, 2000 and beyond Generation Z. Each generation has different characteristics due to the period in which it was born and grew up and the environmental conditions. Having individuals with different values, beliefs and attitudes in the same organization not only creates opportunities for these organizations, but also presents risks. Transforming these risks into opportunities by analyzing them correctly and increasing knowledge sharing can be considered extremely important for organizations. One of the most important aspects of continuity that must be ensured by organizations is knowledge sharing between generations. In fact, since the 1990s, it has been predicted that the aging population will have an impact on organizations and management practices, and today these predictions have become a reality (Drucker, 1993).

Schools are among the few places where all generations come together. Therefore, the faculty composition in schools reflects intergenerational diversity. Generational diversity has many benefits for schools because it allows school members to exchange and discuss different perspectives. Intergenerational diversity can enhance the intergenerational learning ability of all school generations through intergenerational knowledge sharing. As intergenerational learning capacity increases, so does the level of learning organization in schools.

The improvement of schools relies upon on their cappotential to increase and make use of human resources, specifically and knowledge. School improvement relies upon at the cooperative and synergistic efforts of all school individuals. A school has no ability for improvement except its individuals increase powerful relationships to acquire, share, and make use of knowledge.

Every generation has unique contributions. While younger digital natives may have more knowledge about information and communication technologies, senior members of the organization may have gained deeper insight into the relationships and leverage points of business systems. Therefore, for organizations to continuously learn and survive, building cross-generational collaboration is paramount and depends on knowledge sharing. On the other hand, the value of intergenerational cooperation must be embedded withinside the organizational way of life to make certain that interactions are characterised through respect, dignity and mutual understanding (Rupčić, 2018).

Literature review
Intergenerational Knowledge Sharing

Knowledge transfer is a "dual exchange of organizational knowledge between a source and a receiving entity" that involves the provision of knowledge by a source and the acquisition, retention, and use of knowledge by a receiver (Szulanski, 1996). Intergenerational knowledge transfer is an active, reciprocal process where both tacit and explicit knowledge are shared among individuals from different age groups (Harvey, 2012). This type of knowledge transfer encompasses both the dissemination and assimilation of insights among younger and older employees within a workplace (Wang et al., 2017). The concept of knowledge transfer is categorized into two forms: the exchange of knowledge among peers and the transfer of knowledge across different generations (Kalkan, 2006).

In intergenerational knowledge transfer, the focus is on vertical knowledge transfer between generations of employees. This consists of his activities: know-how contribution and know-how acquisition (Kalkan, 2006; Wang et al., 2017; Burmeister et al., 2020). Intergenerational knowledge transfer can be identified by three axes sustainability of intergenerational relationships, responsibility for knowledge acquisition, and knowledge sharing (Kuyken et al., 2018).

Professional age may require younger employees to expand their knowledge, while older employees are typically experts in specific areas of the organization. Young professionals can actively ask questions of older professionals, receive feedback, and gain experience on the job. Through these intergenerational knowledge transfer activities, young workers can expand their existing knowledge (Mannucci and Yong, 2018). Elder employees can share their proficiency in organizational processes with younger colleagues (Fasbender and Gerpott, 2021). While younger employees impart technical knowledge, senior managers often play the role of teachers who challenge the mental models of their colleagues and engage in continuous learning (Senge, 1990). Therefore, intergenerational knowledge transfer is important for younger generations to enrich their knowledge base and innovate within organizations.

Knowledge sharing involves communicating information between people in order to use existing knowledge to improve the performance of the group. Davenport and al., (1997) defined knowledge sharing as a voluntary behavior by separating it from the act of reporting. While reporting is an information exchange that includes a set of structured formats and routines, sharing refers to a behavior in which individuals contribute willingly without any coercion to the parties (Davenport et al., 1997).

Learning Organization

The concept of "Learning Organization", which was first used by Peter Senge in his work "The Fifth Discipline" in 1990, is widely used today. Senge defined the learning organization as "a group of people who work together to develop their capacity and to create results that they truly care about" (Fulmer & Keys, 1998). Senge (1990) introduced the component technologies (disciplines) necessary for learning organizations in the Fifth Discipline. These components are systems thinking, individual mastery, shared vision and learning, mind models as a team (Senge, 1990). In the literature, there are various definitions of learning organisations. A learning organization can discover its power and has the capacity to use this power (Genc, 2004). The phenomenon of learning organization means that the organization works as a kind of collective intelligence. Although the organization is considered as a complex and living organism, it is noted that the personal learning of individuals evolves into organizational learning. Karash (2002) also defined the learning organization as continuous and capacity building activities to achieve desired results at any level individually and as a group. According to Mohanty and Kar (2012), a learning organization constantly expands its capacity to build its future. Learning organizations are organizations that always see learning as the most important element, aim for the continuous development of individuals in the organization, accept communication as a permanent prerequisite, and where the sharing of opinions and information for sustainable development is effective (Koçel, 2003). A learning organization is an organization that can bring into open, acquire and transfer knowledge and change its behavior to create new knowledge. Organizations that can be successful in the future are those that have the potential and desire for individual learning and organizational learning, as well as those that can produce valid and reliable information and apply it to new areas. It is not enough for organizations to learn only certain stereotypes. They need to be able to produce new knowledge, apply their existing knowledge and experience to new fields, and use their knowledge as a production item. Learning organizations are organizations that are seen as a natural process. There are various features that make learning organizations different from other organizations. In learning organizations, the act of learning is not an addition to the work, on the contrary, it is a normal part of the work. Collaboration is at the core of all relationships between individuals in learning organizations. All individuals involved in the organization, while improving the basic components that form the learning organization. According to Yeo and Marquardt (2010), it is fostering a collaborative learning environment, establishing formal and informal learning processes, and reinforcing learning through effective human resource management practices.

In order for a school to become a learning organisation, it's essential that humans dare to innovate of their day by day practice. When a school becomes a learning organisation, it helps and protects folks who take risks, and rewards them for it. It additionally expects that humans will maintain an open thoughts approximately new methods of doing things. Teachers are consequently helped to triumph over the uncertainties and isolation of conventional coaching thru open and collegial dialogue, replacing thoughts and sharing experiences, struggling with troubles and techniques, and through experimenting. As learning organisations, schools have structures in location to make certain they are "information-rich" or, extra appropriately, "knowledgerich". Information isn't always knowledge;

it takes social processing withinside the school context to carry information to life. So, for a learning tradition to emerge, schools as learning organisations want to create the systems for normal talk and knowledge sharing amongst staff (Kools & Stoll, 2016).

Schools as learning organizations ,the link between staff's personal and interpersonal learning and the way schools learn collectively is considered to be the key to success and change (Giles & Hargreaves, 2006). For schools to become learning organizations, it is important that people boldly innovate in their daily practices. As learning organizations, schools therefore support, protect and reward those who take risks. Schools as learning organizations expect people to be open to new approaches (Kools & Stoll, 2016).Teachers can therefore overcome the uncertainty and isolation of traditional education through open dialogue, the exchange of ideas and experiences, discussion of topics and techniques, and experimentation. Bringing information to life requires social processing within schools. Schools as learning organizations need to create structures for regular dialogue and knowledge exchange among employees for a learning culture to emerge (Kools & Stoll, 2016). For schools to foster and maintain effective teacher development, it's essential to cultivate practices and processes characteristic of a learning organization (Opfer & Pedder, 2011). The traits of a school functioning as a learning organization, as outlined by Kools & Stoll (2016), include:

- Cultivating and disseminating a student-centered learning vision
- Providing continuous learning opportunities for educators
- Encouraging collaborative learning and teamwork among faculty
- Promoting a culture of innovation and inquiry through research
- Enabling the collection and exchange of knowledge and educational insights within the system
- Engaging in learning activities that incorporate external environments and the broader educational framework
- Demonstrating and nurturing leadership in learning

When we look at these dimesions, we can see that there is a direct connections between sharing knowledge and learning organisations.

The relationship between intergenerational knowledge sharing and the learning organization

Knowledge sharing, which is be defined as the search for functional information or the transfer of ideas within organizations, requires communication and interaction among individuals within the same organization. According to Hendriks (1999), knowledge sharing requires a relationship between at least two parties, one who needs the information and the other who has the information. In organizations, individuals continually create and share knowledge, making knowledge sharing is considered a spontaneous activity (Hendriks, 1999).

Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) argue that knowledge dissemination is essential to building a learning organization where knowledge becomes a strategic asset of the organization. In particular, Tempest (2003) emphasizes the intergenerational transfer of knowledge based on individual and organizational memory. We define knowledge transfer as the transfer of skills related to specific tasks and tacit knowledge, including appropriate organizational behavior and overall decision-making skills, which encompass culture, organizational politics, and acceptable leadership styles. Additionally, it involves the transfer of experiential knowledge. The transfer of tacit knowledge is critical to organizational survival as older generations step away from leadership positions and younger generations assume such roles (Sprinkle and Urick, 2018).

Knowledge transfer is a crucial component of an organization's learning mechanisms (Easterby-Smith and Lyles, 2011). Lately, there has been a growing recognition among organizations of the importance to pinpoint and foster additional avenues for building knowledge across generations (Gerpott et al., 2017).

Therefore, the exchange of knowledge between older and younger employees is highly relevant to the organization's collective memory and contributes to business success (Fasbender, Gerpott & Unger, 2021). Intergenerational knowledge transfer plays an important role in organizational learning. Numerous evolving learning organizations are concentrating on establishing what are known as learning and practice communities. These communities are pivotal in enriching the learning experience, boosting learning adaptability, and elevating organizational practices. The growth of effective practice and learning communities is contingent upon the fortification and enhancement of intergenerational bonds and reciprocal learning. Consequently, it is evident that the methodologies and strategies examined thus far are instrumental not only in bolstering intergenerational unity but also in fostering robust learning and practice communities (Rupčić, 2018).

Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) stated that the best way to create organizational knowledge is to transfer and transform knowledge. In order to provide learning at the organizational level, it is necessary to create the capacity to store knowledge, support the creation process of knowledge, constantly transform and transfer knowledge (Watkins & Golembiewski, 1995). Knowledge sharing that occurs through the interaction of individuals with different demographic characteristics also includes the concept of intergenerational learning.

When employees retire, it is undesirable situation for organizations to lose their accumulated experiences and knowledge. This phenomenon can mean loss of information and transferring information is vital for the continuity of the organization. At this point, it can be said that it is highly important for organizational learning that previous generations share their knowledge with new employees or employees with less experience than themselves. In this way, members of the organization can learn from each other, make innovations, and as a result, they can combine their experiences and knowledge to increase organizational performance (Hambrick et al., 1996). Therefore, sharing the knowledge of individuals from different generations in the same organization can play an important role in increasing the level of organizational learning and in the formation of a learning organization philosophy.

When considering schools as the primary sites for the dissemination and production of knowledge, their capacity to function as successful learning organizations depends on their promotion of double-loop learning. This approach takes individual and organizational assumptions and goals into account, together with actions, behaviors, and outcomes, aiming to improve them (Töremen, 2011). This means that knowledge is shared in schools and gains value as knowledge is shared (Özen, Kutanis & Mesci, 2013). New developments and changes occur constantly in all areas, including technical, technological and social, and more importantly, a newer model of a product or a more comprehensive form of information emerges within very short periods of time, which can be expressed as days. Only teachers can create an organization that processes information and produces new knowledge. Teachers who stay away from the new developments and changes on the agenda for a while cannot renew themselves and cannot find the opportunity for personal/professional development. At this point, it is essential for teachers of the same branch to learn while producing knowledge together and to share the learned knowledge. Competition among teachers, whether in the same branch or not, should be about learning new knowledge, the knowledge should not remain hidden within the teacher itself, but should be shared in order to achieve the goals set by the school (Taşargöl, 2013).

Purpose of the Study

While numerous studies have delved into the concepts of intergenerational knowledge sharing and learning organizations, the nexus between these two phenomena, particularly in the context of schools, remains underexplored. This study aims to bridge this gap by examining the relationship between intergenerational knowledge sharing and the learning organization profile perceptions among teachers from different generations working in schools.

Research Question: Is there a significant relationship between the intergenerational knowledge sharing practices of teachers and the level of the learning organizational profile in schools?
This study seeks to provide valuable insights into this relationship, contributing to the broader discourse on educational development and organizational learning.

Method

Research Pattern

Correlational research design, one of the quantitative research designs, was preferred in the research. Correlation studies are studies in which the relationships that may exist between two variables or more variables are examined without any intervention to the existing variables (Büyüköztürk, et al., 2012). At this point, when intergenerational knowledge sharing among teachers and organizational learning levels of schools are considered as variables, a correlational research design deemed suitable for examining the relationship between these two variables.

Universe and Sample

The universe of the research includes the teachers working in the primary, secondary and high schools located in Gebze, Kocaeli during the 2020-2021 academic years. 3928 teachers are working in Gebze District of Kocaeli province in the 2020-2021 academic year. Sample of this paper consists of 683 teachers working in Gebze. For

sample selection, simple random sampling method was employed. This method involves selecting units by granting equal selection probability to each unit (Büyüköztürk et al., 2016).

Data Collecting Tools and Analysis

In this research, the "Learning Organization Profile Scale," developed by Bowen, Ware, Rose, and Powers (2006) and adapted to Turkish by Sahin, Cakır, and Oztürk (2014), was utilized. This scale includes 36 items with two components, the first being action and the second being sensitivity. The correlation value between the sub-dimensions of the scale was found to be 0.85. The Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficient for the scale was determined to be 0.96. The "Intergenerational Knowledge Sharing Scale," adapted from the "Information Sharing Behavior Scale: Scale Development and Validation" by Yi (2009), and consisting of 28 items and 4 factors in its original version, was adapted into Turkish by Çelik (2019). The Turkish version of the scale consists of 26 items and four sub-dimensions. Sub-dimensions; Written Contributions, Organizational communications, Personal interaction, Communities of practice. Scale reliability analysis test was performed and Cronbach's alpha (α) value was found to be 0.86. According to the results of the reliability analysis, the scale is described as reliable. In the data collection tool prepared in a five-point Likert type, optional items were graded in the categories of "(5) Strongly agree, (4) Agree, (3) Neither agree nor disagree, (2) Disagree, (1) Strongly disagree".

To examine whether the data follow a normal distribution, skewness and kurtosis coefficients were analyzed. The calculations yielded the following results: for **Intergenerational Knowledge Sharing**, skewness = -0.45 and kurtosis = -0.23; for **Written Contributions**, skewness = -0.74 and kurtosis = 0.25; for **Organizational Communication**, skewness = -0.89 and kurtosis = 0.95; for **Personal Interaction**, skewness = -0.40 and kurtosis = -0.42; for **Application Communities**, skewness = -0.50 and kurtosis = 0.07; and for **Learning Organization Profile**, skewness = -0.95 and kurtosis = 0.71. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2015), skewness and kurtosis values between -1.5 and +1.5 indicate that the data can be assumed to follow a normal distribution.

In the light of these findings, it can be statedthat the variables are normally distributed. The data obtained in the research are suitable for performing parametric tests. In addition, arithmetic mean, t-test and analysis of variance, correlation analysis and regression analysis were applied to the available data. When interpreting arithmetic means; the range of 1.00-1.80 was evaluated as "well below the average", the range of 1.81-2.60 as "below the average", the range of 2.61-3.40 as "average", the range of 3.41-4.20 "above the average" and the range of 4.21-5.00 "well above the average" (Can, 2014). While interpreting the coefficients related to the correlation analysis of the research data; A value in the range of $.10 \leq r < .30$ for the correlation coefficient between the variables is "low level of relationship", a value between $.30 \leq r < .50$ is "moderate relationship", and a value of $r \geq .50$ is "high level" relationship" (Field, 2013).

Results and Discussion

Table 1 shows the arithmetic mean and standard deviation values of intergenerational knowledge sharing and its sub-dimensions -written contributions, organizational communication, personal interaction and practice communities. According to the statistical findings presented in Table 1, it is seen that the level of intergenerational knowledge sharing among teachers (M=4.15, Sd=0.56) is above the average. Written contributions among teachers (M=4.06, Sd =0.76) are above the average, organizational communication (M=4.10, Sd =0.72) is above the average, personal interactions (M=4.15, Sd =0.58) are above the average and the practice communities sub-dimension (M=4.25, Sd =0.57) is well above the average.

Table 1. Arithmetic mean and standard deviation values for intergenerational knowledge sharing and its sub-dimensions

Variables	M	Ss
Intergenerational Knowledge Sharing	4,15	0,56
Written Contributions	4,06	0,76
Organizational Communication	4,10	0,72
Personal Interaction	4,15	0,58
Application Communities	4,25	0,57

According to the data in Table 2, it is seen that the perception level of teachers regarding the level of learning organization profile (M=4.07, SD=0.59) is "above the average"

Table 2. Arithmetic mean and standard deviation values for the level of learning organization profile

Variable	M	Ss
Learning Organization Profile Level	4,07	0,51

When examining the correlational findings presented in Table 3, positive and very low-level significant relationship is observed between knowledge sharing between generations and the level of learning organization profile (r=.08, p<.05). No significant relationship was found between the learning organization profile and the sub-dimensions of intergenerational knowledge sharing, namely written contributions (r=.06, p>.05) and organizational communication (r=-.01, p>.05). There is a positive and very low-level significant relationship between the learning organization profile and the sub-dimensions of intergenerational knowledge sharing, namely personal interactions (r = .10, p > .05) and application communities (r = .14, p > .01).

Table 3. Pearson correlation analysis results

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Intergenerational Knwledge Sharing					
2. Written Contributions	,84**				
3. Organizational Communication	,87**	,84**			
4. Personal Interaction	,93**	,69**	,70**		
5. Application Communities	,75**	,39**	,39**	,77**	
6. Learning Organization Profile Level	,08*	,06	-,01	,10*	,14**

**p < ,01 *p < ,05

Upon analyzing the correlation coefficient between the predictor variable of intergenerational knowledge sharing and the predicted variable of the learning organization profile in Table 4, a low level of positive relationship is identified (R=0.079). The analysis findings suggest that knowledge sharing between generations significantly predicts the learning organization profile (R=0.079, R2=0.004, F(3.844)= 212,922, p<0.01). Intergenerational knowledge sharing explains 004% of the learning organization profile.

Table 4. Simple regression analysis findings on the prediction of learning organization profile between generations of knowledge sharing.

Predictor Variable	B	ShB	β	t	p
Constant	3,741	,17		22,04	,000
Intergenerational Knowledge Sharing	,080	,041	,078	1,961	,023*
R= 0,079 R2= 0,004					
F(3, 844)= 212,922 p= 0,000					

**p < ,01 *p < ,05

Statistical findings in Table 5 show the results of multiple linear regression analysis on whether the sub-dimensions of intergenerational knowledge sharing predict the profile of the learning organization. Written contributions, organizational communication, personal interaction, communities of practice sub-dimensions of the intergenerational knowledge sharing variable predict the profile of the learning organization at a low level positively (R= 0.187, R2= 0.035, p<0.01). The four sub-dimensions that belong to intergenerational knowledge sharing explain 035% of the learning organization profile.
According to the standardized regression coefficients, the order of importance of the predictive variables in terms of affecting the learning organization profile: organizational communication (β=-0.219), written contributions (β=0.169), communities of practice (β=0.137), and personal interaction (β=0.041).

Table 5. Multiple linear regression analysis findings on the prediction of the learning organization profile of intergenerational knowledge sharing sub-dimensions.

Predictor Variable	B	ShB	β	t	p

Constant	3,58	,162		22,098	,000
Writing Contribution	,113	,05	,169	2,269	,024*
Organizational Communication	-0,155	,055	-,219	-2,84	,005*
Personal Interaction	,036	,075	,041	0,477	,633
Application Communities	,122	,058	,137	2,125	,034*

R= 0,187   R2= 0,035
F(5,701)= 168,308   p= 0,000

**p < ,01 *p < ,05

Conclusion

When the results obtained from the findings are examined, it is observed that teachers' perception levels of intergenerational knowledge sharing are above the average. This outcome indicates that individuals do not put obstacles in front of theirselves in terms of intergenerational knowledge sharing in schools and knowledge sharing is realized in terms of intergenerationality. Teachers exchange knowledge with their colleagues from the lower or upper generations on the subjects that they think their knowledge is not sufficient. Although research studies on this subject are limited in the literature, Çelik (2019) presented in his study that knowledge can be exchanged between individuals from different generations in schools, and that teachers consult their colleagues from different generations on subjects they think they do not know.

Geeraerts, Vanhoof, and Van den Bossche (2018) identified in their study that knowledge sharing among the teachers of a school occurs on many subjects, and especially on which subjects teachers need knowledge that they think different age generations have (Geeraerts et al., 2018). According to the study conducted by Bidian and Evans (2018), information about the organization is continuously shared among individuals from different generations. Furthermore, there is no intergenerational difference in terms of the choice of knowledge sharing areas, whether in the workplace or outside it (Bidian & Evans, 2018). Individuals from each generation (Baby Boomers, Generation X, and Generation Y) mostly prefer to share knowledge face to face. Other communication tools, such as telephone, email, and messaging, are also utilized for knowledge sharing. Given that the teachers are together in the school environment during their working days, it can be stated that they are in an area where intergenerational knowledge sharing can occur. This space, offering opportunities for intergenerational knowledge sharing, can form spontaneously or with the contribution of school administrators. Individuals from different generations can gather in an area where they can interact and share knowledge. These areas can be social and cultural activities outside the school environment as well as meetings, seminars, study groups at school (Polat et al., 2019).

In the study conducted by Arslan and Yener (2016), it was posited that it is beneficial for schools when teachers share knowledge with individuals from different generations, regardless of whether they belong to different generations. They highlighted that open knowledge sharing within the school is facilitated through a set of instructions, instructions and informatics tools. (Arslan & Yener, 2016). However, more social contexts are needed 288os hare tacit knowledge. Sharing tacit knowledge is perceived as more challenging compared to sharing explicit knowledge. In this study, it is observed that the teachers' level of perception of intergenerational knowledge sharing is high, indicating that teachers actively share knowledge with their colleagues from different generations, demonstrating a willingness to share knowledge regardless of generational differences. Regarding the sub-dimensions of intergenerational knowledge sharing, the findings of this study present that teachers' written contributions dimension, organizational communication dimension and personal interaction dimension are above the average, but the communities of practice sub-dimension is well above the average. This suggests that intergenerational knowledge sharing is most effective when teachers engage in activities or collaborate as teams.

It has been noted that teachers' learning organization profile perception levels are above the average. Considering this result, it can be inferred said that teachers in schools have awareness of the learning organization and perceive their schools as learning organizations, contributing to the sustainability of the schools. The results are realized in an atmosphere where the methods and techniques to be used in the solution process of the problems are developed. In these organizations, learning is the lifestyle of the members of the organization (Koçel, 1993). A learning organization is likely to emerge, driven by procedural education curricula that promote individual learning and making learning activity a lifestyle (Atak & Atik, 2007). In a related study, it was concluded that teachers are not only informative but also participatory and learners when necessary. It was also observed that teachers were willing and willing 288os hare their knowledge and learn as a team (Toremen, 1999). However, when comparing the

findings of this research with those from a study by Polat and Kazak (2015), differences are observed. In a study on the views of primary school teachers on learning from individuals belonging to different generations, primary school teachers were found to be less willing and voluntary in this regard. This finding contrasts with the findings obtained in this study. It can be said that the primary condition of being a learning organization is the desire to learn individually and 289os hare what has been learned. From this perspective, the willingness of individuals to learn from teachers and other learning resources, whether from the same or different generations, is deemed extremely important.

It can be stated that there is a low and significant relationship between the knowledge sharing of teachers between generations and the perception levels of the learning organization profile of the schools. Additionally, there is not a very low and positive significant relationship between the profile of the learning organization and written contributions, which is one of the sub-dimensions of intergenerational knowledge sharing. The relationship between the learning organization profile and the organizational communication, which is one of the sub-dimensions of intergenerational knowledge sharing, is positive and at a very low level. There is a low level of significance between the personal interactions sub-dimension and the learning organization profile, and a higher level among the practice communities than the other sub-dimensions, but at a low level and there appears to be a significant relationship. Learning organizations are characterized with the ability to shape the behavior of the organization in the light of this newly created knowledge, by creating, obtaining and transferring the necessary information within the organization itself (Garvin, 1994). To facilitate the emergence of new knowledge, share this knowledge with organization members, and utilize it for generating new ideas and systems, it is essential to view all skills acquired through this process as opportunities for new learning and knowledge creation. This process encourages the organization to embrace ongoing learning and knowledge generation (Kocel, 1993). From this perspective, there is a positive correlation between the knowledge sharing between generations and the level of the learning organization profile and they can act together. One of the prerequisites of being a learning organization is individual learning and team learning, which requires sharing these learnings within the organization. When the results of the research are evaluated, it is seen that the level of knowledge sharing between generations and the perception of the learning organization of the teachers are above the average. Therefore, for schools to evolve into more functional learning organizations, factors that increase the knowledge sharing between generations are crucial for the practitioners. Suitable spaces and environments can be created for intergenerational knowledge sharing between administrators and teachers. Social and cultural activities such as projects, workshops and demonstrations, where knowledge sharing between generations can be realized more proactively, can be given more space in schools. Additionally, social activities and teamwork involving teachers from both lower and upper generations can be organized to dispel prejudices and stereotypes that may hinder knowledge sharing between generations.

Implications and Recommendations

It is observed in this study that teachers' perception levels of intergenerational knowledge sharing are above the average. Teachers exchange knowledge with their colleagues from both lower and upper generations in areas where they feel their knowledge is not sufficient. It can be noted that this exchange occurs in both directions: older generations consulting younger ones and vice versa, facilitating knowledge sharing. It is evident that teachers learn to learn as individuals who have learned to teach, they are open to learning at the group level. They are willing to create and share new knowledge, and at this point, schools become learning organizations. Considering research findings, it is apparent that teachers in schools are aware of the learning organization and that they have a perception of a learning organization in order to develop and ensure the sustainability of schools and that they see their schools as learning organizations. Learning organizations are described as entities that prioritize learning as the most crucial element, focus on the continuous development of individuals within the organization, uphold communication as a fundamental prerequisite, and effectively share opinions and information for sustainable development (Kocel, 2003).

As a result of this research, it can be suggested that various factors influence the emergence of a low level relationship between intergenerational knowledge sharing and learning organization. These factors include the individuals participating in the research, the fact that the research was carried out during the pandemic process, and the current knowledge sharing was not reflected in the perception of the learning organization. As Senge (1990) describes, members of a learning organization work together with mutual trust and support to achieve common goals and attain exceptional success in teams. Watkins and Marsick (1996) stated the dimensions of the learning organization as continuous learning, questioning and dialogue, team learning, empowerment, embedded system, system connection and strategic leadership. For this purpose, a learning organization tries to facilitate the learning of all its members and constantly transforms itself (Pedler, Burgoyne & Boydell, 1991). Considering the conceptual connection between these two concepts, the low prediction rate in this study can be attributed to

external factors such as the pandemic conditions experienced during the period when the research was conducted, and the fact that the existing intergenerational knowledge sharing in the schools where the research was conducted may not have been reflected in the learning organization. Schools can be considered natural learning organizations as teachers engage in a continuous process of learning and sharing knowledge while teaching.

In light of the findings and data analysis from this research, the following are recommended for practitioners:
- Suitable spaces and environments can be established for intergenerational knowledge sharing between administrators and teachers.
- Social and cultural activities such as projects, workshops and demonstrations, that facilitate proactive intergenerational knowledge sharing, should be more integrated into schools.
- To increase intergenerational knowledge sharing among teachers, interdisciplinary projects and studies that require team learning can be implemented.
- Social events and teamwork involving teachers from both lower and upper generations can be organized to dismantle prejudices and stereotypes that hinder intergenerational knowledge sharing.
- Administrators can promote knowledge sharing among their teachers through mentoring and reverse mentoring practices by getting to know their teachers comprehensively.

For further research, different and intriguing results can be obtained by exploring the relationships between two variables using different measurement tools. The research can be applied in various countries and the results can be compared with those of this study. Additionally, research focusing on more homogeneous groups, such as exclusively primary or high school teachers, can be conducted.

References

Admiraal, W., Schenke, W., De Jong, L., Emmelot, Y., & Sligte, H. (2021). Schools as professional learning communities: what can schools do to support professional development of their teachers?. *Professional development in education*, *47*(4), 684-698. DOI: 10.1080/19415257.2019.1665573

Argyris, C., & Schon, D. A. (1996). *Organizational learning II: Theory, Method and Practice*. MA: Addison-Wesley

Arslan, A. & Yener, S. (2016). The mediating role of employee voice and the moderator role of psychological comfort perception in the relationship between school administrators' motivational language and teacher tacit knowledge sharing. *16th Istanbul University Business Congress,* 288-300.

Atak, M., & Atik, İ. (2007). Örgütlerde sürekli eğitimin önemi ve öğrenen örgüt oluşturma sürecine etkisi: hava kuvvetleri komutanlığı sürekli eğitim modeli örneği. *Journal of Aeronautics & Space Technologies/Havacilik ve Uzay Teknolojileri Dergisi*, *3*(1), 63-70.

Aybar, S. (2011). *Analysis of the relationship between learning organizations and business productivity in businesses: an application in hotel businesses*. (Master's thesis, Istanbul Commerce University Social Sciences Institute, Istanbul).

Bidian, C. & Evans, M. M. (2018). Examining inter-generational knowledge sharing and technological preferences. *19th European Conference on Knowledge Management*. 95-103.

Bowen, G. L., Rose, R. A., & Ware, W. B. (2006). The reliability and validity of the school success profile learning organization measure. *Evaluation and program planning*, *29*(1), 97-104.

Braham, B. J. (1998) *Creating a Learning Organization*, İstanbul: Rota Publishing.

Burmeister, A., Wang, M., & Hirschi, A. (2020). Understanding the motivational benefits of knowledge transfer for older and younger workers in age-diverse coworker dyads: An actor–partner interdependence model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *105*(7), 748. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000466

Buyukozturk, S., Kilic Cakmak, E., Akgun, O.E., Karadeniz, S. & Demirel, F. (2008). *Scientific Research Methods*, Ankara: Pegem Publishing.

Cohen, L., & Manion, L. (1997). *Research methods in education*, London: Routledge.

Cyert, R. M., & March, J. G. (1963). *A Behavioral theory of the firm*, N.J: Prentice-Hall: Englewood Cliffs.

Çelik, Ç. (2019). *The Relationship between levels of ıntergenerational knowledge sharing and ıntergenerational learning levels among teachers*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Kocaeli University, Kocaeli.

Davenport, T. & Prusak, L. (2001). *Knowledge management in business*. İstanbul: Rota Publishing.

Davenport, T. H., De Long, D. W., & Beers, M. C. (1997). Building successful knowledge management projects. *Center for business innovation working paper*, *4*.

DiBella, A. J., Nevis, E. C., & Gould, J. M. (1996). Understanding organizational learning capability. *Journal of management studies*, *33*(3), 361-379.

Dodgson, M. (1993). Organizational learning: a review of some literatures. *Organization studies*, *14*(3), 375-394.

Drucker, P. F. (1993). The rise of the knowledge society. *The Wilson Quarterly*. *17*(2), 52-72.

Easterby-Smith, M. and Lyles, M.A. (Eds) (2011), *Handbook of organizational learning and knowledge management*, John Wiley&Sons, New York, NY.

Eren, E. (2001), *Yönetim ve organizasyon* (Çağdaş ve Küresel Yaklaşımlar). İstanbul: Beta Publication.

Fasbender, U., & Gerpott, F. H. (2021). To share or not to share: A social-cognitive internalization model to explain how age discrimination impairs older employees' knowledge sharing with younger colleagues. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *30*(1), 125-142.

Fasbender, U., Gerpott, F. H., & Unger, D. (2021). Give and take? Knowledge exchange between older and younger employees as a function of generativity and development striving. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, *25*(10), 2420-2443.

Fiol, C., M. & Lyles, M., A. (1985). Organizational learning. *Academy of Management Review*, *10*(4), 803-813.

Fulmer, R. M., & Keys, J. B. (1998). A conversation with Peter Senge: New developments in organizational learning. *Organizational Dynamics*. 27,2.

Garvin, D. (1993). Building a learning organization. *Harvard Business Review*. 7,4.

Geeraerts, K., Vanhoof, J., &Van den Bossche, P. (2018). Teachers' intergenerational advice and information seeking: content matters!. *Journal of Professional Capital and Community*, 3(4), 256–271.

Genc, N. (2004). *Management and organization: contemporary systems and approaches.* Ankara: Seckin Publishing.

Gerpott, F. H., Lehmann-Willenbrock, N., & Voelpel, S. C. (2017). A phase model of intergenerational learning in organizations. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *16*(2), 193-216.

Graf, N., Brown, A., & Patten, E. (2018). The Narrowing, but Persistent, Gender Gap in Pay. *Pew Research Center. 9*.

Hambrick, D. C., Cho, T. S., & Chen, M. J. (1996). The influence of top management team heterogeneity on firms' competitive moves. *Administrative science quarterly*, 659-684.

Harvey, J. F. (2012). Managing organizational memory with intergenerational knowledge transfer. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, *16*(3), 400-417.

Hendriks, P. (1999). Why share knowledge? The influence of ICT on the motivation for knowledge sharing. *Knowledge and process management*, *6*(2), 91-100.

Howe, N., & Nadler, R. (2012). Why generations matter: Ten findings from lifecourse research on the workforce. *Online). Tersedia di https://www. lifecourse. com/assets/files/Why% 20Generations% 20Matter% 20LifeCourse% 20Associates% 20Feb*, *202012*.

Kalkan, V. D. (2006). Knowledge continuity management process in organizations. *Journal of Business & Economics Research (JBER)*, *4*(3), 41-46.

Karash, R. (2002). Learning-org dialog on learning organization. http//www.learning.org.com/html. (Accessed 23.03.2021)

Kocel, T. (1993). *Bussiness management*. İstanbul: Beta Publishing.

Kools, M., & Stoll, L. (2016). *What makes a school a learning organisation?* Paris, France: OECD Publishing.

Kuyken, K., Ebrahimi, M., & Saives, A. L. (2018). Towards a taxonomy of intergenerational knowledge transfer practices: Insights from an international comparison (Germany–Quebec). *The Learning Organization*, *25*(2), 81-91.

Kyles, D. (2005). Managing your multigenerational workforce. *Strategic Finance*, *87*(6), 52.

Lant, T. K., & Mezias, S. J. (1992). An organizational learning model of convergence and reorientation. *Organization science*, *3*(1), 47-71.

Mannucci, P. V., & Yong, K. (2018). The differential impact of knowledge depth and knowledge breadth on creativity over individual careers. *Academy of Management Journal*, *61*(5), 1741-1763.

Mohanty, K., & Kar, S. (2012). Achieving Innovation and Success: Organizational Learning. *SCMS Journal of Indian Management*, *9*(1).

Morgan, G. (1994). *Images of organzation*. England: Sage Publications Ltd.

Ng, P. T. (2004). The learning organisation and the innovative organisation. *Human Systems Management*, *23*(2), 93-100.

Nonaka, I. (1994). A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation. *Organization science*, *5*(1), 14-37.

Nonaka, I. A. & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge creating company: how japanese companies create the dynamics of ınnovation*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press,

Polat, S., & Kazak, E. (2015). Primary school teachers' views on intergenerational learning. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 15(5), 1189-1203. https://doi. org/10.12738/estp.2015.5.2523..

Polat, S., Okcu, Y., & Çelik, Ç. (2019). Creating and utilizing spaces to enhance intergenerational learning at schools and results. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*. *8*(1), 1–8.

Rupčić, N. (2018). Intergenerational learning and knowledge transfer – challenges and opportunities, *The Learning Organization*, *25*(2). 135-142. https://doi.org/10.1108/TLO-11-2017-0117

Schuman, H., & Scott, J. (1989). Generations and collective memories. *American sociological review*, 359-381.

Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The arts & practice of the learning organization*. New York: Currency and Doubleday.

Senge, P.M., Kleiner, A., Roberts, C., Ross, R.B. & Smith, B.J., (1994). *The fifth discipline fieldbook.* New York: Doubleday.

Smith, J. W. & Clurman, A. (1997). *Rocking the Ages: The Yankelovich Report on Generational Marketing.* New York: Harper Collins.

Sprinkle, T. A., & Urick, M. J. (2018). Three generational issues in organizational learning: Knowledge management, perspectives on training and "low-stakes" development. *The Learning Organization*, *25*(2), 102-112.

Szulanski, G. (1996). Exploring internal stickiness: Impediments to the transfer of best practice within the firm. *Strategic management journal*, *17*(2), 27-43.

Şahin, S., Cakır, C., & Ozturk, N. (2014). Adaptation of the learning organization profile scale into Turkish: validity and reliability study. *Gaziantep University Journal of Social Sciences.* 13(1),153-168.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2015). *Using multivariate statistics*. (sixthed). Allyn & Bacon/Pearson Education. 6. Basımdan Çeviri: Mustafa Baloğlu, Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık, Ankara.

Taylor, J. C. (2008). Whither march the cohorts: The validity of generation theory as a determinant of the sociocultural values of Canadian Forces personnel. *Toronto: Canadian Forces College National Security Studies Program*, *10*.

Tempest, S. (2003). Intergenerational learning: A reciprocal knowledge development process that challenges the language of learning. *Management learning*, *34*(2), 181-200.

Tepeci, Y. M. & Kocak, A. G. N. (2005). Learning in teams: The key to being learning organizations. *Cukurova University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, *14* (1), 379-394.

Toremen, F. (1999). *Organizational learning and barriers in public and private high schools*. Fırat University Social Sciences Institute PhD Thesis. (Unpublished master's thesis). Elazig.

Toremen, F. (2011). *Learning school*. Ankara: Nobel Publishing.

Ucak, N. O., (2010). Knowledge: A multifaceted concept. *Turkish Librarianship*, *24*(4), 705-722.

Wang, C., Zuo, M., & An, X. (2017). Differential influences of perceived organizational factors on younger employees' participation in offline and online intergenerational knowledge transfer. *International Journal of Information Management*, *37*(6), 650-663.

Wang, S., & Noe, R. A. (2010). Knowledge sharing: A review and directions for future research. *Human resource management review*, *20*(2), 115-131.

Watkins, K. E., & Golembiewski, R. T. (1995). Rethinking organization development for the learning organization. *The International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, *3*(1), 86-101.

Yi, J. (2009). A measure of knowledge sharing behavior: Scale development and validation. *Knowledge Management Research and Practice*. *7*(1),65–81.https://doi.org/10.1057/kmrp. 2008.36