

The Impact of Learning Organizations on Organizational Resilience Through Institutionalization: A Study During the Period of Covid-19*

Yaşar Yiğit KAÇMAZ¹
Aydın ÇEVİRGEN²

Received: 24.11.2021, Accepted: 30.12.2021
DOI Number: 10.5281/zenodo.5831835

Abstract

This study aims to determine the impact of learning organizations on organizational resilience through institutionalization. The population consisted of the managers of four and five-star accommodation businesses in Alanya, Turkey. The implementation step was conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic in September 2020 in 54 facilities, 43 of which were five-star and 11 four-star. A total of 392 questionnaires were collected while performing the study. As a result of the factor analyses, it was found that organizational resilience consisted of one factor which was also called organizational resilience, that institutionalization included three factors named professionalization-consistency, social responsibility, and formalization, and that learning organization contained two factors called individual and organizational learning. Correlation analysis results indicated a positive, moderate, and significant relationship between all factors. Hierarchical regression analysis and the Sobel test were utilized to determine the mediating impact. The results of the hierarchical regression analysis indicated that three institutionalization factors had a fully mediating role in terms of the impact of learning organization factors on organizational resilience.

Keywords: Organizational Resilience, Institutionalization, Learning Organization, Accommodation Businesses

JEL Codes: M19, L20, L29, L83

1. Introduction

Businesses need to adapt to the changing environmental conditions and increase their competitive capabilities against their rivals to maintain their presence. In addition, they should make the approach of learning organization a part of their

* This study was based on the doctoral thesis authored by Yaşar Yiğit Kaçmaz (Alanya Alaaddin Keykubat University, Institute of Postgraduate Studies, 2021).

¹ PhD, Independent Researcher, Alanya, Turkey, yykacmaz@hotmail.com, <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8775-7003>

² Assist Prof., PhD, Alanya Alaaddin Keykubat University, Turkey, aydin.cevirgen@alanya.edu.tr, <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3245-8783>

culture, improve their institutional structure and develop their organizational resilience to cope with crises. The issue of crises has recently taken the top spot on businesses' agenda. Many enterprises have suffered from crises due to environmental, financial, economic, and political changes arising from globalization. The global tourism industry, which holds a significant share in the global economy, has also been affected by these crises. The Gulf War of 1991, the 9/11 attacks, the 2003 Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) outbreak, the 2009 global economic crisis, and most recently, the COVID-19 pandemic are the crises of the last 30 years that have reduced the number of tourists (UNWTO, 2020; 2021). A series of severe pneumonia cases with unknown causes were reported from Wuhan, China, in December 2019. The World Health Organization (WHO) declared the SARS-CoV-2 outbreak a Public Health Emergency of International Concern on 30 January 2020 and then declared the COVID-19 outbreak a pandemic on 11 March 2020 (Cucinotta & Vanelli, 2020:157,158). Profoundly affecting all social and financial systems, COVID-19 is still causing death, and the pandemic continues despite all measures to stop it. Due to the pandemic's effect on the tourism sector, the rate of international tourists fell by 73% in 2020 to 399 million, with the tourism income dropping by 63.5%, decreasing to 538 billion dollars (UNWTO, 2021).

As reported above, the world has undergone crises for many different reasons; these crises significantly affect businesses. To cope with these crises and adapt to the changing environment, businesses should adopt various management approaches and adjust their organizational structure accordingly. The concepts of a learning organization, institutionalization, and organizational resilience are included in this scope. A *learning organization* is defined as one that promotes continuous learning and adapts to the changing environment (Malik & Garg, 2020: 1075). Businesses need the learning organization structure to sustain their competitive capabilities and perform activities efficiently during crises and periods of normalcy. For businesses, coping with crises and adapting to the changing environment depends on the status of organizational structure and the manner of management. One of the most important characteristics of businesses that have a professional management mechanism in place and that have managed to sustain their existence for a long time is that they are institutionalized. Accordingly, institutionalization is considered a significant concept for businesses to survive in a global market faced with uncertainties and increasing competition (Yağcı & Çevirgen, 2014: 1249-1250). Another important factor that affects businesses' attitudes during crises is their organizational resilience levels. Defined as an organization's capability to sustain its activities to continue existing under threatening conditions and later return to previous conditions (Gittell, Cameron, Lim, & Rivas, 2006: 303), organizational resilience is an organizational attitude experienced more during crises.

These three concepts (learning organization, institutionalization, and organizational resilience) relate to businesses' capability to cope with crises and adapt to a changing environment. The mediating impact of the institutionalization level in the relationship between learning organization and organizational resilience was examined in the scope of accommodation businesses. Another aspect making

this study unique is that it was conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic. The literature review performed for this study yielded no research examining the relationship between these three variables in this manner from the perspective of all sectors in general and the accommodation sector in particular. Therefore, the results obtained from this study are believed to contribute to the literature and assist managers of the accommodation sector during periods of normalcy and crises.

2. Literature Review and Hypotheses

2.1. Learning Organization-Organizational Resilience Relationship

Modern businesses reorganize their organizational structures to adapt to the changing environmental conditions due to globalization, react to changes rapidly, and achieve superiority over their competition. For such purposes, during the 1980s, businesses opted for total quality management. Various studies have shown that businesses adopted a learning organization approach during the 1990s. The ideal approach to achieving competitive superiority and adapting to environmental conditions is considered a learning organization (Atak, 2009: 23,52; Ulrich, Jick, & Von Glinow, 1993:54).

Definitions regarding learning organizations suggest that the concept focused on replacing the organizational culture with success; certain studies have examined the concept as a process-improving program. Reviewing the concept with different approaches makes defining the concept more difficult (Ulrich et al., 1993: 58). Therefore, different approaches toward the concept of learning organizations should be examined. According to the organizational approaches regarding organizational culture, a *learning organization* is defined as organizational structures that enable information to be revealed, gained, and transferred and that can change attitudes to reflect this information (Garvin, 1993: 3). According to Clarke (2001), learning organizations are the structures that can adapt to changing conditions, can learn lessons from experiences, use development opportunities, improve the quality, and maximize employees' contribution to the organization (Wilkinson, Rushmer, & Davies, 2004: 108). In terms of the approaches of improving institutional processes, displayed by learning organizations, Cohen (1991: 136) associated them with the process of designing an organizational structure and noted that this should occur by conveying information in the fastest and most reliable manner so that an organization can become a learning organization. Burunasin (2001: 52) stated that many processes should occur in learning organizations in a way that enables more people to access professional information faster, supports people in making decisions faster, working together, communicating, and generating new ideas more rapidly.

Regardless of how the concept is assessed, organizations need a learning organization structure to adapt and react to changing environmental conditions due to globalization and gain a competitive superiority. As organizations ensure the learning organization structure, it is believed that they will overcome organizational

crises during crises and non-crisis periods, sustaining their activities during changing environmental conditions. The term *organizational resilience* is another relevant concept in this regard.

Studies on organizational resilience were performed from two different perspectives (Lengnick-Hall, Beck, & Lengnick-Hall, 2011: 244). The first of these perspectives reviews the concepts of resilience as used in the discipline of ecology. Accordingly, the concept of *organizational resilience* is defined as an organization's capability to absorb an unexpected threat and sustain its activities. This definition indicates that organizational resilience is explained as an organization's act of adjusting itself to its previous status following the impact of a threat and displaying the expected performance as fast as possible by developing strategies for coping with the threats (Lengnick-Hall et al., 2011: 244). Mallak (1998: 1) had a similar perspective and defined the businesses using organizational resilience as the enterprises that can design and implement actions to continue their existence and increase their chance of survival. The second perspective regarding the concept is related to the capabilities a business can develop to generate new skills, adapt to new situations, and create new opportunities during crises. According to this perspective, the concept of organizational resilience emerges owing to a business' capability of utilizing unexpected situations and changes (Lengnick-Hall et al., 2011: 244). Vogus and Sutcliffe (2007: 3418) define organizational resilience as a business' ability to sustain its activities under threats and become stronger, absorbing every sort of new threat after terminating the current threat.

The concepts of learning organization and organizational resilience may be associated with one another. Studies conducted indicate that the number of research examining the relationship between learning organization and organizational resilience directly or indirectly is limited. A study conducted on academics in Egypt suggested that learning organizations had an impact on organizational resilience (Mousa, Abdelgaffar, Chaouali, & Aboramadan, 2020). Ghaderi, Som, and Wang (2014) conducted a study within Malaysia's tourism industry and examined the relationship between organizational learning and crisis management. They found that organizational learning was neglected and that such negligence affected crisis management. Another study conducted in the United States of America (USA) aimed to determine the factors affecting resilience and competitive power among businesses. Relevant results suggested that human resources and information management are essential for improving resilience (Gunasekaran, Rai, & Griffin, 2011). Based on the points above, it is safe to state that there is a relationship between learning organization and organizational resilience. Accordingly, hypothesis H₁ was set as follows;

H₁: Learning organization level has a significant impact on organizational resilience.

2.2. Learning Organization-Institutionalization Relationship

Concepts related to learning organizations suggest that relevant approaches focus on organizational culture and improving business processes. These approaches suggest that learning organizations are related to organizational structures. However, considering the attitudes of learning organizations during crises and later periods, institutionalization, another concept related to organizational structure, emerges. The concept of institutionalization is a term utilized for examining economic, socio-cultural, political, and technological events in organizations. How the organizations emerge, work and develop, how the internal and external relationships are, and how the organizational structure and operations are constitute the main topics of institutionalization (Güney, 2017: 252). Therefore, this concept is used and assessed through different perspectives. Based on its broadest definition, *institutionalization* is managing an organization based on certain purposes, principles, and values (Freitas & Guimaaes, 2007: 155). According to another definition, institutionalization is explained as the program and rule systems that are socially organized and routinely regenerated (Jepperson, 2021: 44). Definitions regarding the concept of institutionalization indicate that institutionalization is considered a social concept; its environmental impacts are present in definitions (Bilge, 2010: 24). According to Greening and Gray (1994: 467-468), the pressure businesses encounter due to their environment obligates institutionalization and adaptation to the environment. Considering the concept of institutionalization with the environmental impact, this concept is explained as an organization's transformation with environmental change and then ensuring standardization in an organization (March, 1996: 278-279). Similarly, Karpuzoğlu (2000: 54-55) noted that the structure of institutionalized organizations changes along with the environmental change, that the businesses become learning organizations, and that standards suiting the new conditions are developed after this change. In organizations with a high level of institutionalization, it is expected that the organizational structure is fixed and that the fixed structure is protected from any non-beneficial conditions after adapting to the changing environment.

Based on the institutionalization-related definitions above, it is fair to state that institutionalization may be related to learning organizations. Studies conducted in this scope were reviewed, and no study that directly reviewed the relationship between learning organizations and institutionalization was found. However, some studies indirectly examined this relationship. Avcı (2005) reported that attitudes, educational and developmental activities, and open-mindedness were significant for organizational learning. Özdemir (2006) stated that organizational learning was regarded as a triggering factor and increased organizational performance. Although the concepts of attitude, educational and developmental activities, open-mindedness, and performance were not within the scope of the study, it is safe to state that they are indirectly or directly associated with institutionalization. No study reviewing the relationship between learning organization and institutionalization was found in the literature. However, studies indirectly investigating this relationship and common aspects between relevant concepts

suggest that a relationship exists between learning organization and institutionalization. Accordingly, hypothesis H₂ was set as follows;

H₂: Learning organization level has a significant impact on institutionalization.

2.3. Institutionalization-Organizational Resilience Relationship

Organizations become obliged to institutionalize and harmonize with the environment due to the pressures related to the environmental crises and uncertainties (Greening & Gray 1994: 467-468). Considering the concept of institutionalization and the environment impact, this concept is explained as an organization's transformation with environmental change and ensuring standardization in an organization with this change (March, 1996: 278-279). Additionally, institutionalization concepts suggest that an organization must sustain its activities during crises, uncertainties, and subsequent periods. Considering the fact that the concept of organizational resilience is necessary for organizations to sustain their activities during crises, uncertainties, and subsequent periods, it is safe to say that there is a relationship between organizational resilience and institutionalization. Studies conducted indicate that the number of research examining the relationship between institutionalization and organizational resilience, directly or indirectly, is limited. Ignatiadis and Nandhakumar (2007) conducted a study in an international company and examined the impact of institutional systems on organizational resilience. According to the results, using institutional systems will increase, which may reduce organizational resilience. A study performed in the food industry in Germany examined the relationship between institutional climate adaptation strategies and resilience. According to its results, the development of strategies by businesses helped determine the strategic risks and opportunities in coping with any potential climate changes, which was effective in the institutional climate adaptation strategy (Beerman, 2011). Research conducted in Turkey by Polat (2018) examined the relationship between institutional management principles, institutional risk management, and internal control systems. Based on the results, it was understood that a relationship existed. Kumbalı (2018) assessed the relationships between information management and organizational resilience based on the organizational structure. As a result of this study, it was found that the organic organizational structure positively affected information management and organizational resilience. Furthermore, information management positively impacted organizational resilience, and information management had a mediating role for the impact of organizational structure on organizational resilience. Based on the points above, it is safe to state that there is a relationship between institutionalization and organizational resilience. Accordingly, hypothesis H₃ was set as follows;

H₃: Institutionalization level has a significant impact on organizational resilience.

2.4. Relationship Between Learning Organization, Institutionalization and Organizational Resilience

The literature review performed in this study indicated only one study examining the relationship between learning organization, institutionalization, and organizational resilience. The study conducted by Ebrahimi (2020) in Iran aimed to form a model investigating the relationship between institutionalized learning organizations and organizational resilience. Its results indicated that the model was significant and that the institutionalized learning organizations impacted resilience culture, resilience management, and resilience targets, all of which are the dimensions of organizational resilience. Although relevant studies were limited in number, the aforementioned concepts were found to be related to crises, uncertainties, and subsequent periods. Despite the deficiency of similar studies in the literature, a relationship is believed to exist between learning organization, institutionalization, and organizational resilience. Accordingly, hypothesis H₄ was set as follows;

H₄: Learning organization level affects organizational resilience through institutionalization.

3. Methodology

This study aimed to determine the impact of learning organizations on organizational resilience through institutionalization. The setting for the study was the accommodation facilities serving the tourism industry. The study was conducted using the qualitative research method and data was collected using questionnaires. The items were prepared using a 5-point Likert-type scale, where 1 indicated “completely disagree” and 5 “completely agree.” The process of questionnaire formation is presented below.

The shortened 21-item version (Yang, 2003) of the 43-item scale (Marsick and Watkins, 2003) was used for the items regarding learning organization. The items in the studies by Pugh et al. (1968), Oldham and Hackman (1981), Karpuzoğlu (2000), Denison (2001), Apaydın (2008), Tavşancı (2009), Şanal (2011), Yağcı and Çevirgen (2014) and Türkoğlu (2016) were used while creating the institutionalization scale. The institutionalization scale consisted of 33 items. For the organizational resilience scale, 13 items in the study by Orchiston et al. (2016) were used. Orchiston et al. formed these items utilizing the measurement instrument, the theoretical background of which was prepared by McManus (2008) and developed by Lee et al. (2013). After preparing the questionnaire items, the population and sample were specified.

The population consisted of the managers of four and five-star accommodation businesses in Alanya, Turkey. The Turkish district of Alanya has 184 hotels, 81 of which were five-star and 103 were four-star (Republic of Turkey Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2020). Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the procedure of Safe Tourism Certification was initiated by the Turkish Ministry of

Culture and Tourism. Receiving this certificate was made obligatory for the businesses that would operate in 2020. During the research period, it was understood that a total of 105 hotels (72 were five-star, and 33 were four-star) in Alanya had this certificate (Türkiye Tourism Promotion and Development Agency, 2020). The number of managers in these businesses could not be learned. Therefore, the sample size was set as 384 for a population of 100,000 and more (Sekeran, 1992: 253). Then, the implementation phase began.

First, a pilot study was conducted with 50 managers in the accommodation businesses. It was found that all variables were reliable. Then, the data collection phase was initiated. In September 2020, data was collected using the convenience sampling method. A total of 700 questionnaires were distributed to 58 accommodation businesses; of these facilities, 54 (43 were five-star, and 11 were four-star) filled in the questionnaires. A total of 458 questionnaires were collected. Of 458 questionnaires, 392 were problem-free. As this number was well above the sufficient sample size, the data collection phase ended, and analyses were conducted on Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) 24.0 package software.

4. Results

As a result of the reliability analysis regarding the variables in this study, Cronbach's alpha coefficient (α) was 0.961 for the learning organization scale, 0.964 for the institutionalization scale, and 0.937 for the organizational resilience scale, suggesting that the data was reliable. According to the normality distribution of the study, Skewness values ranged from -1.96 to +1.96 for all items, and Kurtosis values were between -2 and +2 (Hair Jr, Black, Babin & Anderson, 2014: 70-71). Distributions of scales were considered normal in the analyses performed after this step.

Table 1. Learning Organization Factor Analysis

Factor 1: Organizational Learning (OL)	FL	EV	REV	\bar{x}	α
20. In my company, leaders continually look for opportunities to learn.	.796				
21. In my company, leaders ensure that the organization's actions are consistent with its values.	.778				
18. My company encourages people to get answers from across the organization when solving problems.	.749				
15. My company supports employees who take calculated risks.	.745				
17. My company works together with the outside community to meet mutual needs.	.736	10.273	57.071	3.96	.950
16. My company encourages people to think from a global perspective.	.733				
13. My company recognizes people for taking initiative.	.731				
19. In my company, leaders mentor and coach those they lead.	.722				
12. My company measures the results of the time and resources spent on training.	.703				
11. My company makes its lessons learned available to all employees.	.699				

14. My company gives people control over the resources they need to accomplish their work.	.698				
10. My company creates systems to measure gaps between current and expected performance.	.676				
9. In my company, teams/groups are confident that the organization will act on their recommendations.	.658				
Factor 2: Individual Learning (IL)	FL	EV	REV	\bar{x}	α
1. In my company, people help each other learn.	.844				
2. In my company, people are given time to support learning.	.764				
4. In my company, people give open and honest feedback to each other.	.659				
5. In my company, whenever people state their view, they also ask what others think.	.650	1.114	6.118	3.92	.856
6. In my company, people spend time building trust with each other.	.582				
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin	.955; p<0.05				
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	5089.717; df 153; Sig. 000				
Rate of Explaining the Total Variance	63.259%				
Cronbach's Alpha	.955				
FL: Factor Loads, EV: Eigenvalue, REV: Rate of Explaining the Variance					
Source: Prepared by the authors					

Next, exploratory factor analyses were conducted. Table 1 presents the results of the factor analysis regarding the learning organization scale. Furthermore, it was understood that KMO (.955) and general reliability coefficient values ($\alpha=.955$) were high. The rate of explaining the total variance was 63.259% for the scale. Factor analysis indicated that 18 out of 21 items were collected under two factors. The first of these factors, organizational learning, consisted of 13 items, and the second factor, individual learning, consisted of 5 items.

According to Table 2, the KMO value was .938 for the institutionalization scale, and that the general reliability coefficient value was .934 for the scale. The rate of explaining the total variance was 64.470% for the scale. Factor analysis indicated that 18 out of 33 items were collected under three factors. The first of these factors, professionalization-consistency, consisted of eight items, and the second and third factors, social responsibility and formalization, had five items.

Table 2. Institutionalization Factor Analysis

Factor 1: Professionalization-Consistency (PC)	FL	EV	REV	\bar{x}	α
12. The ability to make decisions is at a high level among the professionals at our business.	.807				
11. The employees are rewarded based on their performance and abilities.	.807				
13. No intervention is made to the authorities and responsibilities of our employees.	.720				
23. Rewards and punishments apply to everybody in the same manner at our company.	.695	8.696	48.310	3.79	.896
10. Employees are promoted based on their performance and skills.	.603				
18. Our company has missions, visions, and strategies suiting our decisions.	.552				
19. The business processes and organizational structure are in harmony.	.533				

20. The business processes and employee competencies are in harmony.	.519				
Factor 2: Social Responsibility (SR)	FL	EV	REV	\bar{x}	α
32. Our employees are expected to follow the professional and sectoral norms.	.825				
31. Our employees are expected to display behaviors suiting the societal values and ethical rules.	.791				
30. Our company observes the benefit of society while performing actions and making decisions.	.755	1.597	8.872	4.13	.879
33. Our company controls the results of its activities and takes the relevant responsibilities.	.749				
24. All company activities are honestly reported to external auditors.	.587				
Factor 3: Formalization (F)	FL	EV	REV	\bar{x}	α
3. Our company has a written organization schema indicating the hierarchical relationships.	.795				
2. Duties, powers, and responsibilities of all employees are written down.	.784				
1. Operational instructions and company rules are written down.	.742	1.312	7.288	3.99	.843
6. Our company has an orientation program for new employees.	.549				
4. The company's purposes of the departments and employees are in harmony.	.568				
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin	.938; p<0.05				
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	4221.140; df 153; Sig. 000				
Rate of Explaining the Total Variance	64.470%				
Cronbach's Alpha	.934				
FL: Factor Loads, EV: Eigenvalue, REV: Rate of Explaining the Variance					
Source: Prepared by the authors					

Table 3 presents the results of the factor analysis for the organizational resilience scale. The KMO (.956) and general reliability coefficient (.937) values of the scale were high, and the rate of explaining the total variance was 57.179%. Factor analysis indicated that all of the 13 items were collected under one factor, organizational resilience.

Table 3. Organizational Resilience Factor Analysis

Factor 1: Organizational Resilience (OR)	FL	EV	REV	\bar{x}	α
6. There would be good leadership from within our organization if we were struck by a crisis.	.812				
7. Given our level of importance, the way we plan for the unexpected is appropriate.	.800				
5. We have a focus on being able to respond to the unexpected.	.798				
2. We have clearly defined priorities for what is important during and after a crisis.	.794				
4. Our organization maintains sufficient resources to absorb some unexpected change.	.779				
10. We are known for our ability to use knowledge in novel ways.	.777	7.433	57.179	4.01	.937
3. We build relationships with organizations we might have to work with in a crisis.	.756				
1. We proactively monitor our industry to have an early warning of emerging issues	.754				
13. We believe emergency plans must be practised and tested to be effective.	.746				
11. We can make tough decisions quickly.	.720				

12. There are few barriers stopping us from working well with other organizations.	.702
8. People in our organization are committed to working on a problem until it is resolved.	.699
9. If key people are unavailable, there are always others who could fill their role.	.677
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin	.956; p<0.05
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	3067.683; df 78; Sig. 000
Rate of Explaining the Total Variance	57.179%
Cronbach's Alpha	.937
FL: Factor Loads, EV: Eigenvalue, REV: Rate of Explaining the Variance	
Source: Prepared by the authors	

Correlation and regression analyses were performed to test the hypotheses following the factor analyses regarding the scales. The Pearson correlation coefficient was utilized during the correlation analysis. Correlation analysis results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Correlation Analysis Results

Variables	IL	OL	OR	PC	SR	F
IL	1	.764**	.585**	.690**	.668**	.558**
OL	.764**	1	.575**	.736**	.652**	.483**
OR	.585**	.575**	1	.696**	.700**	.665**

** p<0.01

Source: Authors' calculations

The results showed a positive, moderate, and significant relationship between all factors (p<0.01). The relationship between institutionalization factors and organizational resilience was higher than the relationship between learning organization factors and organizational resilience (Table 4).

Regressions analyses were performed to determine whether the learning organization affected organizational resilience through institutionalization. For the regression analyses utilized in this study, the capability of explaining the mediating impact depends on whether the four models met certain conditions. These models are as follows (Baron & Kenny, 1986):

Model 1: Independent variable should affect the dependent variable.

Model 2: Independent variable should affect the mediator variable.

Model 3: Mediator variable should affect the dependent variable.

Model 4: Independent variable should affect the dependent variable through the mediator variable.

Multiple regression analyses were conducted to test the first three models within the study. For Model 4, hierarchical regression analysis was performed.

According to Table 5, learning organization factors had a positive impact on organizational resilience. The Model 1 accounts for 37,8 % of the variance in the dependent variable. Individual learning ($\beta = 0.349$; p<0.01) was a stronger predictor of the organizational resilience than organizational learning ($\beta = 0.309$; p<0.01). These results suggested that the conditions necessary for Model 1 were met.

Accordingly, hypothesis H₁ was accepted. In Table 5, learning organization factors positively affected the professionalization-consistency. These factors account for 57,9 % of the variance in the dependent variable. Organizational learning ($\beta = 0.503$; $p < 0.01$) was a stronger predictor of the professionalization-consistency than Individual learning ($\beta = 0.306$; $p < 0.01$). Similarly, learning organization factors positively affected the social responsibility. These variables account for 49,1 % of the variance in the dependent variable. Individual learning ($\beta = 0.409$; $p < 0.01$) was a stronger predictor of the social responsibility than organizational learning ($\beta = 0.333$; $p < 0.01$). Lastly, learning organization factors had a positive impact on social responsibility. These factors account for 31,5 % of the variance in the dependent variable. Individual learning ($\beta = 0.453$; $p < 0.01$) was a stronger predictor of the formalization than organizational learning ($\beta = 0.136$; $p < 0.05$). Results in Table 5 suggested that the conditions necessary for Model 2 were met. Accordingly, hypothesis H₂ was accepted.

Table 5. Multiple Regression Analysis Results for the First Three Models and Hypotheses

Dependent Variable	Independent Variables	Beta (β)	t value	p	Models/ Hypotheses	
Organizational Resilience (OR)	IL	.349	5.636	.000**	Model 1 H ₁ : Accepted	
	OL	.309	4.992	.000**		
R ² = 0.381, Adjusted R ² = 0.378, F = 119.886, p = 0.000, ** p < 0.01						
Professionalization-Consistency (PC)	IL	.306	6.008	.000**	Model 2 H ₂ : Accepted	
	OL	.503	9.882	.000**		
R ² = 0.581, Adjusted R ² = 0.579, F = 269.929, p = 0.000, ** p < 0.01						
Social Responsibility (SR)	IL	.409	7.312	.000**		
	OL	.333	6.062	.000**		
R ² = 0.494, Adjusted R ² = 0.491, F = 189.951, p = 0.000, ** p < 0.01						
Formalization (F)	IL	.453	6.987	.000**		
	OL	.136	2.097	.037*		
R ² = 0.319, Adjusted R ² = 0.315, F = 90.917, p = 0.000, * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01						
Organizational Resilience (OR)	PC	.302	6.545	.000**	Model 3 H ₃ : Accepted	
	SR	.332	7.357	.000**		
	F	.263	6.044	.000**		
R ² = 0.618, Adjusted R ² = 0.615, F = 189.951, p = 0.000, ** p < 0.01						

Source: Authors' calculations

According to the final analysis in Table 5, institutionalization factors had a positive impact on organizational resilience. These factors account for 61,5 % of the variance in the dependent variable. Social responsibility ($\beta = 0.332$; $p < .001$) was the strongest predictor of the organizational resilience followed by professionalization-consistency ($\beta = 0.302$; $p < .001$) and formalization ($\beta = 0.263$; $p < .001$). These results suggested that the conditions necessary for Model 3 were met. Accordingly, hypothesis H₃ was accepted.

Table 6. Hierarchical Regression Analysis Results for the Fourth Model and Hypothesis

Stage 1	Independent Variables	Beta (β)	t value	p	Model/ Hypothesis
	IL	.349	5.636	.000**	Model 4
	OL	.309	4.992	.000**	
R ² = 0.381, Adjusted R ² = 0.378, F = 119.886, p = 0.000, ** p < 0.01					
	IL	.009	0.160	.873	
	OL	.018	0.331	.741	

Stage 2	PC	.288	5.259	.000**	H4: Accepted
	SR	.323	6.618	.000**	
	F	264	5.953	.000**	
R ² = 0.618, Adjusted R ² = 0.613, F = 124.846, p = 0.000, ** p < 0.01					
Dependent Variable: Organizational Resilience					

Source: Authors' calculations

Table 6 presents the results of the hierarchical regression analysis regarding how much the learning organization affected organizational resilience through institutionalization. Furthermore, the analysis occurred in two steps according to the table. Results of the regression analysis conducted to determine the impact of learning organization factors on the organizational resilience factor are presented in the first step. The results obtained in the first step are not different from the results in Table 5.

The second step displays the regression analysis results conducted to determine the impact of learning organization factors on the organizational resilience factor through the institutionalization factors. According to the analysis, “individual learning” and “organizational learning” lost their significance. However, institutionalization factors with a mediating role indicated that the factors “professionalization-consistency,” “social responsibility,” and “formalization” had a positive and significant impact on “organizational resilience” (p < 0.01). Data regarding the results are presented in Table 6.

Accordingly, learning organization factors were effectively explained the organizational resilience in the first step, which was not the case in the second. Moreover, it is safe to state that the institutionalization factors: professionalization-consistency, social responsibility, and formalization all have a mediating role. Sobel tests should be used to determine whether the fully mediating role of institutionalization factors was significant. The z value was calculated with the Sobel test performed to measure the mediating impact of professionalization-consistency in the relationship between individual learning and organizational resilience, and the result was 5.08427 (p < 0.01). Additionally, this value was 3.57351 for the mediating role of social responsibility (p < 0.01) and 4.45533 for formalization (p < 0.01), which shows the fully mediating role of institutionalization factors in the relationship between individual learning and organizational resilience.

According to the results of the Sobel test performed to measure the mediating impact of professionalization-consistency, social responsibility, and formalization in the relationship between organizational learning and organizational resilience; z value was 4.56824 (p < 0.01) for professionalization-consistency, 3.36735 for social responsibility (p < 0.01) and 4.09953 for formalization (p < 0.01). The statistically significant aspect of these values indicates the fully mediating impact of the institutionalization factors in the relationship between organizational learning and organizational resilience. These results suggested that the conditions necessary for Model 4 were met. Accordingly, hypothesis H4 was accepted.

5. Conclusion and Discussion

This study, examining the impact of learning organizations on organizational resilience through institutionalization, indicated positive relationships between all variables. Furthermore, correlation analyses revealed a moderate-level, positive relationship between learning organization factors and organizational resilience. This result was compared with the results of other relevant studies in the literature. Mousa et al. (2020) found that learning organization affected organizational resilience, and Ghaderi et al. (2014) also achieved results similar to those in the present study. They noted that organizational learning was neglected in places where relevant studies were conducted, adding that this negligence affected crisis management. Although crisis management does not fully explain organizational resilience, the result mentioned above resembles the data found in the present study considering the relationship between these concepts.

Data regarding the correlation analyses between learning organization and institutionalization factors similarly indicated a moderate-level, positive relationship. The results were compared with those of the relevant studies. According to Avcı (2005), attitudes, educational and developmental activities, and open-mindedness were important for organizational learning. Moreover, Avcı's study pointed to a relationship between organizational learning and non-financial performance. The study by Özdemir (2006) had similar results supporting the data found by Avcı (2005); organizational learning was considered a triggering factor and found to increase organizational performance. Although the concepts and topics of attitude, educational and developmental activities, open-mindedness, and performance were not included in the scope of this study, they may be indirectly associated with the institutionalization factors. There was a moderate-level, positive relationship between institutionalization factors and organizational resilience. The results were compared with the data in the relevant literature, and they differed from the results found by Ignatiadis and Nandhakumar (2007), who noted that utilizing institutional systems would reduce organizational resilience. However, the results of the present study suggested that there was a positive relationship between institutionalization and organizational resilience. This difference is believed to have arisen from different populations and samples as well as different study periods. The literature includes studies supporting the data of the present research. Gunasekaran et al. (2011) reported that human resources and information management would increase organizational resilience. Similarly, Kumbalı (2018) mentioned that information management would positively affect organizational resilience, adding that organizational structure had a mediating role in terms of the impact. Polat (2018) suggested that institutional management principles and institutional risk management were related. Even though the concepts and topics of human resources, information management, organizational structure, and institutional management principles were not included in the scope of this study, they may be indirectly associated with the institutionalization factors.

The regression analyses conducted to test the study's main hypothesis indicated that learning organizations affected organizational resilience through institutionalization. The factor with the highest impact was social responsibility,

followed by professionalization-consistency. The mediating role of institutionalization occurred as fully. This result was compared with the literature, and there was a resemblance to the study by Ebrahimi (2020), who found that institutionalized learning organizations impacted organizational resilience.

According to obtaining data, it was determined that 89% of five-star hotels and 32% of four-star hotels in Alanya received the obligatory Safe Tourism Certification during the period of COVID-19 pandemic in 2020. In this case, it is possible to say that five-star hotels are in a better position in terms of organizational resilience levels than four-star hotels. In addition, the organizational resilience ($\bar{x}=4.01$), institutionalization ($\bar{x}=3.97$), and learning organization ($\bar{x}=3.94$) levels of the businesses participating in the research were found to be quite high. Based on these findings, it may be said that the accommodation businesses included in the survey can respond quickly to the global crisis and continue their activities by adapting to the COVID-19 pandemic conditions.

Considering the results, the practical contribution of the study is that accommodation businesses should display a proactive approach and make the learning organization structure a part of their culture, not only during the crises but also during periods of normalcy, and that they should improve their institutional structures. In order to increase organizational resilience, social responsibility activities should be prioritized, and a professional and consistent management approach should be adopted. Accordingly, it will be easier for businesses to adapt to the changing environmental conditions and gain competitive superiority. Based on the results, it is safe to state that businesses should display behaviors, which will help employees and organizations related to the learning, that they should promote learning and be open to new ideas, that displaying such behaviors and promoting learning will increase the professionalization-consistency, social responsibility and formalization levels within businesses, and that they will achieve an organizational resilience level which is affected less by crises and can adapt to the changing environment. In addition to the contributions to the managers of the accommodation sector, this study is believed to be of great importance for this research field, covering a limited number of studies.

The present study was performed during the global COVID-19 crisis that has affected all industries. Therefore, participants' perceptions may differ in non-crisis periods, which can be considered the limitation of the present study. Additionally, the study being conducted in four and five-star accommodation businesses in Alanya may be another limitation. It is recommended that future studies be conducted during non-crisis periods, in different regions, in different cultures, and within different accommodation facilities. Moreover, new studies can be conducted to reveal other factors (leadership styles, life satisfaction, market turbulence etc.) that may affect organizational resilience. New data which can be obtained through the studies mentioned above are believed to contribute to the literature.

REFERENCES

- Apaydın, F. (2008). Kurumsallaşmanın küçük ve orta ölçekli işletmelerin performansına etkileri. [Effects of institutionalization on the performance of small and medium size firms]. *International Journal of Management Economics and Business*, 4(7), 121-145. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/ijmeb/issue/54832/750712>
- Atak, M. (2009). *Öğrenen örgüt ve örgütsel bağlılık ilişkisi [Relation between learning organization and organizational commitment]*. (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis). Atatürk University, Erzurum, Turkey.
- Avcı, U. (2005). *İşletmelerde örgütsel öğrenme-örgütsel performans ilişkisi: Konaklama işletmelerinde örgütsel öğrenme-örgütsel performans ilişkisine yönelik inceleme [The Relation between organizational learning and organizational performance: An investigation about the relation between organizational learning and organizational performance in the hospitality industry]*. (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis). Süleyman Demirel University, Isparta, Turkey.
- Baron, R. M. & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(6), 1173-1182. Retrieved from <https://psycnet.apa.org/buy/1987-13085-001>
- Beerman, M. (2011). Linking corporate climate adaptation strategies with resilience thinking. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 19, 836-842. Doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2010.10.017
- Bilge, H. (2010). *Küçük ve orta boy işletmelerde insan kaynakları yönetimi fonksiyonları açısından kurumsallaşma: Manisa Organize Sanayi Bölgesinde ampirik bir çalışma [Institutionalizing in small and medium sized enterprises from the standpoint of human source management functions: An empirical study in Manisa Organized Industrial Zone]*. (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis). Celal Bayar University, Manisa, Turkey.
- Burunasin, B. (2001). *Relationship between internet usage and learning organization characteristics in American and Tai universities*. (Unpublished Doctorate Thesis). University of New Haven, United States of America. Retrieved from <https://www.proquest.com/docview/276509159?pq-origsite=gscholar&fromopenview=true>
- Clarke, A. (2001). *Learning organizations, what they are and how to become one*. England: The National Organization for Adult Learning. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED459367>
- Cohen, M. D. (1991). Individual learning and organizational routine: Emerging connections. *Organization Science*, 2(1), 135-139. Doi: 10.1287/orsc.2.1.135

- Cucinotta, D., & Vanelli, M. (2020). WHO declares COVID-19 a pandemic. *Acta Biomed*, 91(1): 157-160. Doi: 10.23750/abm.v91i1.9397
- Denison, D. (2001). Organizational culture: Can it be a key lever for driving organizational change?. In Cooper, C. L., Cartwright, S. & Earley, P. C. (Eds.). *Organizational culture and climate*. (pp. 347-376). United States of America: Wiley.
- Ebrahimi, A. (2020). Design of a resilience model based on the institutionalization of organizational learning in the red crescent society. *Journal of Rescue and Relief*, 12(1), 35-45. Retrieved from https://jorar.ir/browse.php?a_id=583&slc_lang=en&sid=1&printcase=1&hbnr=1&hmb=1
- Freitas, C. A. S. & Guimaraes, T. A. (2007). Isomorphism, institutionalization and legitimacy: Operational auditing at the court of auditors. *Revista de Administração Contemporânea*, 11(1), 153-175. Doi: 10.1590/S1415-65552007000500008
- Garvin, D. A. (1993). Building a learning organization. *Harvard Business Review*, 71(4), 78-91. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/1993/07/building-a-learning-organization>
- Ghaderi, Z., Som, A. P. M., & Wang, J. (2014). Organizational learning in tourism crisis management: An experience from Malaysia. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 31, 627-648. Doi: 10.1080/10548408.2014.883951
- Gittell, J. H., Cameron, K., Lim, S., & Rivas, V. (2006). Relationships, layoffs, and organizational resilience. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 42(3), 300-329. Doi: 10.1177/0021886306286466
- Greening, D. W. & Gray, B. (1994). Testing a model of organizational response to social and political issues. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(3), 467-498. Doi: 10.5465/256697
- Gunasekaran, A., Rai B. K., & Griffin, M. (2011). Resilience and competitiveness of small and medium size enterprises: An empirical research. *International Journal of Production Research*, 49(18), 5489-5509. Doi: 10.1080/00207543.2011.563831
- Güney, S. (2017). *Yönetim ve organizasyon [Management and organization]* Ankara: Nobel.
- Hair Jr, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2014). *Multivariate data analysis: Pearson new international edition*. (7rded.). Essex: Pearson Education Limited. Retrieved from <https://www.pearson.com/uk/educators/higher-education-educators/program/Hair-Multivariate-Data-Analysis-Global-Edition-7th-Edition/PGM916641.html>
- Ignatiadis, I. & Nandhakumar, J. (2007). The impact of enterprise systems on organizational resilience. *Journal of Information Technology*, 22, 36-43. Doi: 10.1057/palgrave.jit.2000087

- Jepperson, R. (2021). Institutions, institutional effects, and institutionalism (1991). In R.L. Jepperson & J. W. Meyer (Eds), *Institutional theory: the cultural construction of organizations, states, and identities*, (pp. 37-66). New York: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from <https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/abs/institutional-theory/institutions-institutional-effects-and-institutionalism-1991/CC5A317E318F1E1B517AF68D5D38EBF6>
- Karpuzoğlu, E. (2000). *Aile şirketlerinin kurumsallaşma düzeylerini belirlemeye yönelik bir araştırma [A Study aimed at defining institutionalization levels of family business]*. (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis). İstanbul University, İstanbul, Turkey.
- Kumbalı, H. Ç. (2018). *Örgüt yapısına göre bilgi yönetimi ve örgütsel dayanıklılık ilişkisi [The relationship between knowledge management and organizational resilience in terms of organizational structure]*. (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis). Pamukkale University, Denizli, Turkey.
- Lee, A. V., Vargo, J., & Seville, E. (2013). Developing a tool to measure and compare organizations' resilience. *Natural Hazards Review*, February, 29-41. Doi: 10.1061/(ASCE)NH.1527-6996.0000075
- Lengnick-Hall, C. A., Beck, T. E., & Lengnick-Hall, M. L. (2011). Developing a capacity for organizational resilience through strategic human resource management. *Human Resource Management Review*, 21, 243-255. Doi: 10.1016/j.hrmr.2010.07.001
- Mallak, L. (1998). Putting Organizational Resilience to Work. *Industrial Management*, December, 1-9. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Larry-Mallak/publication/291863333_Putting_Organizational_Resilience_to_Work/links/5831eed408aef19cb819ad93/Putting-Organizational-Resilience-to-Work.pdf
- March, J. G. (1996). Continuity and change in theories of organizational action. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41(2), 278-287. Doi: 10.2307/2393720
- Marsick, V. J. & Watkins, K. E. (2003). Demonstrating the value of an organization's learning culture: The dimensions of the learning organization questionnaire. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 5(2): 132-151. Doi: 10.1177/1523422303005002002
- Malik, P. & Garg, P. (2020) Learning organization and work engagement: the mediating role of employee resilience, *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 31:8, 1071-1094, DOI: 10.1080/09585192.2017.1396549
- McManus, S. T. (2008). *Organizational resilience in New Zealand*. (Unpublished Doctorate Thesis). University of Canterbury at Christchurch, New Zealand. Retrieved from <http://ir.canterbury.ac.nz/handle/10092/1574>
- Mousa, M., Abdelgaffar, H. A., Chaouali, W., & Aboramadan, M. (2020). Organizational learning, organizational resilience and the mediating role of multi-stakeholder networks, A study of Egyptian Academics. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 32(3), 161-181. Doi: 10.1108/JWL-05-2019-0057

- Oldham, G. R. & Hackman, J. R. (1981). Relationships between organizational structure and employee reactions: comparing alternative frameworks. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26(1): 66-83. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/2392600?casa_token=QcLMSf-xlwAAAAA%3AtND1gtm3q7bGCZI3PzjYUcSAP7Cse_nOTd8YFMPTMi119I-ya-FMv0DerxOE6kCkLghpOTSvCGKkwPjURUAfrpdsrNRFZX_-4WhWsKI_N5pFIN4Kb8JT&seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents
- Orchiston, C., Prayag, G., & Brown, C. (2016). Organizational resilience in the tourism sector. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 56, 145-148. Doi: 10.1016/j.annals.2015.11.002
- Özdemir, B. (2006). *Örgütsel öğrenme, çevre ve örgütsel performans ilişkisi: Otel yöneticilerinin algılamaları üzerine bir araştırma [The Association of organizational learning with environment, and organizational performance: Research on perceptions of hotel managers]*. (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis). Akdeniz University, Antalya, Turkey.
- Polat, E. (2018). *Aile şirketlerinde kurumsal yönetim ilkeleri çerçevesinde kurumsal risk yönetimi ve iç kontrol sistemi: TRC3 bölgesi uygulaması [Enterprise risk management and internal control system in the framework of corporate governance principles in family companies: TRC3 region application]* (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis). İnönü University, Malatya, Turkey.
- Pugh, D. S., Hickson, D. J., Hinings, C. R. & Turner, C. (1968). Dimensions of organization structure. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 13(1): 65-105. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/2391262?casa_token=PH7UksFkuDUAAAAA:CHQ6H-ix0Pe6zceX0ubbe38rArHbY54u-F_1Cj3m8p82aaUSt3C_MpjxNY2FbR3AeX_Qug6qKQEYoCSKQ7yNt3DhXO1v6O0Vq6eTJq_5PWcXkwWEO5SR
- Republic of Turkey Ministry of Culture and Tourism (2020). Turizm Tesisleri [Tourism Facilities]. Retrieved June 25, 2020 from <https://yigm.ktb.gov.tr/TR-9579/turizm-tesisleri.html>
- Sekeran, U. (1992). *Research Methods for Business*. United States of America: Wiley.
- Şanal, M. (2011). *Aile işletmelerinde kurumsallaşma ve kurumsal girişimcilik üzerine bir araştırma [A study of family businesses on institutionalization and instutional entrepreneurship]*. (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis). Çukurova University, Adana, Turkey.
- Tavşancı, S. (2009). *Firmalarda kurumsallaşma düzeyinin rekabet gücüne etkisi üzerine bir araştırma [A research on the effect of institutionalization level on competitiveness in firms]*. (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis). Dokuz Eylül University, İzmir, Turkey.
- Türkiye Tourism Promotion and Development Agency. (2020). Retrieved September 2, 2020 from <https://tga.gov.tr/search-hotel/?certificateType=4>

- Türkoğlu, N. (2016). *Konaklama işletmelerinde kurumsallaşma, entelektüel sermaye ve rekabet gücü ilişkisinin incelenmesi* [The analysis of the relationship between institutionalization, intellectual capital and competitive in accommodation establishments]. (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis). Akdeniz University, Antalya, Turkey.
- Ulrich, D., Jick, T., & Von Glinow, M. A. (1993). High-impact learning: Building and diffusing learning capability. *Organizational Dynamics*, 22(2), 52-66. Doi: 10.1016/0090-2616(93)90053-4
- UNWTO. (2020). UNWTO world tourism barometer, May 2020: Special focus on the impact of COVID-19 (summary). Spain: United Nation World Tourism Organization. Retrieved July 25, 2020 from <https://webunwto.s3.eu-west-1.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/2020-05/Barometer%20-%20May%202020%20-%20Short.pdf>
- UNWTO. (2021). Global and Regional Tourism Performance, UNWTO Tourism Dashboard. Retrieved September 22, 2021 from <https://www.unwto.org/global-and-regional-tourism-performance>
- Vogus, T. J. & Sutcliffe, K. M. (2007). *Organizational resilience: towards a theory and research agenda*. Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Systems (pp.3418-3422), Man and Cybernetics. Montreal, Canada.
- Wilkinson, J. E., Rushmer, R. K., & Davies, H. T. O. (2004). Clinical governance and the learning organization. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 12, 105-113. Doi: 10.1046/j.1365-2834.2003.00435.x
- Yağcı, E. & Çevirgen, A. (2014). Kurumsallaşma düzeyi ve işletme yapısı arasındaki ilişki: Türkiye'deki beş yıldızlı otellerde bir araştırma [The relationship between institutionalization level and business structure: A study in five-star hotels in Turkey]. In *15th National Tourism Congress Proceedings Book* (pp. 1249–1264), Ankara, Turkey: Detay Publishing.
- Yang, B. (2003). Identifying valid and reliable measures for dimensions of a learning culture. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 5(2): 152-162. Doi: 10.1177/1523422303251357