



## COMPARISON OF THE RATE OF USAGE OF CHARACTERISTICS OF LEARNING ORGANIZATIONS IN ISLAMIC AZAD AND STATE UNIVERSITIES OF FARS PROVINCE IN ACADEMIC YEAR 2013-2014

Seyed Ahmad Hashemi<sup>\*1</sup>, Doctor seyed Mehdi Mirdamadi<sup>2</sup> and Abolfazl Abbasi<sup>3</sup>

<sup>\*1</sup> Islamic Azad University, Lamerd Branch,

<sup>2</sup> Islamic Azad University, Science and research Branch, Tehran, Iran

<sup>3</sup> Educational administration, shiraz university, and Employee Education, Larestan. Iran

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article History:

Received 12<sup>th</sup>, June, 2014

Received in revised form 22<sup>nd</sup>, June, 2014

Accepted 13<sup>rd</sup>, July, 2014

Published online 28<sup>th</sup>, July, 2014

#### Key words:

Learning organization, Islamic Azad Universities, State Universities, and Fars province

### ABSTRACT

This study aims at Comparison of the rate of usage of characteristics of learning organizations in Islamic Azad and State universities of Fars province in academic year 2013-2014 . This survey has applied purpose and is a kind of descriptive survey. The population of this study is all of the faculty members of Azad (2300 persons) and State (930 persons) universities of Fars province, in 2013-2014. The sample of this study consisted of the 353 persons selected by Cochran's formula and random stratified sampling method. The information gathered through a researcher made questionnaire based on Mar quart's systematic model which used after determining the validity and reliability (0.87). The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics methods (frequency, percent, bar chart, mean, and standard deviation) and inferential statistic methods such as two independent samples t-test, two-way analysis of variance, and Freidman test at 0.05 level of significant. The results show that there is no significant difference between Islamic Azad and State universities in the degree of being a learning organization.

© Copy Right, IJCLS, 2014, Academic Journals. All rights reserved.

### INTRODUCTION

The importance of organizational learning in today's dynamic world is a clear-cut issue to everybody. Senge (1990) says that the most effective Comparative advantage of any organization is its learnability. But this issue specially has the most significant operation in knowledge based organizations, so that one can find the evaluation of weaknesses and strengths of organizational learning for an organization as a proper evaluation for that organization. Patterson (1999) suggests that in this condition, university needs to continuously provide itself with new learning issues in order to gain favorable global position. Hence necessity of making universities to be continues learning environments, becomes clear. Somerville and McConell also declare seven main characteristics of a learning organization: Continuous learning, Inquiry and dialogue, Team learning, Empowerment, Embedded systems, Leadership and System connection. (Somerville and McConell, 2004). In a learning organization all people are engaged in identifying and solving problems and using this feature, the organization can acquire new experiences and improve the issues and enhance its own abilities. (Senge, 1990) A learning organization is a place where people continually expand their capacity to create results they truly desire, where new and expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured,

where collective aspiration is set free, and where people are continually learning how to learn together. According to Garvin a learning organization is an organization skilled at creating, acquiring and transferring knowledge and at modifying its behavior to reflect new knowledge and insights. (Garvin, 2004)

Marquardt has proposes a relatively comprehensive definition of a learning organization. He describes a learning organization as an organization which learns powerfully and collectively and is continually transforming itself to better collect, manage, and use knowledge for corporate success. (Pour Hosseiny, 2007).

There are also some studies done in this issue. Including: Kashef *et al* (2009), in a study entitled "the relation between organizational intelligence and knowledge management in educational offices of east and west Azerbaijan" has figure out that according to According to the Pearson correlation coefficient, there is a significant positive relationship between the sub-systems of knowledge management and all components of organizational intelligence and total organizational intelligence. Atafar and Bahrami (2009), carried out a study entitled " rate of usage of dimensions of learning organizations in state universities and Islamic azad universities of Shahr-e-Kord according to five disciplines of learning organizations, Personal mastery, Mental

*\*Corresponding author Seyed Ahmad Hashemi*  
Islamic Azad University, Lamerd Branch,

models, shared vision, team learning, system thinking". The results illustrated that use of Personal mastery in Islamic Azad universities is more than average and for public universities is in average level. Showghi (2007), In a research entitled "Assessment of learning organization dimensions for Tabriz private and public boy's high schools according to viewpoint of principals and teachers in academic year 2006-2007" concluded that there is a significant difference between public and private high schools in terms of learning organizations dimensions. Cheewaruengro (2008), in a research entitled "A Study of factors correlating With the learning organization of schools according to the congregation of the sisters of the sacred Heart of Jesus of Bangkok" illustrated that studied schools are in favorable level of learning organizations dimensions. Ward(2006), in a research studied Implementing knowledge management to support executive decision making in a joint military environment. The results illustrate that the creativities of the knowledge management does not impact knowledge directly. It in fact directs the internal and environmental atmosphere of the organization in order to motivate and encourage. In a his study entitled 'Assessing The Learner Organization Profile In Line With Developing Ohio University' by an organizational model related to systems" Angel Barrio (2006) concluded that the employees' learning level should increase, organization need essential changes, the management method should change and employees should be motivated in order to enable organization to be learner. Kelly (2000), also figured out that the dimensions of Personal mastery, Mental models and Team learning are in reasonable level in his studied colleges. Krefting (2005), also showed that universities show special attention toward students,

Employees and instructors and seek for empowerment them. Agaoglu (2006), in his study figured out that the faculty of education of Anadolu university has the favorable organizational culture and structure required for transformation into a learning organization. Vaughan (1983), in a study entitled "The relationship of managers", education, Training to cultural climate concluded that there is a relation between organizational culture and manager's qualification, knowledge and academic level. In a study, Tim and Peterson (1986), showed that factors such as trust, kknowledge, participatory decision making, open relations from top to bottom and focus on high performance goals has a significant effect on organizational culture. Based on above issues and according to the importance of learnability for organizations and also considering the fact higher academic system is facing with sweeping changes in today's world, the necessity of make this system to be a learning organization becomes clear.

**Table 1** T-test results for comparison of Islamic Azad and state universities according to the subsystem of dynamicity of learning

Type of university	Quantity	Mean	Standard deviation	T	p-value
Islamic Azad university	251	2.96	0.63	0.981	0.328
State university	102	2.84	0.65		

As the dimensions of system-linked model for learning organizations proposed by Marquardt are among comprehensive ones, this study uses this model to compare

learn ability of Islamic Azad and state universities of Fars province.

**Questions of the study:**

1. Is there any significant difference between learn ability of Islamic Azad and state universities of Fars province according to the subsystem of dynamicity of learning?
2. Is there any significant difference between learn ability of Islamic Azad and state universities of Fars province according to the subsystem of organizational transformation?
3. Is there any significant difference between learn ability of Islamic Azad and state universities of Fars province according to the subsystem of empowerment?
4. Is there any significant difference between learn ability of Islamic Azad and state universities of Fars province according to the subsystem of knowledge management?
5. Is there any significant difference between learn ability of Islamic Azad and state universities of Fars province according to the subsystem of application of technology?

**METHOD**

This survey has applied purpose and is a kind of descriptive survey. The population of this study is all of the faculty members of Azad (2300 persons) and State (930 persons) universities of Fars province, in academic year 2013-2014. The sample of this study consisted of the 353 persons selected by Cochran's formula and random stratified sampling method. The information gathered through a researcher made questionnaire based on Marquardt's systematic model. For validity, questionnaire were investigated by experts and used after their verification. In addition, using Cronbach's alpha, the reliability of questionnaire was determined to be 0.87.

After gathering data, inferential statistic methods such as two independent samples t-test, two-way analysis of variance, and Freidman test at 0.05 level of significance were used.

**RESULTS**

Question 1: Is there any significant difference between learnability of Islamic Azad and state universities of Fars province according to the subsystem of dynamicity of learning?

In order to answer to the question, the two independent samples T-test was employed. The results are as below:

As the determined P-value from T-test is 0.328 and is more

than 0.05, it could be concluded that the test is meaningless and there is no significant difference between Islamic Azad and state universities according subsystem of dynamicity of learning.

**Question 2: Is there any significant difference between learn ability of Islamic Azad and state universities of Fars province according to the subsystem of organizational transformation?**

In order to answer to the question, the two independent samples T-test was employed. The results are as below:

**Table 2** T-test results for comparison of Islamic Azad and state universities according subsystem of organizational transformation

Type of university	Quantity	Mean	Standard deviation	T	p-value
Islamic Azad university	251	2.91	0.74	0.633	0.528
State university	102	2.82	0.56		

As the determined P-value from T-test is 0.528 and is more than 0.05, it could be concluded that the test is meaningless and there is no significant difference between Islamic Azad and state universities according to the subsystem of organizational transformation.

**Question 3: Is there any significant difference between learnability of Islamic Azad and state universities of Fars province according to the subsystem of empowerment?**

In order to answer to the question, the two independent samples T-test was employed. The results are as below:

**Table 3** T-test results for comparison of Islamic Azad and state universities according subsystem of empowerment

Type of university	Quantity	Mean	Standard deviation	T	p-value
Islamic Azad university	251	3.05	0.87	0.534	0.594
State university	102	2.97	0.63		

As the determined P-value from T-test is 0.594 and is more than 0.05, it could be concluded that the test is meaningless and there is no significant difference between Islamic Azad and state universities according to the subsystem of empowerment.

**Question 4: Is there any significant difference between learnability of Islamic Azad and state universities of Fars province according to the subsystem of knowledge management?**

In order to answer to the question, the two independent samples T-test was employed. The results are as below:

**Table 4** T-test results for comparison of Islamic Azad and state universities according to subsystem of knowledge management

Type of university	Quantity	Mean	Standard deviation	T	p-value
Islamic Azad university	251	2.73	0.68	0.223	0.824
State university	102	2.70	0.51		

As the determined P-value from T-test is 0.828 and is more than 0.05, it could be concluded that the test is meaningless and there is no significant difference between Islamic Azad and state universities according to the subsystem of knowledge management.

**Table 5** T-test results for comparison of Islamic Azad and state universities according to subsystem of application of technology

Type of university	Quantity	Mean	Standard deviation	T	p-value
Islamic Azad university	251	2.95	0.43	0.608	0.544
State university	102	2.88	0.62		

**Question 5: Is there any significant difference between learnability of Islamic Azad and state universities of**

**Fars province according to the subsystem of application of technology**

In order to answer to the question, the two independent samples T-test was employed. The results are as below:

As the determined P-value from T-test is 0.544 and is more than 0.05, it could be concluded that the test is meaningless

and there is no significant difference between Islamic Azad and state universities according to the subsystem of application of technology.

**DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

The main goal of this study is comparison of learn ability of Islamic Azad and state universities of Fars province. According to the results of the study it could be concluded that:

There is no significant difference between Islamic Azad and state universities according to the subsystem of

dynamicity of learning. This result is in line with results of studies done by Agaoglu(2006) and Kelly (2000).

In addition, there is no significant difference between Islamic Azad and state universities according to subsystem of organizational transformation. This result is in line with results of studies done by Agaoglu (2006) and Kelly (2000). They also didn't find any significant difference. However this result doesn't agree with results of the study done by showghi (2007).

Furthermore, there is no significant difference between Islamic Azad and state universities according to subsystem

of empowerment. This result is in line with results of the study done by krefting (2005). He also didn't find any significant difference. However this result doesn't agree with results of the study done by showghi (2007).

In addition, there is no significant difference between Islamic Azad and state universities according to subsystem

of knowledge management. This result is not in line with the results of the study done by showghi (2007).

And finally, there is no significant difference between Islamic Azad and state universities according to subsystem of application of technology. This result is in line with results of studies done by Vaughan(1983). He also didn't find any significant difference. However this result doesn't agree with results of the study done by showghi(2007).

## References

1. Agaoglu, E. (2006). The Reflection of the learning organization concept to school of education, Turkish online journal of distance education Vol. 7, No. 1, Article. 12
2. Garvin, D. A. (2004). "Building a learning organization", Harvard Business review, pp.78-91, 1993.
3. Kelly, D. W. A. (2000). "Seges learning organization conspt applied to one vocational school faculty", P. H. D. Thesis, Immaculata college, Pennsylvania, available at: digital library/ proquest.
4. Krefting, D. V. (2005). "Knowledge seeking practices of healthcare leaders in a learning organization", M. A. Thesis, royal road university, Canada , available at: digital library/ Request.
5. M. Marquardt, Building *the* Learning Organization, By Mohammad Reza Zali,(2006), *University* of Tehran.
6. Pour hoseiny, Javad(2007), "Learning organizations, Today's business necessities in today's world" , journal of management, Vol. 121-122 pp 52-58
7. Rezayian, Ali, "Fundamentals of management", Theran, The Organization for Researching and Composing University Textbooks in the Humanities (SAMT)
8. Senge, P.M. (1990). "The fifth discipline: The art and practice of learning organization". New York, Doubleday
9. Shoghi, Karim, " Assessment of learning organization dimensions for Tabriz private and public boy's high schools according to viewpoint of principals and teachers in academic year 2006-2007"
10. Somervill, M. , McConnell, A. (2004), "Applying the learning organization in a rapidly changing environment", in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Bcom Honors in human Resourse management at university of Pretoria- south Africa
11. Timm, p. R & Peterson, B. D. (1982). "people at work ", human relation in organizations , west publishing company, university of Pifts burgh.
12. Vaughan, K. M.(1983)."The relationship of managers", education, Training to cultural climate, Boston University.
13. Ward, T. E. (2006)."Implementing Knowledge management to support executive decision making in a joint military environment", canella university

\*\*\*\*\*