

THE INFLUENCE OF EMPLOYEES' UNDERSTANDING OF ADAPTATION ON EMPLOYEES' UNDERSTANDING OF LEARNING ORGANIZATIONAL DIMENSIONS

Arghavan Yarahmadi¹, Mojtaba Keshvari²

¹ *M.A. Student, Faculty of Management, Borujerd Branch, Islamic Azad University, Borujerd, Iran*

² *M.A. Student, Faculty of Management, Malayer Branch, Islamic Azad University, Malayer, Iran*

ABSTRACT

The aim of this research was to study the influence of employees' understanding of adaptation on employees' understanding of learning organizational commitment. This study was practical due to its objectives, and was descriptive due to its methodology. The statistical society included 280 employees of Borujerd Communication Organization among whom the researchers selected 162 persons using Morgan Table. In order to collect the data needed, the researchers used, in addition to library researches, questionnaires. The alpha coefficient for the questionnaires was 0.86.5. Moreover, the researchers used SPSS and software to analyse the data. Finally, the result showed that employees' understanding of adaptation influenced their understanding of common ideals, team learning, and systematic thinking.

KEYWORDS: Adaptation, Learning Organization, Team Learning, Systematic Learning.

INTRODUCTION

Today, the changing environment does not allow organizations to be controlled in a traditional way and this is because of the pressures that are from competitors' skills, abilities, and technologies. In fact in this changing environment, those organizations which adapt themselves with the environment surroundings have the chance of survival. These changes force the organizations to search for the best ways and alternative when they want to adapt themselves and this is why they reach the ability of competition. "One of the best ways to reach such ability is to put the emphasis on employees' learning and also to create continues learning culture to reach organizational objectives along with the highest degree of effectiveness" (Sobhani Nezhad and et al 2006, p. 11). Therefore, the most valuable capital for each organization is its human resource. In this alternative world, all organizations are familiar with the phenomenon of change. Severe changes in the roots of the society and rapid technological advancements face human being a new and novel situation. Paying attention to organization from cultural point of view is a relatively new phenomenon which is highly considered in organizational and managerial discussions and studies. Today, the study of organizational culture becomes very important and this is because of the reason that organizations own very powerful cultures and have the abilities to react against changes taken from environment. Today's organizations and companies should be adaptive, expanding, and innovative in a continuous way. In

this regard, “the principles of learning and innovative organizations are vital factors” (Martensen and Dahlgard 1999, pp. 878-891).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Adaptation (Stability and Unity): Professor Daniel Denison (2000) investigated some issues in organizational culture and effectiveness fields of study. In his model, he introduced “adaptation” as one of the cultural characteristics (qtd. in Manouriyani and Bakhtae 2005, p. 5). Researches showed that organizations that are often effective are united and stable and employees’ behaviors are derived from fundamental values. Leaders and subordinates are skillful in reaching adaptations (even when they have opposite ideas) and organizational activities are done in a united and continuous way. Organizations with such abilities have strong and diverse cultures and have adequate influences on employees’ behaviors (Rahim Niya and Alizadeh 2009, p. 156). This characteristic is studied through these indexes including (1) Fundamental Values, (2) Agreement, and (3) Unity.

Fundamental Values: Organization members have a set of common values that create unity and clarity of expectations.

Agreement: Organization members have the ability to come to an agreement on important issues. This subject includes factors such as reaching fundamental levels of agreement and the ability to solve the existing contrasts in between.

Unity: Different organization departments and parts have the ability to work and act together to reach their objectives and goals. It should be noted that organizational borders would not be disturbed by such ability.

Learning Organization: It refers to a kind of organization in which people continuously increase their abilities to reach the results they expect and by doing so, the new thinking pattern and collective thought are developed and expanded.

Learning Organization Dimensions: There are 4 dimensions for learning organizations including personal abilities, mental models, common ideal, and team learning.

Personal Abilities: These abilities are things more than obtainable skills and the power of competition, although they can be categorized based upon two principles. Some scholars believe that personal learning is not necessarily the insurance of learning, but without personal learning it is impossible to have organizational learning. In this regard, the most important role of a manager is to provide circumstances in which individuals can obtain the necessary skills to have a good and comfortable life.

Mental Models: These models refer to expectations and beliefs engraved in the mind or general beliefs or even general images which influence our understanding of the world. Mental models cause us to adjust our performance based upon them. For instance, “if we believe that we cannot trust in others; consequently, our behaviours shape according to distrust” (Zaree and et al 1999, p. 70).

Common Ideal: Common ideal is necessary to create pervasive learning and this is because of the reason that it provides the needed energy to learn. In fact, the idea of pervasive learning without an important objective or goal to move and act is completely meaningless and naïve. Ideals are common when individuals have a better image of future and feel a kind of commitment to reach it.

Team Learning: In pervasive organizations, “team learning” is very important, because it is “the foundation of learning in modern organizations” (Akhavan and Jafari 2006). Team learning starts with “discussing” and till the time that “teams do not learn”, “the organizations do not learn”, too (Gore Lick 2005, pp. 383-388).

Systematic Learning: It is the fifth level in shaping learning organizations that integrate other principles and combine them through an integrated structure in term of theory and practice. “Peter Drucker introduced this kind of organization as an orchestra in which each one plays his/her own song, but the important point is that all are subordinated or directed by the leader and the result is a rhythmic music” (qtd. in Zibae 2007).

Reza Shafae (2001) in his thesis studied the barriers for learning organizations creation and concluded that the barriers were in three categories including “barriers for starting the movement, barriers for keeping the movement, and barriers for establishment of results” (Shafae 2001, p. 1). Brooks and his coworkers in 1992 showed that if personal efforts to change the organizational culture were not accompanied with common ideals would fail. Moreover, “the managers’ efforts to change to be adapted to organizational culture would be useless. In addition, mental dimensions, learning ethics, and social characteristics should be developed” (Brooks and et al 1992, pp. 333-344).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study was practical due to its objectives, and was descriptive due to its methodology. The statistical society included 280 employees of Borujerd Communication Organization among whom the researchers selected 162 persons using Morgan Table. In order to collect the data needed, the researchers used, in addition to library researches, questionnaires. The alpha coefficient for the questionnaires was 0.86.5. Moreover, the researchers used SPSS and software to analyse the data.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

In this research we used SPSS software version 19. There are 5 alternative hypotheses.

The hypotheses are as following:

The First Hypothesis: The relationship between employees’ understanding of adaptation and employees’ understanding of personal abilities.

The null hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between employees’ understanding of adaptation and employees’ understanding of personal abilities.

The Alternative hypothesis: There is a significant relationship between employees’ understanding of adaptation and employees’ understanding of personal abilities.

Table 1

| | Significancy | Error | F | Mean | Deviation |
|---|---------------------|--------------|----------|-------------|------------------|
| Employees’ Understanding of Adaptation and Employees’ Understanding of Personal Abilities | 0.141 | 0.05 | 2.183 | 3.51 | 0.59 |

According to table 1 and the significancy, the null hypothesis is accepted and the alternative hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, there is no significant relationship between employees’ understanding of adaptation and employees’ understanding of personal abilities.

The Second Hypothesis: The relationship between employees' understanding of adaptation and employees' understanding of mental models.

The null hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between employees' understanding of adaptation and employees' understanding of mental models.

The Alternative hypothesis: There is a significant relationship between employees' understanding of adaptation and employees' understanding of mental models.

Table 2

| | Significancy | Error | F | Mean | Deviation |
|---|---------------------|--------------|----------|-------------|------------------|
| Employees' Understanding of Adaptation and Employees' Understanding of Mental Model | 0.185 | 0.05 | 1.769 | 3.48 | 0.57 |

According to table 2 and the significancy, the null hypothesis is accepted and the alternative hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, there is no significant relationship employees' understanding of adaptation and employees' understanding of mental models.

The Third Hypothesis: The relationship between employees' understanding of adaptation and employees' understanding of common ideals.

The null hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between employees' understanding of adaptation and employees' understanding of common ideals.

The Alternative hypothesis: There is a significant relationship between employees' understanding of adaptation and employees' understanding of common ideals.

Table 3

| | Significancy | Error | F | Mean | Deviation |
|--|---------------------|--------------|----------|-------------|------------------|
| Employees' Understanding of Adaptation and Employees' Understanding of Common Ideals | 0.000 | 0.05 | 101.582 | 3.31 | 0.66 |

According to table 3 and the significancy, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, there is a significant relationship between employees' understanding of adaptation and employees' understanding of common ideals.

The Fourth Hypothesis: The relationship between employees' understanding of adaptation and employees' understanding of team learning.

The null hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between employees' understanding of adaptation and employees' understanding of team learning.

The Alternative hypothesis: There is a significant relationship between employees' understanding of adaptation and employees' understanding of team learning.

Table 4

| | Significancy | Error | F | Mean | Deviation |
|--|---------------------|--------------|----------|-------------|------------------|
| Employees' Understanding of Adaptation and Employees' Understanding of Team Learning | 0.000 | 0.05 | 19.333 | 3.44 | 0.63 |

According to table 4 and the significancy, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, there is a significant relationship employees' understanding of adaptation and employees' understanding of team learning.

The Fifth Hypothesis: The relationship between employees' understanding of adaptation and employees' understanding of systematic thinking.

The null hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between employees' understanding of adaptation and employees' understanding of systematic thinking.

The Alternative hypothesis: There is a significant relationship between employees' understanding of adaptation and employees' understanding of systematic thinking.

Table 5

| | Significancy | Error | F | Mean | Deviation |
|--|---------------------|--------------|----------|-------------|------------------|
| Employees' Understanding of Adaptation and Employees' Understanding of Systematic Thinking | 0.000 | 0.05 | 74.217 | 3.31 | 0.67 |

According to table 5 and the significancy, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, there is a significant relationship between employees' understanding of adaptation and employees' understanding of systematic thinking.

CONCLUSION

In this research we study the influence of employees' understanding of adaptation on employees' understanding of learning organizational commitment. This study is practical due to its objectives, and is descriptive due to its methodology. The statistical society includes 280 employees of Borujerd Communication Organization among whom the researchers select 162 persons using Morgan Table. In order to collect the data needed, the researchers use, in addition to library researches, questionnaires. The alpha coefficient for the questionnaires is 0.86.5. Moreover, the researchers use SPSS and software to analyse the data. Finally, the results show that employees' understanding of adaptation influenced their understanding of common ideals, team learning, and systematic thinking.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Akhavan, Peyman and Jafari, Mustafa. The Learning Organizations: The Necessity of Intellectuality Era. Journal of Tadbir. No. 169. 2006.
- [2]. Brooks, A., and et al. Building Learning Organization, Dual Culture Interaction and Invited Reaction and Find Word Human Resource Development Quartered. Volume .3, No. 4. 1992.
- [3]. Gore Lick, C. Organizational Learning vs. The Learning Organization : A Conversation with a Practitioner. The Learning Organization. Volume . 12. No. 4. 2005.
- [4]. Manouriyan, Abbas and Bakhtae, Amir. Understanding Organizational Culture Based upon Denison's Model. 4th International Conference on Management; Tehran Iran. 2005.
- [5]. Martensen, A. and Dahlgaard, J. J. Strategy and Planning for Innovation Management-Supported by Creative and Learning Organizations. International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management, Volume, 16 No. 9. 1999.
- [6]. Rahim Niya, Faroborz and Alizadeh, Masoud. The Study of Organizational Culture Dimensions Based upon Denison's Model. Tehran: Firdausi University Journal of Psychology and Culture. No. 10. 2009.
- [7]. Shafae, Reza. The Study of Creating Learning Organization Barriers in Iran. M.A. Thesis. Tehran Modares University. 2001.
- [8]. Sobhani Nezhad, Mehdi and et al. Learning Organizations: Theoretical Patterns and Evaluation. Tehran: Yastaroon Publishing Press. 1st Edition. 2006.
- [9]. Zaree, Peyman, and et al. Learner Organization: A Pattern for Leading Today's Universities. Isfahan: Jahad Daneshgahi Publishing Press. 1st Edition. 1999.
- [10]. Zibae, Saeedeh. The Study of Behavioral Indexes for Learning Organizations. Journal of Growing Researches. No. 12. 2006.