

The relationship between knowledge management and organizational learning within middle and senior managers of Iranian public organizations

Associate Professor. Ali Asghar Fani,
Faculty of management, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran.

Professor, Hasan, Danaee Fard,
Faculty of management, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran.

Hossein.Yakhkeshi,
Msc Public Management, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran.

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between knowledge management and organizational learning. The sample for the study is consisted of 270 middle and senior managers from the 28 public organizations in Iran. The study utilized both quantitative data (questionnaire) and qualitative data (interview). Amah (2013) KM questionnaires and Watkins and Marsiek (2003) organizational learning were used. The reliability of the questionnaires in Iran renew determined. The pearson rank correlation coefficient and Multiple Regression Model using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20 were utilized for the analysis of data. Our finding revealed a positive and significant relationship between knowledge management and organizational learning. Specifically, knowledge acquisition, knowledge storage, knowledge sharing and knowledge utilization were revealed to have a positive and significant influence on organizational learning. Based on this finding, it was concluded that knowledge management enhances organizational learning. It is recommended that organizations should continue to strengthen their knowledge management practices especially knowledge acquisition, knowledge storage, knowledge sharing and knowledge utilization in their everyday activities as this is a sure guarantee for their learning.

Keywords: Knowledge Management, Organizational learning, Knowledge Acquisition, Knowledge Storage, Knowledge Sharing, Knowledge utilization.

1. Introduction

In the current turbulent environment that environment changes had increasing growth, the organizations not only want stay in the future, but also want to maintain their power. Therefore, organizations should constantly keep pace with environmental change and cope with change is dependent on organizational learning (Louise et al, 2006). In fact, nowadays advantage that achieved for an organization depending on knowledge existent, use effective of knowledge and until what size ready receive and use of data and new knowledge on itself creating. If in the agricultural age, arm strength and in the industrial age, tools and machinery ingredient important were considered to the survival and sustainability, in the present age that McLuhan's has called global village, Shapiro and Varian (1999) Information Age, and Thurow (2003) Third Industrial Revolution, the only source of strength and durability, learn better and faster than competitors. Because people may come and go, but would be ready to die if lose valuable knowledge organization (Davenport & Prusak, 1998).

Technology is a necessary condition but not sufficient, because the new technology sooner or later to other companies will happen, so do not be-can create sustainable competitive advantage. The relationship between knowledge and knowledge management can satisfy the needs of the company. Drucker (1993) state "The basic economic resource - the means of production - is no longer capital, nor natural resources, nor labor. It is and will be knowledge". Christensen and Raynor, (2003) bluntly stated that "Resources are usually people or things – they can be hired and fired, bought and sold, depreciated and built". "The only irreplaceable capital an organization possesses is the knowledge and ability of its people.

Knowledge also, There is within human. Thus, man is the most important factor in gaining competitive advantage. Because man knowledge to produce and the application of resources. Wisdom also needful having is knowledge. Because you do not know everything, and what you know may not always be applicable in a particular situation. Knowledge management also, most important of knowledge is, because in organizations want style complexity, conversion information and witting individual and organizational on knowledge and individual and grouping skills specifying.

In fact, natural and human capitals when become the wealth that mixed and stirred on knowledge. Development knowledge also would not be possible without learning. Therefore, organizations must change if they want to stay. Otherwise organizations will suffer the same fate as the dinosaurs because of inability to adapt to

environmental conditions were doomed and lost.

2.Literature review

Liao (2002) stated that knowledge is fluid like water, once knowledge is no more shared and updated, then stagnation of water could cause the water death and the loss of its nourishment. It means that updating knowledge cultivating and enriches the abilities of KM on problem solving. If everything comes from past experience and knowledge without revision and update, the method or problem solving will be predictable and inertial. Once, in a highly competitive environment, someone predicts the trajectory of what you are thinking or doing, tracking and reaching of predictive action from others could cause failures and loss. Simultaneity experience is experience, but we never want experiences again repeat and purpose not this that life necessary experiences become unlearning. In fact, purpose creation knowledge of collation past on future and arrival new paradigms or beliefs that in contrast whatever in past forming creation. In the meantime awareness plays a major role. However, organizations also as individuals must have the ability to learn and this is duty managers that can improve people ability. Organization that don't know what know and ability implement what work had transfer knowledge on not process simple.

But the main point is learning usually take place of two sources organizational success and failure. Perhaps the most surprising discovery has been that learning from repeated success makes future failure very likely. Long periods of continued success foster structural and strategic inertia and cause that organization for its current situation preservation of its adaptability on external changes refuse. The same processes that firms use to capture their learning from successes also undermine their long-run viability (Baumard & Starbuck, 2005), and in a world where change is the only constant factor causes that organization larger failure in future experience. Sitkin (1992) argued that moderate failures draw a firm's attention to potential problems, stimulate search for solutions for these problems and motivate people to improve. In fact, failure for organizational learning more effective is of success. In this process first step necessary identify in time failure. The only identify failure be not cause learning, rather analyze failure, namely attention on what cause be that correction this wrong also requirement. The errors and failures cause be that individuals and organizations clever, until deliberate old methods abandon. The individuals and organizations usually on base this theory learning that can be learning and always learning. But the most important thing is to learn why organizations fail and thus remain on the sidelines.

Machine learning cannot be a coincidence or thinking prefecture in the bathtub. If the organization wants to learn it should be organized. Why such an organization pursues goals and is determined to fulfill them. Factor other, learn how learn. In fact on individual must how learn instruct.

Many experts as Schein and Hofstede's believed that culture had layers or different levels. Each level represents a degree of culture. When a change creates in the deeper levels or culture mental layers, learning occurs. Organizational culture if able not be on accept change, the best programs knowledge management also possible in implementation facing on fail and any extent of technology or project management skills, cause not be success a project (Davenport & prusak, 1998). Because organizational culture the fiber and sinew of all organizations and can be thought of as an organizational character (De Oliveira et al, 2013). Learning culture deep rooted in knowledge creation and a prerequisite is for success in knowledge and knowledge creation. Alavi et al (2006) cite expertise, formalization, innovativeness, collaboration and autonomy as the values of organizational culture that lead to effective knowledge management. But, individuals and organizations before of learning concept new, must first what they think they know, their unlearning. Most people have their beliefs and methods are maintained for a long time, and usually in the form of failures, convinces them to accept new paradigms. Organizations make it more difficult to learn without first unlearning. People in organizations find it hard to ignore their current beliefs and methods because they create explicit justifications for policies and actions. Also, they integrate their beliefs and methods into coherent, rational structures in which elements support each other. These coherent structures have rigidity that arises from their complex interdependence. While flexibility and change the need for life and unlearning prevent of rigidity (Akgun et al, 2007). In finally, organizational learning when possible that leaders acts upon tactics command and control and employees encourage on organizational learning.

2.1.Knowledge management

It can be argued that traces the origin and evolution of knowledge management comes back to the third millennium BC. All thinkers from Plato to Descartes and Kant in the search term used to express the nature of knowledge. Why did not specify a name for it could be the one reason that the concept is that does not need to manage. Or do not specify a name for it. Because used in practice but informally and whatever that nowadays new is about knowledge management, awareness of the process of knowledge management. Several experts and specialists involved in the development of knowledge management concept that they some of the most famous are include Drucker, Strawsman and Senge. The biggest research done to today about knowledge management is related to Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) to title "The knowledge creating company: How Japanese companies

create the dynamics of innovation”.

Several definitions and conceptions of KM exist (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995; Davenport & Prusak, 1998; Probst et al., 2000; Alavi & Leidner, 2001). KM corporation’s knowledge through a specified process for acquiring, organizing, sustaining, applying, sharing and renewing the knowledge of employees to enhance organizational performance and create value (Alavi & Leidner, 2001). Knowledge management involves individuals sharing of their experience, skills, ideas, context, interpretations, judgments, intuition and motivations (Ahmed et al, 2002). Wiig (1997) puts that purpose of KM is “to maximize the enterprise’s knowledge related effectiveness and returns from its knowledge assets and to renew them constantly”.

Davenport and Volpel (2001) also argues that Knowledge management is people Management and people management is knowledge management. Thus the benefits of knowledge management depend had to motivate people, their aspirations, their ability to knowledge sharing and use of knowledge. Thus, the survey knowledge management equivalent on acquisition, transfer and application of knowledge, also, implicit knowledge management provided to improve the capacity of people to communicate and collaborate with each other (Umoh & Amah, 2013). Knowledge management on organizational activities such as problem solving, decision making, strategic planning and dynamic learning by capturing, select, organize, distribute and transmit important information and experience helps.

The ultimate goal of knowledge management is the application of knowledge to improve organizational performance. Because knowledge when will be invaluable that applied. In fact, knowledge management not tool to earn money, but a way of life, because in of the individual vision and dreams and something that about the future we to it believe be shared, and what that of experiences myriad in organizations achieved, knowledge management not need on tools more for gathering data and information, rather needy a new perspective for combine information separate is that vision individual preferment and acts propel.

2.2. Knowledge management process

Scholars frequently specify two kinds of KM process (Filius et al, 2000): (1) tactical KM process — by which employees collect information to solve problems, derive value from the collected information, learn from the value, and update the existing knowledge in the system; and (2) strategic KM process — by which organizations formulate KM strategy to assess, create, and sustain intangible assets, and align KM strategy with its business strategy. According to Filius et al. (2000), tactical KM process includes the activities of knowledge acquisition, documentation, transfer, creation, and application. At the strategic level, including: Evaluation: Intellectual and Intellectual Capital evaluation, Creation: the allocation of resources for the conservation of the knowledge, use: Keeping assets that are not the market value for organization.

Bhatt (2001) proposed knowledge management processes as creation, validation, presentation, distribution, and application. Knowledge creation refers to the ability of an organization to develop novel and useful ideas and solutions. Knowledge validation refers to the extent to which a firm can reflect on knowledge and evaluate its effectiveness for the existing organizational environment. Knowledge presentation refers to the ways knowledge is displayed to the organizational members. Knowledge needs to be distributed and shared throughout the organization, before it can be exploited at the organizational level. Knowledge application means making knowledge more active and relevant for the firm in creating values.

Also, researchers have identified many aspects to this knowledge management process: capture, transfer, and use (DeLong, 1997); Identification, capture, development, sharing, dissemination, application and storage (Probest et al, 2000); acquisition, creation, storage, transfer, application, (Marquardt, 1996); capture, organization, storage, dissemination, and application (Lawson, 2003). KM includes activities such as creating, organizing, sharing and using know-ledge (Wong & Aspinwall, 2004). Cui et al. (2005) also mention that knowledge management capabilities consist of three interrelated processes: knowledge acquisition, knowledge conversion, and knowledge application Lee et al (2005) introduced the Knowledge Circulation Process that can be determined by knowledge creation, knowledge accumulation, knowledge sharing, knowledge utilization and knowledge internalization. Shin et al (2001) have also combined different authors' terminologies in knowledge management processes description and classified them as creation, storage, distribution and application.

Alavi and Linder (2001) posed four processes of creating, storage, transfer, and application knowledge management. In addition, they have stated that there is not a main difference between this classifications, the only difference is the name and number of process steps.

Knowledge when created that individual finds a new way of doing things or developed substantive knowledge (Bose, 2004). Knowledge creation is the result of social interactions and Organizational collaborations (Alavi.& Leidner, 2001).The organizations may forgotten knowledge that create (i.e., do not remember or lose track of the acquired knowledge). Therefore it is necessary this knowledge in organizational memory storing, organizing and retrieving. Organizational memory includes knowledge residing in various component forms, including written documentation, structured information stored in electronic databases, codified human knowledge stored in expert systems, documented organizational procedures and processes. Knowledge should be available to everyone in

the organization at any time and place where it needs to be used. Knowledge transfer allows employees to share their tacit and explicit knowledge to other employees inside and outside of their organizations. When people share their thoughts and ideas, likely received new knowledge and ideas of them. Application refers to the ultimate objective of any knowledge management system. Knowledge application allows employees to apply knowledge gained of side or outside of the organization for their own purposes.

2.3. Organizational learning

Richard Cyert and James March, the first people that in 1963 to put two words learning and organization together and introduce learning as organizational phenomenon. The several researchers also it analyzed from different perspectives. Among these approaches, psychological approaches (Cyert & March, 1963; Daft & Weick, 1984), social studies approach (Nelson & Winter, 1982; Levit & March, 1988) and organization theory (Nonaka, 1994; Huber, 1991; Gomez et al., 2005) can mention. The name of researchers that in organizational learning frequent seen including of: Peter Senge, pedler, Marquardt, Mumford, Harrison, Argyris, and Schon. The number of study also helped to spread concept organizational learning, as divide learning to single-loop and double-loop learning Argyris and Schon (1978), The Age of Unreason Charles Handy (1989), The living company Arie De Geus (1997), The Fifth Discipline senge (1990).

Organizational learning refers to the capacity of the organization for constant modification and improvement (Lien and Hung, 2007) that helps the organization to adopt with the changes (Chiva et al., 2007; Zhang et al, 2009). Argyris and Schon (1978) define learning as a process of detecting and correcting errors. Cook and Yanow (1995) mentioned organizational learning is learning developed form in organizations through key individuals to associate with subsequent organizational changes. Organizational learning is the generation of organizational members' participation in the interaction and sharing of knowledge and experiences (Curado, 2006). Gieskes et al. (2002) described that the barriers of learning with three categories, including, 1) interrupted learning processes; 2) psychological and cultural blockages to learning; and 3) obstacles related to organizational structure and leadership. In book "The Fifth Discipline," Senge (1990) identified five key factors to promote organizational learning: system thinking, personal mastery, mental models, shared vision, and team learning.

In past terms of organizational learning and the learning organization instead went to work. History is also tied to each other, but later many writers as two separate concepts as they looked. Organizational learning on concept individuals and groups learning into organization and learning organization on concept organizational learning is as a system total. Marquardt (2002) also states that the debate learning organizations on what (systems, principles and characteristics of organizations that learn and produce as a collective entity) the focus of it. But in debate organizational learning, attended on how learning in organization occurs (skills, processes of creation and application of knowledge). Organizational learning, knowledge creation and new visions that can influence had in the organization's beliefs. Learning organization points to the organization's ability to learn from its past experience. In short, the difference between organizational learning and learning organization can be seen as difference process and structure.

So if researchers focus on the learning process of theoretical and conceptual dimension, the study is among the studies of organizational learning. But if the identification and study of learning processes in organization implementation of perspective functional and operational and performance this type study occurs in learning organization (Karlson, 2007). Finally, organizational learning is more academic, while learning organization is Practitioners Consultants (Ortenblad, 1998).

Argyris and Schon (1978) describe three types of organizational learning: Single-loop learning (SLL): Single-loop learning takes place when organizations deal with first- order problems (symptoms) to find efficient solutions without changes to commonly agreed upon routines. Double-loop learning (DLL): Double-loop learning occurs when organizational members question existing frames of reference and are open to rethinking of strategy. The level of triple loop learning has subsequently been added and represents a 'highest' form of organizational self-examination where people may challenge the very raison of the organization (Argyris & schon, 1996).

The paradigm of organizational learning needs to shift from single-loop or double-loop learning to triple loop learning or unlearning, from knowledge creation through incremental changes to knowledge creation through radical changes, from system thinking to creative thinking, and from continuous improvement to creative and innovative improvement (Lee & Tsai, 2005).

There are two types of organizational learning that can take place. This includes exploratory learning and exploitative learning. Exploratory learning implies acquiring knowledge for the purpose of creating value for the customers which does not exist within the organization, whereas exploitative learning implies creating value for the customers by deepening existing knowledge. Both types of learning have different benefits and costs associated with them (Kang et al, 2007). Pilar et al (2005) considered OL to be a latent multidimensional construct including managerial commitment, systems perspective, openness and experimentation, and knowledge transfer and integration.

Huber (1991) from previous examinations of organizational learning in that it is broader in scope and more evaluative of the literatures. Four constructs related to organizational learning (knowledge acquisition, information distribution, information interpretation, and organizational memory) are articulated. One of the most well-known and comprehensive ones is Neefe's (2001) perspective in which organizational learning consists of seven dimensions, including shared vision, organizational culture, team learning, system thinking, participative leadership, personal mastery and sharing knowledge .

2.4. Organizational learning processes

Huber (1991), know organizational learning as a process consisting of: knowledge acquisition, information distribution, information interpretation, and organizational memory. The organized five processes through which organizations acquire information or knowledge: congenital learning, experiential learning, vicarious learning, grafting, and searching. Information interpretation state that inclusive four sub processes: Cognitive Maps and framing, media richness, information overload, and unlearning. Also, organizational memory state that inclusive two sub processes: storing and retrieving information, computer – based organizational memory. Gomez (2005) also, pointed that organizational learning process including: Acquisition, Transfer, and Integration.

Based Slater and Narver (1995), organizational learning is a function of a three-step process, including: (1) information acquisition, (2) information dissemination, and (3) shared interpretation. Information acquisition refers to the “collection and assessment of both customer needs/preferences and the forces that influence the development and refinement of those needs”, Information dissemination is defined as the “process and extent of market information exchange within a given organization”, shared interpretation as “the process through which information is given meaning”.

Pham and Swierczek (2006) Organizational learning on know involves 3 process knowledge acquisition, knowledge sharing and knowledge use. Yang (2011) stated that organizational learning including: identifying/creating, assimilating, and applying. Crossan et al. (1999) developed a detailed model integrating the learning at the different levels of the organization. The building of collective knowledge is based on four sub processes: intuiting, interpreting, integrating and institution, which are supposed to occur at different organizational levels (individuals, groups and organization) (Stevens & Dimitriadis, 2003).

Among the different models of learning styles, Kolb's model (1984) is one of the most effective approaches in the study of learning. According to this model, learning is process four stages that involves, concrete experience, observation and reflections, formation of abstract concepts and generalizations, and testing implications of concepts in new situations. The four-stage formed two dimensional or continuum that is in the first dimension, the concrete experience versus abstract concepts and in the second dimension, concrete experience versus active experimentation. The intersection of these two continuums, create four learning styles divergent, convergent, assimilating and accommodating (Romer, 1992).

2.5. Knowledge management and organizational learning

Both organizational learning and knowledge management approaches are related to increased rationally capitals and to the human capacity and capability complementary for effective measures. The researchers claim that achieving the organizational knowledge and progress are outcomes that result from organizational learning (Song, 2009; Yang et al, 2004), and they typically mention the organizational learning as the key to improving the organizational function (Spicer and Sadler- Smith, 2006). No wonder that both organizational learning and knowledge management have provides the potential to achieve higher levels of effectiveness. Because has been formed the concept knowledge management of organizational learning researches. In some of the writings related on organizational learning literature, organizational learning process is considered equivalent knowledge management and process mastery on knowledge (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995). This knowledge is generated by manageable processes of organizational learning, with the outcome being managed, in turn, by the processes of knowledge management. Hence organizational learning and knowledge management may seem complementary (Antal et al., 2001). Organizational knowledge applies to what these learning processes have generated and this part of the literature typically deals with the nature and location of the organization’s knowledge (Tsoukas & Mylonopoulos, 2004). Organizational learning is a field of knowledge within organizational theory that studies models and theories about the way an organization learns and adapts (Vasenska, 2013). In fact, exist organizational learning in essence knowledge management and role effective had in the organization's long-term performance. The process learning also based is that via concept knowledge management understood.

Brown and Woodland (1999) of organization learning school acclaimed that learning is process knowledge acquisition and Allee (1997) of knowledge management school stated that each of knowledge dimension had a activity learning related to itself (Loermans,2002). By taking a broader perspective, the knowledge application is the result final of the learning process.

Researchers such as (Glasser, 1999; Cross and Baird, 2000; Bixler, 2002; Barna, 2003) in their study found that

is organizational learning as a factor in the success of knowledge management in organizations. Also, the result research Liao & Wu (2010) shown that organizational learning as a variable mediator act between knowledge management and organizational innovation. The results study Liao & Wu (2009) also suggests that the organizational learning is a mechanism along knowledge management. This means that organizational learning acts as an intermediary in positive relationship between knowledge management and organizational performance. yoon (2009) do research to topic "knowledge management System: theoretical considerations and practical application". Research findings indicate that the interaction between the processes strategy and guideline of knowledge management and organizational learning is a key point and a competitive advantage for the business organizations. The result study Lopez & et al (2004) suggested that most important factor on knowledge management process is personnel skillful and organizational learning.

Therefore, those who cannot learning, adaptation and embrace change simply be destroyed. Learning will save us and it will be done by managing on organizational knowledge (Fernandez & Sabherwal, 2001). But problem that there is, anyway, knowledge is power and some individuals whatever that inducement power itself know disposal others not put. In the other hand, in worlds that changes into done continuum only a subject or sets of subjects that on you helped in foresight future there isn't, rather now most important skill this is that learn that how learn.

Therefore, for knowledge acquisition must environment proper it created and on confidence also can told that done expenses in way, great low willing of loss organization knowledge. This is possible through the creation of a culture of organizational learning. Because, culture is heart organization and is a base of knowledge activity. Generally, if the cultural base not ready for knowledge create and application, any technology, content knowledge or knowledge management efforts cause are not successful.

3. Theoretical Framework

For this study, researchers presented four hypotheses on the relationship between four processes knowledge management and organizational learning in between managers of public organizations in Iran.

- 1- There is a positive and significant relationship between knowledge acquisition and organizational learning
- 2- There is a positive and significant relationship between knowledge storage and organizational learning
- 3- There is a positive and significant relationship between knowledge sharing and organizational learning
- 4- There is a positive and significant relationship between knowledge utilization and organizational learning

4. Research Methodology

The study was a quantitative cross sectional survey. The study units for data generation was middle and senior managers in Iranian public organizations. 28 of the public organizations were selected as study population. Whereas managers occupy strategic positions and it is believed that managers are in position to truly respond to questions about organizational attributes (Baer and Frese, 2003). The independent variable in this research is knowledge management and its four processes, knowledge acquisition, knowledge storage, knowledge sharing and knowledge utilization. The dependent variable in this study is organizational learning. Questionnaires were distributed among middle and senior managers. 320 questionnaires distributed and collected among samples within 34 days. 307 copies were returned to the researcher. 28 questionnaires were excluded because they lacked the concurrent validity. The responds that they had not time to fill out a questionnaire and answers were rushed to the questionnaire, they questionnaires were removed. 9 questionnaires were excluded because they were incomplete. Finally, data from 270 questionnaires were analyzed. Data analysis was performed using SPSS version 20. In this study, questionnaires reliability was tested again. For this purpose, initial sample of 30 questionnaires were distributed among the studied sample. Then, using data obtained from the questionnaire was calculated reliability coefficient use of Cronbach's alpha. The reliability of knowledge acquisition ($\alpha = 0.791$), knowledge storage ($\alpha = 0.819$), knowledge sharing ($\alpha = 0.845$) and application of knowledge ($\alpha = 0.922$) was calculated. The reliability of organizational learning ($\alpha = 0.960$) was calculated. Knowledge management is operationalized using Amah (2013) (2012) KM questionnaire and organizational learning on using Watkins and Marsiek (2003) organizational learning questionnaire. knowledge management questionnaire consists of 16 items, questions 1- 4 is related to knowledge acquisition, 5-8 related to knowledge storage, 9-12 related to knowledge sharing and 13-16 related to knowledge utilization and Organizational learning questionnaire is consists of 43 items. The response mode followed a five-point Likert type scale with 5= 'agree strongly', 4= 'agree slightly', 3= 'neither agree nor disagree', 2= 'disagree slightly' and 1= 'disagree strongly'.

Data for this study was analyzed using the Pearson's Rank Correlation Coefficient. The test measures the relationship between two sets of ranked observations and degree of relatedness among ordinal variables when ranked respectively. The value of the Pearson's correlation lies between -1 & +1, the sign indicates the direction of association between the independent variable and the dependent variable. The Pearson's correlation is positive if the dependent variable increase when the independent variable increases; and it's negative if the dependent variable decreases when the independent increases.

5. Research Results and Findings

Frequencies and descriptive were used in our primary analysis which focused on the study demographics and univariate analysis respectively. The results show that 27.4% of respondents younger than 40 years. 51.1% between 40 and 50 years and 21.5% more than 50 years. Minimum age is 32 years and maximum age is 59 years. 8.4% of respondents were women and 95.2% male. 3 % had a lower of undergraduate and diploma degree. 19.3 % graduate, 72 .6 % masters. 2.5 % of managers also had a PhD degree. 22.6% of respondents were less than 15 years of service. 56.3 % of those between 15 and 23 years of service, and 21.1 % had more than 23 years of service. 51.1 % had Less than 10 years management experience, 39.3 % of those between 10 and 18 years of management experience, and 9.6 % had more than 18 years of management experience.

H1: There is a significant positive correlation between Knowledge acquisition and organizational learning in Iranian public organizations.

Table1. Correlations between Knowledge acquisition and OL

		Knowledge Acquisition	Organizational Learning
Knowledge Acquisition	Pearson Correlation	1	.459**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	270	270
Organizational Learning	Pearson Correlation	.459**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	270	270

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The table 1 indicates that there exists a positive relationship between knowledge acquisition and organizational learning. The rho indicates a value of .459 at a significant value of 0.000. Since it falls within the 0.05 level of our preferred level of confidence, we can conclude that there is a significant correlation between knowledge acquisition and organizational learning. This implies that knowledge acquisition has a significant effect on organizational learning.

H2: There is a significant positive correlation between knowledge storage and Organizational learning in Iranian public organizations.

Table2. Correlations between Knowledge storage and OL

		Knowledge Storage	Organizational Learning
Knowledge Storage	Pearson Correlation	1	.490**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	270	270
Organizational Learning	Pearson Correlation	.490**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	270	270

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The table 2 shows that there exists a positive and significant relationship between knowledge storage and organizational learning. The rho value is 0.490 at a significant value of .000 falls within the critical value at a 0.05 level of confidence, hence accepted hypothesis2 which states that there is a significant positive correlation

between knowledge storage and Organizational learning.

H3: There is a significant positive correlation between knowledge sharing and organizational learning in Iranian public organizations.

Table3. Correlations between Knowledge Sharing and OL

		Knowledge Sharing	Organizational Learning
Knowledge Sharing	Pearson Correlation	1	.361 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	270	270
Organizational Learning	Pearson Correlation	.361 **	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	270	270

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The table 3 shows that there exists a statistical significant relationship between the variables. The significant value of 0.000 showed higher value and lies within the preferred critical value of 0.05 (95%) confidence level, therefore the hypothesis2 which states that there is a significant positive relationship between knowledge sharing and organizational learning accepted. Hence knowledge sharing has a significant effect on organizational learning. The coefficient of correlation R shows a 0.361 value implies that there is a positive correlation.

H4: There is a significant positive correlation between knowledge utilization and organizational learning in Iranian public organizations.

Table4. Correlations between Knowledge Utilization and OL

		Knowledge Utilization	Organizational Learning
Knowledge Utilization	Pearson Correlation	1	.572 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	270	270
Organizational Learning	Pearson Correlation	.572 **	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	270	270

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The table 4 indicates that there exists a positive relationship between knowledge utilization and organizational learning. The rho indicates a value of 0.572 at a significant value of 0.000. Since it falls within the 0.05 level of our preferred level of confidence, we can conclude that there is a significant relationship between knowledge utilization and organizational learning. This implies that knowledge utilization has a significant effect on organizational learning.

6. Discussion, Conclusion and Recommendation

The research is about the importance of the relationship between knowledge management and organizational learning between the managers of public organizations in Iran. The findings reveal a positive and significant

relationship between knowledge acquisition and organizational learning ($r = 0.459$, $\rho < 0.01$). Also, a significant positive relationship between the knowledge storage and organizational learning ($r = 0.490$, $\rho < 0.01$), and a significant positive relationship between knowledge sharing and organizational learning ($r = 0.361$, $\rho < 0.01$). The findings also showed a significant positive relationship between knowledge utilization and organizational learning ($r = 0.572$, $\rho < 0.01$).

Based on the discussions above, we concluded that knowledge acquisition, knowledge storage, knowledge sharing and knowledge utilization, increases organizational learning in public organizations of Iran. These findings suggest that the fact that public organizations in knowledge acquisition, knowledge storage, knowledge sharing and knowledge utilization to enhance organizational learning are trying.

Based on the above discussions, we recommend that workshops and training courses to increase the level of awareness of the principles, disciplines, and mechanisms of the organizational learning and knowledge management processes should be conducted. Organizations should providing institutional training and support would certainly increase individual and organizational leaning. Also, organizational learning and KM should be integrated into the above management activities.

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, P.K., K.K. Lim and A.Y.E Loh, (2002). *Learning through knowledge management*. Oxford: Butterworth/Heinemann.
- Akgun AE, Byrne JC, Lynn GS, Keskin H. (2007). *New product development in turbulent environments: Impact of improvisation and unlearning on new product performance*. J Eng Technol Manag. 24(3), pp. 203-30.
- Alavi, M. & Leidner, D. E. (2001). *Review: Knowledge Management and Knowledge Management Systems*. MIS Quarterly, 25(1), pp.107-136.
- Alavi, M., Kayworth, T. R., & Leidner, E. L., (2006). An empirical examination of the influence of organizational culture on knowledge management practices. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 22(3), 191-224.
- Allee, V. (1997). *The knowledge evolution: Expanding organizational intelligence*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann, UK.
- Antal, A. B., Dierkes, M., Child, J. and Nonaka, I. (2001). *Introduction: Finding Paths Through the Handbook*, in M. Dierkes, A. B. Antal, J. Child and I. Nonaka (eds) *Handbook of Organizational Learning and Knowledge*, pp. 1-7. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Argyris, C. & Schon, D. (1978). *Organisational learning: a theory of action perspective*, New York: Addison-Wesley.
- Baer, M. and Frese, M. (2003). Innovation is not enough: climates for initiative and psychological safety, process innovations, and firm performance, *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 24 (1), pp. 45-68.
- Barna, Z. (2003). *Knowledge management: a critical e-business strategic factor*. Master thesis, San Diego State University, USA.
- Baumard, P., & Starbuck, W. H. (2005). *Learning from failures: Why it may not happen*. *Long Range Planning*, 38(3), 281-298.
- Bixler. (2002). *Applying the four pillars of knowledge management*. *KMWorld11* (1), pp.34-40.
- Bhatt , G., (2001), Knowledge Management in Organizations: Examining the Interaction Between Technologies, Techniques, and People, *Journal of Knowledge Management* , 5(1), pp. 75-98.
- Bose, R. (2004), "Knowledge management metrics", *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 104 (6), pp. 457-468.
- Chiva, R., Alegre, J., and Lapiedra, R. (2007). Measuring organizational learning capability among the workforce. *International Journal of Manpower*. 28 (3/4), pp. 224-242.
- Christensen, C.M. & Rarnor, m. e. (2003). *The Innovators Solution: Creating and Sustaining Successful Growth*. Harvard Business School Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Cook, S., & Yanow, D. (1995). *Culture and organizational learning*. *Organizational learning*, 430-59.
- Cross, R., and L. Baird. (2000). *Technology is not enough: improving performance by building organizational memory*. *Salon management review* 41 (3), PP.41-54.
- Crossan, M. M., Lane, H. W., & White, R. E. (1999). *An Organizational Learning Framework: From Intuition to Institution*. *Academy of Management Review*, 24 (3), pp.522-537.
- Cui, A.S., Griffith, D.A., Cavusgil, S.T. (2005). The Influence of Competitive Intensity and Market Dynamism on Knowledge Management Capabilities of MNC Subsidiaries. *Journal of International Marketing*, 13(3), pp. 32-53.
- Curado, C. (2006). *Organizational learning and organizational design*. *The Learning Organization*, 13(1), 25-48.
- Cyert, R., March, J. (1963). *A Behavioral theory of the Firm*. Englewood Cliffs (NJ) Prentice-Hall.
- Daft, R. L & Weick, K. E. (1984). *Toward a Model of Organizations as Interpretation System*, *Academic Management Review* 9 (2), pp.284-295.
- Davenport, T. & prusak, L. (1998). *working knowledge: how organization manage what they know*. Harvard Business School Press, Boston, Massachusetts.
- Davenport, T. & Volpel, S.C. (2001). The rise of Knowledge towards attention management. *Journal of Knowledge management*. PP. 212-221.

- De Geus, A. (1997). *The Living Company*. Harvard Business Review, 75(2), pp. 51-59. See also his book of the same name. The Living Company: Habits for Survival in a Turbulent Business Environment. Longview Publishing.
- Delong, D. (1997). *Building the knowledge-based organization: How culture drives knowledge behaviors*. Center for business innovation.
- De Oliveira, E. & William, B. & Werther, Jr. (2013). *Resilience: Continuous renewal of competitive advantages Business Horizons*. 56, pp. 333-342.
- Drucker, P. (1993). *Postcapitalist society*. New York, NY: Harper Business.
- Fernandez, I.B. & Sabherwal, R. (2001). Organizational Knowledge Management: A Contingency Perspective. *Journal of Management Information Systems* 18(1), pp. 23-55.
- Filius, R., De Jong, J. A., & Roelofs, E. C. (2000). Knowledge management in the HRD office: A comparison of three cases. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 12, pp. 286-295.
- Gieskes, J. B., Hyland, P., & Magnusson, M. G. (2002). Organizational learning barriers in distributed product development: observations from a multinational corporation. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 14(7/8), pp. 310-319.
- Glasser, P. (1999). *The knowledge factor*. *CIO magazine* (15), pp.1-9.
- Gomez, J. & Cespedes- Lorente, J. & Valle- cabreva, R. (2005). Organizational Learning capability: a proposal of management. *Journal of Business Research*. 18. pp.715-725.
- Huber, G., (1991). *Organizational learning: the contributing process and the literature*. *Organization Science* 2(1), pp. 88-115.
- Kang, S. C., Morris, S. S., & Snell, S. A. (2007). *Relational archetypes, organizational learning, and value creation: Extending the human resource architecture*. *Academy of Management Review*, 32, 236-256.
- Karlson, A. k. (2007). *knowledge and learning in aid organizations – A literature review with suggestions for further studies*, www.sadew.se.
- Kolb, D.A. (1984). *Experimental learning. Experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood cliffs, N, J: Prentice Hall.
- Lawson, S., (2003). *Examining the relationship between organizational culture and knowledge management*. Nova Southeastern University.
- Lee, T. S. and Tsai, H. J. (2005). The Effects of Business Operation Mode on Market orientation, Learning Orientation and Innovativeness, *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 105(3), pp. 325-348.
- Lee, K. C., Lee, S., & Kang, I.W. (2005). KMPI: measuring knowledge management performance. *Information & Management*, 42(3), pp. 469 – 482.
- Levit, B & March, J.G. (1988). *Organizational Learning Annual, review Sociology* 14, pp.319-340.
- Liao, S.H. (2002). *Problem Solving and knowledge Inertia; Expert Systems with Applications* 22, pp. 21-31.
- Liao, S. & Wu, C, (2009). The Relationship among Knowledge Management, Organizational Learning, and Organizational Performance, *International Journal of Business and Management*, 4.
- Liao, S. H., & Wu, C. C. (2010). *System perspective of knowledge management, organizational learning, and organizational innovation*. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 37, pp.1096-1103.
- Lien B.Y, Hung R.Y, Mclean G.N, (2007). *Organizational learning as an organization development intervention in six high-technology firms in Taiwan: an exploratory case study; Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 18(2), pp: 211-228.
- Loermans, J., (2002). Synergizing the learning organization and knowledge management. *Journal of knowledge Management*, 6 (3), PP. 285-294.
- Lopez, S., Perez, J., and Manuel, M., (2004), Managing Knowledge: The Link Between Culture and Organizational Learning, *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 8 (6), pp. 93-104.
- Louise, Y. B. David, N. Benjamin, W. Robert, G. (2006). *Leadership and organizational learning: a multiple levels perspective, The Leadership Quarterly*, 17, PP. 577-594.
- Marquardt, M.J. (1996), *Building the Learning Organization*, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.
- Marquardt, M. J. (2002). *Building the Learning Organization: Mastering the Five Elements for Corporate Learning*. Palo Alto: Davies-Black Press.
- Neefe DO. (2001) *Comparing levels of organizational learning maturity of colleges and universities participating in traditional and nontraditional (Academic Quality Improvement project) accreditation process [M.S. Dissertation]*. Menomonie: University of Wisconsin- Stout.
- Nelson, R. R & Winter, S. G. (1982). *An Evolutionary Theory of Economic Change*, Cambridge: Belknap Press.
- Nonaka, I. (1994). *A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation*. *Organization Science*, 5 (1), pp. 14-37.
- Nonaka, I., Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ortenblad, A. (1998). *on differences between organizational learning and organization the learning organization*, 8(3).
- Pilar, Jerez-Gomez, Jose, Cespedes-Lorente, & Ramon, Valle-Cabrera (2005). Organizational learning capability: A proposal of measurement. *Journal of Business Research*, 58(6), 715-725.
- Pham T. N., Swierczek W. F. (2006). *Facilitators of organizational learning in design; The Learning Organization*, 13(2).
- Probest, G. Raub, S. & romhardt, K. (2000). *Managing knowledge building blocks for success*. John Wiley and Sons.
- Romer, R (1992) *by all measures: Equally: A Trans cendent issue*. Education Week, 17, P. 17.
- Senge, P. (1990). *The Fifth Discipline: The art and practice of learning organization*. New York: Doubleday Dell.

- Sitkin, S. B. (1992). *Learning through failure: The strategy of small losses*. Research in organizational behavior, 14, pp. 231-231.
- Shapiro, Carl, and Hal Varian. (1999). *Information Rules: A Strategic Guide to the Network Economy*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Shin, M., Holden, T. & Schmidt, R.A. (2001). *From knowledge theory to management practice: Toward an integrated approach*. Information Processing and Management, 37(2), pp. 335-355.
- Slater, S.F. and Narver J.C. (1995). Market orientation and learning organizational; *Journal of Marketing*; 59, pp. 61-73.
- Song J.H, Joo B, Chermack T.J, (2009). The dimensions of learning organization questionnaire (DLOQ): a validation study in a Korean context; *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 20(1), pp: 43- 64.
- Spicer D.P, Sadler- Smith E, (2006). Organizational learning in smaller manufacturing firms. *International Small Business Journal*. 24(2), pp. 133-158.
- Stevens, E., Dimitriadis, S. (2003). New service development through the lens of organizational learning: evidence from longitudinal case studies; *Journal of Business Research*, 58(74), pp.1-11.
- Thurrow, L.C. (2003). *Fortune Favors the Bold: What We Must Do to Build a New and Lasting Global Prosperity*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.
- Tsoukas, H. and Mylonopoulos, N. (eds) (2004) *Organizations as Knowledge Systems: Knowledge, Learning and Dynamic Capabilities*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Umoh, G. Amah, E. (2013). Knowledge Management and Organizational Resilience in Nigerian Manufacturing Organizations. *Journal of Developing Country Studies*. 3(9), pp.104-120.
- Vasenska I. (2013). *Organizational Learning and Employee Empowering Increasing Tourist Destination Performance*. Proceedings of the 2013 Active Citizenship by Knowledge Management & Innovation: Proceedings of the Management, Knowledge and Learning International Conference 2013: 615-624.
- Wiig, K.M., (1997). Knowledge management: where did it come from and where will it go. *Journal of Expert Systems with Applications*, 13, pp.1-14.
- Wong, K.W. & Aspinwall, El. (2004). *Knowledge management implementation frameworks: a review*, Knowledge and Process Management, 11(2), PP 93-104.
- Yang, D. (2011). *The Effect of Knowledge Management on Product Innovation - Evidence from the Chinese Software Outsourcing Vendors*, *Business*, 2011, 3, pp. 16-22.
- Yang B, Watkins K.E, Marsick V.J, (2004). The construct of the learning organization: dimensions, measurement, and validation measurement. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 15(1), pp: 31-55.
- Yoon, A. (2009). *Designing integrative knowledge management System: theoretical considerations and practical application*. Advances in Developing Human Resources, sanfrancisco. 11(3), p. 307.
- Zhang, Li., Tian, Y., & Zhongying Q, A. (2009). *A conceptual model organizational learning based on knowledge sharing*. Advanced Learning Technologies, 2006. Sixth International Conference, 20(5), pp.4-6.

The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open-Access hosting service and academic event management. The aim of the firm is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the firm can be found on the homepage:

<http://www.iiste.org>

CALL FOR JOURNAL PAPERS

There are more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals hosted under the hosting platform.

Prospective authors of journals can find the submission instruction on the following page: <http://www.iiste.org/journals/> All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Paper version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

MORE RESOURCES

Book publication information: <http://www.iiste.org/book/>

Academic conference: <http://www.iiste.org/conference/upcoming-conferences-call-for-paper/>

IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digital Library, NewJour, Google Scholar

