

# IMPERATIVE OF LEARNING ORGANIZATION ON ECONOMIC GROWTH: A STUDY OF SELECTED TERTIARY SCHOOL IN ABIA STATE

BY  
AMOBI, MAXWELL UBABUIKE  
OKEBERAM, SUNDAY MOSES

## *Abstract*

*The study focused on the impact of learning organizations on the growth of Nigeria (A study of MOUAAU and Abia State University Uturu, Abia State). The specific objectives were to determine the impact of learning organizations on the growth of MOUAAU and Abia State University Uturu, Abia State, ascertain the relationship between learning organizations and economic growth of MOUAAU and Abia State University Uturu, Abia State, to examine the factors affecting learning organization on the growth of Nigeria and to assess the learning organization strategies to improve growth MOUAAU and ABSU. The study adopted survey research design, the survey research design was used to identify the participants in an accurate way and it involves describing people who takes part in the study conducted. The population of the study comprised four thousand, one hundred and thirty six (4362). The study sample size involves (400). Primary data obtain from distribution of questionnaires were analyze using descriptive statistic such as frequency, mean and percentage. The study adopted simple regression, multiple regression and correlation coefficient to analyze the hypotheses. The result reviews that learning organizations has significant impact on the growth of MOUAAU and ABSU, there is significant relationship between learning organization and the growth of MOUAAU and ABSU, no interest or passion to learn, no orientation, poor empowerment, poor thinking and value system have significant impact on the growth of MOUAAU and ABSU and working in conducive environment and harmonized lecturer and student relationships a have significant impact on the growth of MOUAAU and ABSU. It was recommended that management of the studied organizations to inculcate the spirit of learning since its leads to better and well improve organizational learning*

**Keywords:** *Learning organizations and growth of Nigeria*

## **Introduction**

### **Background of the Study**

In order to cope with unexpected and drastic changes, organizations need to embrace and devise their cutting edge strategies for survival and growth; this however has led to constantly changing of existing strategies by unlearning, relearning and learning new ways of behaving/operations in organizations. According to Senge (1990) learning organization is one where people continuously expand their capacity to create the 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 improve and enhance the performance of their organization. In today's organizations particularly institution learning and its application have become the basic components and pillars of growth, survival and success for indigenous firms established within the state. The dynamic changes of the environment have therefore may it an imperative and not optional for many contemporary organizations to be understudy to better understand how they operate and change according to the changing needs and demands of its customers (Lawrence, 2012).

Consequently, it is asserted that the only constant thing in life is change; hence it is now clear to many organizations particularly those sited in Nigeria that only firms who understand and proactively embraced changes/innovation has the tendency of survival and growth. In this era of intensified competition, knowledge economy and rapid transformation and change, successful organizations are those that can recognize, react to, manage, and prosper in a changing environment

(Johnson, 2009). In addition, the capacity for change and improvement is linked with learning and learning in its totality. To obtain and sustain competitive advantage institutions must enhance their learning capability and must be able to encourage learning to foster success and limit failures within and outside the organization (Marquardt, 2011).

Furthermore, learning organization is the key to being able to identify opportunities and to exploit them rapidly and fully. Learning has now been recognized as an important ingredient of organizational changes and the ability of individuals and organizations to learn has become the primary means of winning and survival in this 21<sup>st</sup> century (Argote and Oke, 2011). This in turn has led to the emergence of learning organization whose foundation lies in the belief that learning and change are closely intertwined. Learning organizations have structures and systems and are designed in ways that help to anticipate and react to changes such that people and organizations can improve their performance and survive in the turbulent environment.

Moreover, learning organizations emphasize more on organization that focuses on the creation, acquisition and transference of knowledge to continuously improve and transform itself, facilitates the learning and develop its staff, fosters and supports a learning environment (Senge, and Ali, 2012). Learning organizations have a greater capacity to spot opportunities and sense trends and events in the market which consequently leads to better products/services, customer satisfaction and improved market performance (Rose and Kumar, 2009). In the fiercely changing environment, learning organization has become essential for the survival of most organizations, presenting them with faster and more effective ways to render services and outperform their various competitors leading to rapidly growing business, large customer base and market shares in the long run (Kingsley, 2012).

Recently, organizations (institutions) in this millennium are willing and able to have its staff fully engage in the daily operation of the business by presenting them the opportunities to learn, relearn and constantly search for new ways to improve the organization performance as well becoming relevant by continually serving its customers at all cost. It is therefore imperative and viable to state that the need for survival and growth in an era of continuous change can force organizations to find a condition that will enable them to cope with this new situation in the environment cutting edge and being entirely different and preferable more than its competition (Avlonitis Salavou, Bierly, Daly, Akhavan, Jafari Austin and Harkins 2008). Thus, all these underlying uses prompted this study.

### **Statement of Problem**

Over the last one decade, the tertiary institutions have experienced unsatisfactory progress resulting to retarded growth rate in terms of educational quality, consistent striking by academic staff, examinational malpractices, youth's engagement in cultism because of bad morals, coupled with employment of half-baked and inexperienced staff in the system. The interaction between academic representatives and government agencies has kept on nose-diving virtually in all issues, over exercising control through many rules and regulations with difficult conditions, policy formulation with little or no provision for infrastructural facilities in tertiary institutions. Given all these challenges, it is difficult for learning organizations to achieve its cost due to this evil cankerworm at play. In response to these challenges, institutions such as (MOU/UAU) are beginning to see the usefulness of learning organization in order to practically contend the pressures facing it. However, it had been noted that learning organizational variables as mentioned in the hypotheses had added to the problems affecting organization in recent times, it could be asserted that staff and management in the institutions find it hard to get along as a result this has affected the organizational growth; today it is a common practice to see that instead of staff working to improve student performance or the academic sector they would rather operate contrary to the goal of the institution for their own

financial gain and benefits. This in return may be as a result of a number of factors such as lack of trust and low commitment level between management and staff in position of authority.

Also institutional leaders today have been so redundant and do not want to share their vision and ideas with staff at lower level even finds it hard to commitment easily because of the fear of specialization and perfection (taping from them) and still wants these staff to be highly committed, effective and productive at all cost. This however may had formed what affects learning in organization and backdrop to organizational performance in the long run.

Furthermore, it could be stated that today you will find that tertiary institutions do not take their time to consider all the parameters that can facilitate better and effective academic improvement before implementation but instead believe that the use system thinking it quite effective in averting all possible challenges, because of this negligence and shortcomings a good number of tertiary institution have not being able to excel in academic for a long time but instead rise and fall like an institution without a blue print and management proficiency.

More so, it is even disappointing to say that as much as some committed staff takes it as a point of duty and necessity to contribute to the student academic success and progress; it is even more difficult to see that a good number of student cannot learn even within a comfortable environment equip with all facilities which may bring out the best test of staff them. Also it is even more disturbing to see today how team learning instead of enhancing staff performance has done the contrary thereby affecting those who had the capacity and capability to carry out the function personally underperform because of laxity on the part of his colleague's team mate, this and many aforementioned forms what may likely affects learning in organization and its performance rate. It is against these backdrops that this study intends to investigate the impact of learning organization of Nigeria.

### **Objectives of the Study**

The broad objective of the study is the impact of learning organizations on the growth of Nigeria (A study of MOUAAU and Abia State University Uturu, Abia State). The specific objectives were to;

- i. determine the impact of learning organizations on the growth of MOUAAU and Abia State University Uturu, Abia State
- ii. ascertain the relationship between learning organizations and economic growth of MOUAAU and Abia State University Uturu, Abia State
- iii. examine the factors affecting learning organization on the growth of Nigeria
- iv. to assess the learning organization strategies to improve growth MOUAAU and ABSU

### **Research Questions**

1. What is the impact of learning organizations on the growth of MOUAAU and Abia State?
2. What is the relationship between learning organizations and economic growth of MOUAAU and Abia State University Uturu, Abia State?
3. What are factors affecting learning organization on the growth of Nigeria?
4. What is assess the learning organization strategies to improve growth MOUAAU and ABSU?

### **Research Hypotheses**

**H01:** Learning organizations has no significant impact on the growth of MOUAU and ABSU.

**H02:** There is no significant relationship between learning organization and economic growth of MOUAU and ABSU.

**H03:** No interest or passion to learn, No orientation, poor empowerment, poor thinking and value system have no significant impact on the growth of MOUAU and ABSU.

**H04:** Working in conducive environment and harmonized lecturer and student relationships has no significant impact on the growth of MOUAU and ABSU.

## **Review of Related Literature**

### **Conceptual Framework**

The concept of learning organization has been in existence for quite some time but it has gained larger currency after the work of Senge in 2002 with his book *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization* described learning organization in terms of five building blocks, i.e. personal mastery, mental models, shared vision, systems thinking, and team learning.

### **Learning Organization**

A learning organization is one that seeks to create its own future; that assumes learning as an ongoing and creative process for its members; and one that develops, adapts, and transforms itself in response to the needs and aspirations of people, both inside and outside itself (Navran Associates Newsletter, 2009). A learning organization (LO) is described as an organization where individuals continuously stretch their capacity to make the result they really desire, where patterns of thinking that are new and beyond easy reach are reared, where collective ambition is released, and also where persons are constantly thinking out ways to learn the whole altogether (Senge, 2002). According to the authors, business organizations will need to imbibe the philosophy of learning organizations that is, a philosophy that will developed the capacity to continuously learn new things and change things. In addition, Moilanen (2009) asserted that learning organization is something that can be consciously managed in an organization using learning as an important element in its core values, mission, visions and objectives as well as in its day to day operations and their assessment. Kinicki and Williams (2011) opine that learning organization is an organization that seeks to actively create knowledge, acquire knowledge, and transfer knowledge, within itself and is able to change its behaviour to show new knowledge. A learning organization can learn about, and from its environment and fitting itself into it. Advanced learning organizations can change their environments with the aim of achieving the desired objectives.

Learning organization is a group of people working together collectively to enhance their capacities to create results they really care about. Organizational learning involves individual learning, and those who make the shift from traditional organization thinking to learning organizations develop the ability to think critically and creatively. Senge (2002) describes learning organizations as organizations where employees continually seek to expand their capacity and ability to create and produce results they desire, where new and expansive creative thinking are nurtured, where team aspiration is promoted, and where employees are continually learning in order to see the whole problem of the organization together. learning organization is the capability “within an organization to maintain or improve performance based on experience. This activity involves knowledge acquisition (the development or creation of skills, insights, and relationships), knowledge sharing (the dissemination to others of what has been acquired by some), and knowledge utilization (integration of learning so that it is assimilated and broadly available and can be generalized to new situations). Learning organization is the development by which the organization boost the information produced by individuals in a prearranged way and converts this information into element of the organization's knowledge classification. The procedure occurs in a society of interface in which the forms generates understanding, which develops in a invariable self-motivated

among the explicit and the tacit (Nonaka and Takeuchi, 2009). The progress of new talent and awareness and enlarge in the organization's competence encourage learning organization. Learning organization engages behavioral and cognitive revolutionize.

In a complicated and variable environment of today world, the learning organization concept is one of the most modern concepts in the context of organizational development and human resource development (Song *et al.*, 2009). According to Senge (2006), two kinds of organizations will be in future; those who have failed and will be vanished gradually and the second group are learning organizations. There is no consensus among researchers and scholars on the definition of learning organization, there are varied definitions of this concept among them, according to their differences in philosophical orientation and the nature of experience and expertise and disciplines to which they belong. In light of Senge's belief, learning can be enhanced with the knowledge, experience and new skills, in the light of this belief, he defines the learning organizations as "those organizations where people continually expand their capacity to create the 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 to see the whole together" (Senge, 2006). Watkins and Marsick (2009) believe that learning organization seeks continuously to learn and move toward all that is new, through the adoption of an integrated strategy to work through participatory learning in order to improve the organization's ability to innovate and grow.

Gardiner and Whiting (2007) believe that most successful organizations are the learning organizations so that centrality of new paradigm is "learning ". According to Garvin *et al.*, (2008), the organization, which has its place of excellence in knowledge creation, acquisition and transfer is a learning one, and can be achieved through the provision of three fundamental building blocks, namely: the internal environment supporting learning processes, and the processes and practices of concrete function of learning, in addition to the behavior of a leadership supported and enhanced these processes and practices. Therefore, a learning organization is able to exploit the personal skill impeded in employees' intellectual and mental energies, and able to create shared vision, team learning, and systems thinking to achieve organizational goals (Jacobs, 2012). Learning organization is an organization that encourages and facilitates learning in order to continually transform itself to survive and excel in a rapidly changing business environment. The highly complex, interrelated, and integrated global economy of the 21st century presents new challenges to managers and employees attempting to effectively compete in such a dynamic business environment. The characteristics of a learning organization will help managers and employees meet these challenges by providing them tools to pursue a creative vision, learn and work together effectively, and adapt to change. A learning organization is a living, breathing organism that creates the space that enables people and the system to learn, to grow, and to endure (Marsick and Watkins, 2009). In order to develop better ability to adapt to a changing global environment, there is a greater need to design organizations that can learn (McGill, Slocum and Lei, 2013).

Through the above definitions, we can say that the learning organization is the organization that is able to develop future vision, regulatory contexts, strategies, and work activities that promoting and strengthening of organizational learning. This can be done through the process of knowledge creation, acquisition, and transfer in collective and participatory manner, as well as by enhancing the capabilities of self-development, in the light of the data and deliberate shifts to rapid changes in the environment and the challenges related to this.

## **Predictable Variables of Learning Organization**

### **Personal Mastery**

It begins "by becoming committed to lifelong learning," and is the spiritual cornerstone of a learning organization. Personal Mastery involves being more realistic, focusing on becoming the best person possible, and striving for a sense of commitment and excitement in our careers to facilitate the realization of potential (Senge 1990 in Oke, (2011).

Personal mastery applies to individual learning that organizations cannot learn until their members begin to learn. Personal Mastery has two components. First, one must define what one is trying to achieve (a goal). Second, one must have a true measure of how close one is to the goal. Long-term goals are often something to be achieved in the next three to five years. In personal mastery, the goal, or what one is trying to achieve, is much further away in distance. It may take a lifetime to reach it, if one ever does. Individuals who practice personal mastery experience other changes in their thinking. They learn to use both reason and intuition to create. They become systems thinkers who see the interconnectedness of everything around them and, as a result, they feel more connected to the whole. It is exactly this type of individual that one needs at every level of an organization for the organization to a brief look at the literature pertaining to learning organization suggests that a learning organization is nothing but a particular organizational form (Goh, 2001). Senge (1990) who popularized the concept of learning organization stated that in order to build a learning organization, five disciplines are necessary. The presence or mastery of these disciplines distinguishes a learning organization from others.

### **Mental Model**

It must be managed because they do prevent new powerful insights and organizational practices from becoming implemented. The process begins with self-reflection; unearthing deeply held belief structures and generalizations, and understanding how they dramatically influence the way we operate in our own lives. Until there is realization and a focus on openness, real change can never take place (Senge 1990 in Oke, 2011).

It is a framework for the cognitive processes of our mind. In other words, it determines how we think and act. The assumptions held by individuals and organizations are called mental models. To become a learning organization, these models must be challenged. Individuals tend to espouse theories, which are what they intend to follow, and theories-in-use, which are what they actually do. Similarly, organizations tend to have 'memories' which preserve certain behaviors.

### **System Thinking**

The idea of the learning organization developed from a body of work called systems thinking. This is a conceptual framework that allows people to study businesses as bounded objects. Learning organizations use this method of thinking when assessing their company and have information systems that measure the performance of the organization as a whole and of its various components. System thinking states that all the characteristics must be apparent at once in an organization for it to be a learning organization. If some of these characteristics are missing, then the organization will fall short of its goal. System thinking is a framework for seeing patterns and interrelationships. It's especially important to see the world as a whole as it grows more and more complex.

System thinking is the ability to see the big picture, and to distinguish patterns instead of conceptualizing change as isolated events. System thinking needs the other four disciplines to enable a learning organization to be realized. There must be a paradigm shift - from being unconnected to interconnected to the whole, and from blaming our problems on something external to a realization that how we operate, our actions, can create problems (Senge 1990 in Oke, 2010).

### **Team Learning**

A team, say Robbins and Finley, is people doing something together. People trusted each other, complemented each other's strengths, compensated for each other's weaknesses, aimed for goals

higher than anyone might have dared individually-and a result produced an extraordinary outcome. In such teams, each member is committed to continual improvement, each suspends judgment as to what's possible and so removes mental limitations, each shares a vision of greatness, and the team's collective competence is far greater than any individual's. Team members also recognize and understand the system in which they operate and how they can influence it. a number of persons, usually reporting to a common superior and having some face-to-face interaction, who have some degree of interdependence in carrying out tasks for the purpose of achieving organizational goals (French and Bell, 2015).

### **Shared Vision**

A shared vision begins with the individual, and an individual vision is something that one person holds as a truth. a vision is a vivid mental image. In this context, vivid means graphic and lifelike. Based on this, it can be concluded that a vision is a graphic and lifelike mental image that is very important to us, i.e., held within our hearts. The vision is often a goal that the individual wants to reach. In systems thinking that goal is most often a long term goal, something that can be a leading star for the individual. The development of a shared vision is important in motivating the staff to learn, as it creates a common identity that provides focus and energy for learning. The most successful visions build on the individual visions of the employees at all levels of the organization, thus the creation of a shared vision can be hindered by traditional structures where the company vision is imposed from above. Therefore, learning organizations tend to have flat, decentralized organizational structures. The shared vision is often to succeed against a competitor however; Senge (2002) states that these are transitory goals and suggests that there should also be long-term goals that are intrinsic within the company. the vision must be created through interaction with the individuals in the organization. The leader's role in creating a shared vision is to share her own vision with the employees. This should not be done to force that vision on others, but rather to encourage others to share their vision too (French and Bell, 2015).



Source, Senge, (1990)

### **Other Predictable Variables of Learning Organization**

Learning issues are dynamic and will be based on the requirements and effort of the people to learn. In keeping up with the required growth of a learning infrastructure, organizational members should be supported to advance their professional qualifications. These facilitate essential means to create and enhance a learning culture based on group work. Continuous learning opportunities are the prerequisites to enhance personal and professional growth and development among organizational members. According to Thomas and Brown (2011) learning in this twenty first century is rather not

taking place in a classroom, it is happening all around us, everywhere and it is powerful. A learning culture is an organizational commitment to an effective ongoing learning and the team processes of communication, sharing, support and understanding that moves the organization forward. It is a set of norms and values about the functioning of an organization that supports systematic, in-depth approaches aimed at achieving higher-level, strategic or generative organizational learning through phases of information acquisition, information interpretation and accompanying behavioral and cognitive changes (Skerlavaj *et al.*, 2007).

A learning culture is important in an organization because it allows learning to be cultivated (Farago and Skyrme, 2015). The commitment of learning must receive broad backing from the top management, where people at all levels are encouraged to learn, develop and designate their thoughts. Moreover, Chinowsky, Molenaar, and Realph (2007) asserted that to have a proactive learning culture, an organization accentuate expenditure of time and resources. They also placed some key contributors to adopt learning culture in organizations such as performance, aging workforce, distributed workforce, best solutions, and growth of the organization's development. Azmee, Kassim and Sulaiman (2012) emphasized the benefits of a learning culture in organization that comprises of providing good quality of products and services, satisfying customer's needs, superior performance, committed and result-focused workforce.

## **A. Leadership**

Leadership is commonly understood as the use of influence to encourage participation in achieving set goals. The leadership process involves the leader's personality and behaviors, the follower's perception of the leader and the context within which the interaction takes place (Day and Antonakis, 2012). Yukl and Heaton (2002) in their research noted that leadership is normally interpreted as the use of influence to promote participation in reaching set goals. Day and Antonakis (2012) explained that the leadership process involves the leader's personality and behaviors, the follower's perception of the leader and the context within which the interaction takes place. Pearce and Conger (2012) stressed that the primary concept of leadership is the relationship that takes place between leaders and followers. Bass (1991) said that leaders must structure or restructure perceptions, expectations, and situations of group member.

Leaders are a relational process between leader and followers, and are shaped by the setting. For leadership to be effective, Riggio, Murphy and Pirozzolo (2011) suggested that leaders must focus on their credibility and legitimacy with followers, the development of a relationship via identification of followers' needs and motivations, and deploying resources as to draw the best out of followers in order to meet established goals. Kotter (2001) clarified that leaders must adapt for change, motivate and inspire followers in the right direction. The effectiveness of leadership can also be focused on the good relationship beyond their immediate subordinates. According to Balkundi and Kilduff (2006), leadership is related to social capital, which is leadership as a social capital that collects around certain individuals.

## **b. Dialogue**

Dialogue is referred to here, not in the ordinary sense of a conversation between two people, but in a specific sense, defined by the late physicist Bohm (2003), which uses particular methods by which a group can participate in a pool of common substance which is capable of constant growth and variety. According to Senge (1994) dialogue helps people travel beyond the boundaries of their thinking. Through a process of collective inquiry, a deeper understanding of one another emerges with alternative points of view, bringing new approaches to old problems. There must be a 'facilitator' who 'holds the context' of dialogue (Senge, 1990). According to Bell (2009), dialogue is his study literally means "the flow of meaning". It helps people move beyond the limits of their thinking. Through a process of collective inquiry, a deeper understanding of one another emerges



with alternative points of view, bringing new approaches to old problems. Based on Ballantyne (2009), dialogue has been discussed as a process of interactive learning together. The process between business counterparts is often spontaneous and unruly yet bounded by a serious intent to reach mutual understanding.

Moreover, according to Bokeno (2007) dialogue requires open conversation, honest, mutual interaction; not clearer messages, but authentic collaboration, not more communication, but different communication, trust, genuine self-reflection, exposure of clear and tacit ways of thinking, and willingness to grow through risk. Thus, it is easy to see that the premise for dialogue enthusiastically reaches far beyond the industry standard for “effective” internal communication. Based on Bokeno (2007)’s study, dialogue tends to be utilized in any of three broad ways:

- For more creative and innovative decision making and problem resolving.
- For a greater understanding, minimize conflict and increase tolerance of each other.
- For a mutual transformation or change on the part of the participants.

### **Sustaining Learning Organization**

Building and sustaining a learning organization is a challenging endeavor. Sustainable development has become popular for potentially integrating economic, environmental sustainability and social dimensions, which are known as the triple bottom line, in the performance evaluation of businesses (Jamali, 2006). Velazquez, Esquer, Munguía and Moure (2011) defined sustainability as a process to transit to sustainable development. It is a learning process that must be measured in a continuous scale where the stock of knowledge is increased along the time. Taking into consideration of this perspective, it is inadequate to consider sustainable development as discrete data where there are only two possible scores which are sustainable or unsustainable. Besides that, learning organization refers to an ideal form of organization where several processes take place for learning (Ortenblad, 2011). This concept has been challenged by Grieves (2008) who suggested the idea of abandoning the learning organization concept. In addition, Kliucininkas (2001) mentioned that the sustainable development concept has also faced a lot of critiques because of its vague meaning and it can mean all or nothing at the same time. This has become an intuitive concept that could be mentioned as a goal in any organization almost regardless of what they are doing. According to Velaquez *et al.*, (2011), the existing knowledge about learning organization and sustainable development do not give a clear direction to firms’ managers about how to become a sustainable learning organization; however, the learning sustainability experiences around the world have provided tools and mechanics to companies to enhance its economic profits without affecting the environment and communities.

Allenby (2009) claimed that there was not an organization that could call itself a sustainable organization because it is immersed in an unsustainable global economy. An organization needs to be more consistent towards the development and sharing of knowledge within and among the organization in order to improve and sustain organizational performance (Shamsul and Kassim, 2014). However, Natrass (2013) suggested an industry’s sustainability learning timeline in which sustainability knowledge can be developed to realize that they are part of nature and consciously integrate their vision and operations with natural cycle processes.

### **Learning Organization Perspectives**

Numerous management perspectives try to determine the dimensions of the learning organization, and the following are the most prominent of these perspectives:

### **System Perspective:**

This perspective based on idea of a holistic view of the organization and its interaction and response with the internal and external environment. Among the most prominent pioneers of this perspective, the researcher and thinker Peter Senge, who believes that the organization must possess an adaptive capacity with its environment, and develop a set of alternatives for the future in order to survive and grow, as well as the creation of shared visions and perceptions between members of the organization to achieve high degrees of harmony and coordination of efforts are basic requirements (Senge, 2006). Senge has identified five dimensions of learning organization, these dimension are: personal mastery, mental models, building a shared vision, team learning, and systems thinking (Senge, 2006).

### **Learning Perspective:**

In light of this perspective, learning organization can be viewed as an organization that facilitates the learning process for all its members, and strives continuously to achieve its strategic objectives through creating intended processes of change and transformation. Pedler and Others (1991) identified an eleven cornerstones that must be available in learning organizations, these cornerstones are: learning through building strategies, participatory decision-making processes, shared information system, control systems, transparent accountability, internal information exchange system, flexible rewards systems, organizational structures that support learning, environmental scans through specialized groups, organizational learning, organizational climate that support learning, and entrench the principles of self-development for all.

### **Strategic Perspective:**

This perspective has been emphasized the importance of strategic factors in building the organization's learning capacity. Garvin and Others (1993) stress on the importance of knowledge creation, acquisition, and transfer that is obtained organizationally, and the process of behavior modification in accordance with this knowledge. On the other hand, Gho (1998) believes that leader's skills and capabilities play a vital role in building efficient and effective learning organization (Gho, 1998).

### **Integrative Perspective:**

This perspective was developed by the work of Watkins and Marsick. They identified seven dimensions for the learning organization, these dimension are (Watkins and Marsick, (2006) create continuous learning opportunities, promote inquiry and dialogue, encourage collaboration and team learning, establish systems to capture and share learning, empower people toward a collective vision, connect the organization to its environment, use leaders who model and support learning at the individual, team, and organizational levels. In light of these dimensions, Watkins and Marsick developed "The Dimension of Learning Organization Questionnaire", which is a tool to measure the dimensions of learning in the context of learning organizations. This questionnaire is universally accepted and widely used among researchers. It contains (43) statements to measure the dimensions of the learning organization. This measure has achieved a high reliability in studies conducted in the Western and Arab contexts (Fry, Griswold and Song *et al.*, 2009).

### **The Reason for Learning Organization**

Many researchers have used the term "Learning Organization" and "Organization Learning" interchangeably despite their different meaning (Islam, Kassim and Sadiq, 2014). For instance, Erdem and Ucar (2013) defined learning organization as a concept, where an organization

continuously maintains and motivates employee training and development in order to provide opportunities to learn and develop their growth, thus increasing the success of learning as an investment and the capacity of the organization. In order to create a learning organization, a leader must develop or build a learning environment in their organization. Mumford (2009) examined the nature of a learning organization and suggests how to achieve it by creating an effective environment where the behaviors and practices involved is continuous and actively encouraged by the organization. Meanwhile, organizational learning is becoming increasingly popular and has turned into the catchword of the 90s. An organization that endeavors to increase competitive advantage, innovation, and effectiveness, must pay attention to the concept of organizational learning (Kassim and Azizah 2005). The topic on organizational learning have largely remained in the area of academics while learning organization that are concerned more with how to transform the organizational behavior and bring it closer to a desired state are the areas of practitioners (Kassim, Ortenblad, and Tsang, 2010).

Ortenblad (2010) asserted that the two most common ways to differentiate between organizational learning and the learning organization are that learning organization is a form of organization while organizational learning is the process or activities in organizations. Moreover, Huber (1991) noted that organizational learning is a dynamic and multi process that refers to the development of new knowledge and has the potential to change behavior of the whole. Since it involves deep in changing the view or mindset of individual and organizational behavior, it does a time consuming process (Murray and Donegan, 2001). Comparatively, Huber (2011) emphasized that firms that have developed a strong learning culture are good at inventing, creating, acquiring and transmitting knowledge, changing behavior that reflect new acquired knowledge and insight. There have been numerous trials to define organizational learning and its multi aspects. Simon (2008) posited that organizational learning is a dynamic process of using new knowledge and insights in order to improve staff behavior and performance. On the other hand, Senge (1990) expressed that organizational learning is a continuous application of experience and its transformation into knowledge are available and shared to the whole organization and align to their goals. Additionally, Huber (2011) saw it in different perspective, which is a combination of four processes: acquisition of information, information dissemination, information explanation and organizational memory.

Learning issues are dynamic and will be based on the requirements and effort of the people to learn. In keeping up with the required growth of a learning infrastructure, organizational members should be supported to advance their professional qualifications. These facilitate essential means to create and enhance a learning culture based on group work. Continuous learning opportunities are the prerequisites to enhance personal and professional growth and development among organizational members. According to Thomas and Brown (2011) learning in this twenty first century is rather not taking place in a classroom, it is happening all around us, everywhere and it is powerful. A learning culture is an organizational commitment to an effective ongoing learning and the team processes of communication, sharing, support and understanding that moves the organization forward. It is a set of norms and values about the functioning of an organization that supports systematic, in-depth approaches aimed at achieving higher-level, strategic or generative organizational learning through phases of information acquisition, information interpretation and accompanying behavioral and cognitive changes (Skerlavaj and Huber, 2011).

A learning culture is important in an organization and learning can be cultivated (Farago and Skyrme, 2015). The commitment of learning must receive broad backing from the top management, where people at all levels are encouraged to learn, develop and designate their thoughts. Moreover, Chinowsky, Molenaar, and Realph (2007) asserted that to have a proactive learning culture, an organization accentuate expenditure of time and resources. They also placed some key contributors to adopt learning culture in organizations such as performance, aging workforce, distributed workforce, best solutions, and growth of the organization's development. Azmee, Kassim and Sulaiman (2012) emphasized the benefits of a learning culture in organization that comprises of

providing good quality of products and services, satisfying customer's needs, superior performance, committed and result-focused workforce.

### **Measurement of learning organization:**

The following are used to measure learning organization:

**Holistic frame:** - This includes systems thinking, mainly perceiving interconnections and patterns amongst key variables and systematic problem-solving.

**Strategic thrust:** - This includes organizing things to be done, understanding their consequences, prioritizing the work and sharing strategy at all levels.

**Shared vision:** - This includes developing a vision which links with personal goals, communicating the vision and developing and using transformational leadership.

**Empowerment:** - This includes decentralization, delegation, providing proper direction, trust, providing support when needed and rewarding initiative and decisions.

**Information flow:** - This includes free flow of information at all levels, minimum role of rumors and encouraging internal exchange of ideas.

**Internality:** - This includes essence of control over most part of our destiny, optimism, self discipline, commitment and moderate risk taking.

**Learning:** - This includes several mechanism and sources which are valuing and encouraging self-development, creating conducive climate for learning and encouraging and using dialogue and discussions (Richard, Devinney Yip and Johnson, 2009).

**Synergy:** - This includes collaboration and team work, empathy, thinking together, debates, coordinated actions and using cross functional teams (Richard, Devinney Yip and Johnson, 2009).

### **Organizational Learning and Knowledge Management**

The concept of organizational learning and knowledge management are closely related (Akbar Anuradha, Gopalan, Daneshgar, Parirokh, Ajmal, Kekale, Gonsel, Siachou *et al.*, 2011). While organizational learning is concerned with knowledge acquisition, dissemination, usage and storage, knowledge management is mainly concerned with knowledge flows and with the administration of knowledge stocks in an organization (Bontis, Crossan *et al.*, 2008). Bontis, Crossan, and Hulland (2008) suggested that organizational learning is a process that encompasses knowledge management and intellectual capital, and incorporates them into a learning process. In this context, the knowledge management processes are used to administer knowledge stocks and flows. Kogut and Zander (2013) have stated that organizational learning theory has contributed to a larger theoretical movement emphasizing the importance of knowledge development and knowledge storage in organizations, which also included the knowledge-based theory of the firm, and the theory of organizational memory, group learning, and shared cognition. An organization's knowledge determines what actions its members are capable of taking, as well as how they coordinate and integrate their efforts.

According to Song, Uhm, and Yoon (2011) organizational knowledge is created, refined, altered, and discarded as organizational members experience reality and attempt to update their individual and shared understandings of it to reflect the lessons they draw from their experience. Building on this view of organizational knowledge and knowledge development, Benoit and Mackenzie (2009) asserted that organizational learning is the evolution of organizational knowledge. Organizational learning can be conceived as having three sub-processes: creating, retaining and transferring knowledge (Akbar 2003). The knowledge can then be retained so that it exhibits some persistence over time. Knowledge can also be transferred within and between units. Through knowledge transfer, one unit is affected by the experience of another (Argote, and Ingram *et al.*, 2010) or learns vicariously from the experience of other units (Easterby-Smith, and Lyles, 2008). This research uses the organizational learning concept rather than the concept of organizational knowledge, because it

is assumed that organizational knowledge is an aspect of organizational learning (Liao and Wu, 2010), especially in regard to sharing knowledge and storing organizational memories.

## **Organizational Performance**

Professionals in numerous fields judge organizational performance as concerning tactical finance, operations, legal, planners and' organizational development. Organizational performance is a meter which procedures how fit an enterprise accomplished their purposes. An organization can review organizational performance according to the effectiveness and efficiency of target accomplishment. Buckley and Andersen (2006) circumstances that the theory of efficacy is a ratio, involving those two things are mandatory when determining and defining efficiency (e.g. return on assets). Andersen also regards effectiveness as the measure of target accomplishment (i.e. the attainment of productivity). Additionally, organizational performance contains the authentic productivity or consequences of an organization as deliberate against the planned productivity. Strijbos (2004) identify that efficiency refers to the size and worth of individual or group effort accomplishing the targets. Currently, organizational performance, efficiency and effectiveness, are opposite words which are similar. Organizational performance, commonly identified as a spike of how able-bodied a corporations' responsibility according to several place of standard has for eternity been a fundamental apprehension for both scholars and management. Judgment of managerial performance are carried out sequentially to comprehend the scope to which organizations reach their common tactical purpose in addition to their ambition interrelated to development and productivity in market share and sales (Hurley& Hult,1998). Organizational performance has been recognized quite recently like a multidimensional and multifaceted thought (Prieto and Revilla, 2006) and to be incorporated both subjective and quantitative sections. As has been converses in the past fragment, every one stakeholder think about particular decisive factor when assessed organizational performance (Espinosa and Porter, 2011).

## **Theoretical Framework**

### **Theory of Organizational Learning**

Theory of organizational learning was propounded by Argyris and Schon in (1978). In the process of organizational inquiry, the individual will interact with other members of the organization and learning will take place. Learning is therefore a direct product of this interaction. Argyris and Schon (1978) emphasize that this interaction often goes well beyond defined organizational rules and procedures. Their approach to organizational learning theory is based on the understanding of two (often conflicting) modes of operation. Levitt and March (1996) expand further on the dynamics of organizational learning theory. Their view presents the organization as routine-based, history dependent, and target oriented. While lessons from history are stored in the organizational memory, the event itself is often lost. They note that past lessons are captured by routines "in a way that makes the lessons, but not the history, accessible to organizations and organizational members." The problem most organizations face is that it is usually better to have the event rather than the interpretation. Organizational learning is transmitted through socialization, education, imitation and so on, and can change over time as a result of interpretations of history.

### **Human Capital Theory**

Human Capital theory was proposed by Schultz (1961) and developed extensively by Becker (1964) who classified expenditures on human capital as investment rather than consumption. Human capital can be defined as knowledge, skills, attitudes, aptitudes, and other acquired traits contributing to production. Human capital theory suggests that education or training raises the productivity of

workers by imparting useful knowledge and skills, hence raising workers' future income by increasing their lifetime earnings (Becker, 1964). In Becker's view, human capital is similar to "physical means of production", e.g., factories and machines: one can invest in human capital (via education, training) and one's outputs depend partly on the rate of return on the human capital one owns. Thus, human capital is a means of production, into which additional investment yields additional output. Human capital is substitutable, but not transferable like land, labor, or fixed capital (Becker, 1964).

### **Social Learning Theory**

Social learning theory was developed to describe and predict how people learn from observation. Bandura, (1977) observational learning is controlled by processes of attention, retention, and reproduction. From social learning theory, a number of rules can be derived for optimal training conditions. For example: When modeling a task, give the learner a verbal model to guide performance. The best verbal models will give rules for the responses of the task, but will be as simple as possible and easy to remember. The trainee is most likely to learn to reward himself for a good job performance if he comes to feel that the work he is performing is very important to himself and to the company and that he has significant control of the work outcomes. Social learning theory has been applied to industries through training methods. The theory has been used to teach managers to deal more effectively with human relations problems occurring on the job, and to predict which subordinates will imitate the behavior of their supervisors. A number of companies have trained their supervisors to deal more effectively with various interpersonal job problems (such as motivating the poor performer, overcoming resistance to change, handling a discrimination complaint (Bandura, 1977).

### **Empirical Review**

Ghafoor, Munir and Ahmad (2016) carried out a study aimed to investigate the impact of organizational learning on organizational performance by considering the mediating role of organizational innovation. The primary data was collected from employees of small and medium enterprises (SMEs) located at Gujranwala. Valid and pretested scales from prior studies were adopted to collect data from participants by using simple random sampling. Self-administrated questionnaire was designed for data collection. AMOS 21.0 and SPSS 21.0 were used for data analysis. Structural Equation Modeling technique was used to achieve the objectives. The results indicated that organizational learning positively and significantly associated with organizational performance. The findings also demonstrated that organizational innovation didn't mediate the relationship between organizational learning and organizational performance. This study aimed to investigate the impact of organizational learning on organizational performance by considering the mediating role of organizational innovation. The primary data was collected from employees of small and medium enterprises (SMEs) located at Gujranwala. Valid and pretested scales from prior studies were adopted to collect data from participants by using simple random sampling. Self-administrated questionnaire was designed for data collection. AMOS 21.0 and SPSS 21.0 were used for data analysis. Structural Equation Modeling technique was used to achieve the objectives. The results indicated that organizational learning positively and significantly associated with organizational performance. The findings also demonstrated that organizational innovation didn't mediate the relationship between organizational learning and organizational performance.

Umar and Haruna (2016) carried out a study evaluated the effect of learning organization on organizational survival with reference to selected Nigerian manufacturing firms. The study objectives were to: examine the influence of learning organization on organizational survival; evaluate the relationship between learning organization elements and organizational survival elements. Primary data were obtained through a questionnaire. A total of 359 respondents were randomly sampled from the study population of 5401 employees. Multiple regression and

correlation were used for data analysis. The result of the regression showed that learning organization has significant impact on organizational survival (R Square of 0.959, p-value=0.000) and the result of the correlation analysis indicated that there is a positive significant relationship between learning organization elements and organizational survival elements. The study concluded that learning organization increased the organization's ability to be innovative which increases chances of survival. The study therefore recommends that Nigerian manufacturing firms should adopt learning organization in its entirety, in order to come up with various strategies that strengthen their survival.

Rajnish, Kriti, Nupur, Khattar and Agarwal (2014) carried out a study on the impact of learning organization on organizational performance in Consulting Industry. The objective of this study is to analyze learning organization, organizational performance and study the relationship between the two. Companies that invest more efforts in achieving higher level organizational performance gain both in financial and non-financial terms. It is widely recognized that the development of a learning organization is a fundamental factor for the achievement of a durable competitive advantage. But the relevance of the learning organization for the improvement of the organizational performance, and thus competence, has been insufficiently developed. The research design is descriptive in nature. A convenient sampling has been used to collect the data. The participants in the survey are 50 employees of leading consulting firms working on different positions of management cadre. The tool used for learning organization is a "designed questionnaire for data collection". After the analysis, it was observed that there is a positive correlation between Learning organization and Organizational Performance with respect to their parameters. The objective of the study was achieved to a certain extent since organizational performance is affected by Learning Organization but to a very limited extent. It could be suggested that the organizations need to be proactive in nature and be more connected to the environment to be able to scan it and further adapt to changes. The study should be used and extended for more accurate results for the consultancy groups as there can be human errors and personal biasness.

Syed and Samreen (2010) carried out a study to examine the effect of the practices of learning organization on the financial and non-financial performance of Pakistani hospitals. Data was collected through questionnaires distributed to the medical staff members of four large hospitals of the Rawalpindi-Islamabad region. Learning organization practices were found to explain significant variations in the financial performance and non-financial performance. Strategic leadership had the highest influence on financial performance, whereas system connection had the lowest. Similarly, continuous learning was the most, whereas embedded system was the least influential predictor of non-financial performance.

## **Methodology**

### **Research Design**

The research adopted survey design. Survey research design shows in details how the research intends to carry out the study using the independent variables to explain the dependent variable. It also involves designing and distributing of questionnaire across the entire organization to ascertain if learning organization significantly affects the economy growth.

### **Sources of Data**

There are two types of data collection primary and secondary data collection. This study therefore adopted the use of primary source of data collection. This source of data collection involved administration and distribution of a well-structured questionnaire to staff of the Abia State University ABSU and Michael Okpara University of Agriculture Umudike.

### **Primary Source of Data**

The study adopted primary source of data collection. This source of data collection involves designing and administration of a well-structured questionnaire.

### Secondary Source of Data

The study makes use of adopt secondary source of data to collect information and this was sourced from four major sources which may include textbook, the library, journals or even the internet. These materials gathered will relate to learning organization and organizational growth.

### Population of the Study

The total population comprise of both teaching and none teaching staff. The population was estimated to be four thousand, one hundred and thirty six (4362). The figure was gotten from academic planning.

### Population Table

Institutions	Staff
A. Michael Okpara University of Agriculture	2351
B. Abia State University (ABSU)	2011
<b>Total</b>	<b>4362</b>

Source: Academic Planning, 2020

### Sample Size Determination

Sample size determination is a tool that is adopted to determine the sample target or frame. The sample size was determined by the application of a generally acceptable formular called Taro Yamane propounded in (1967) and this formula is stated as follow:

$$n = \frac{N}{1+N(e)^2}$$

Where

n = Sample size

N = Total population of the study,

1 = Constant

e = error term

$$n = \frac{4362}{1+4362(0.05)^2}$$

$$n = \frac{4362}{1+4362(0.0025)}$$

$$n = \frac{4362}{10.905}$$

$$n = \frac{4362}{10.905}$$

$$n = 400$$

### Sampling Technique

The researchers adopted simple random sampling technique. The simple random sampling technique has the advantage of ensuring that every member of the population stands an equal chance of being selected as the sample.

### Description of Research Instrument



The major instrument that was used for data collection is questionnaire. In designing the questionnaire, the researcher made use of 5Point Likert scale questions, this will enable the respondents pick or tick option which best suit or answer he's/her question. The scale include strongly agree (SA), strongly agree (A), neutral (UN), strongly disagree (SD), and disagree.

### Validity of the Research Instrument

To test for the validity of the instrument the researcher made use of content validity, whereby the supervisor and other expert in the Department of Business Administration was given the questionnaire to vet and make adequate correction before approved for production and reproduction proper.

### Reliability of the Research Instrument

To test for the internal consistency of the instrument, a test and re-test reliability of the instrument was done and reliability coefficient of (r) was obtained. Twenty (20) sets questionnaire was administered to some respondents and after two weeks interval, the same number was issued out. At the end the coefficient of the reliability was determine using Cronbach Alpha.

### Method of Data Analysis

Objectives i, ii, iii and iv were analyze using descriptive statistics, simple percentage and mean while hypothesis 1, was tested using simple regression, hypothesis 2 was tested using correlation coefficient and hypotheses 3 and 4 were tested with multiple regression modern. Multiple regression model show the relationship between a dependent variable and two or more independent variables and further explain the causes and effect of those variables while correlation coefficient shows the relationship between independent variable and the dependence

### Data Presentation/ Results and Discussions

**Table 1: Rate of Return Questionnaire**

Institution	Questionnaire Distributed	%	Questionnaire Returned	%	Questionnaire Not Returned	%
MOUAU	217	54.2	209	54.8	8	1.5
ABSU	183	45.8	172	45.2	11	2.1
Total	400	100	381	100	19	3.6

Source: Field Survey, 2020

Table 1 above reveals that out of 217 set of questionnaire distributed to staff of Michael Okpara University of Agriculture Umudike with 54.2%, 209 sets were return with 54.8% and 8 sets were not returned with 1.5%, also 183 set of questionnaire distributed to Abia State University Uturu with 45.8%, 172 sets were return with 45.2% and 11 sets were not returned with 2.1%

### Research Question One

**Table 2: What is the impact of learning organizations on the growth of MOUAU and Abia State?**

	SA	A	U	D	SD	Total

1. Continuous learning in institution affects the growth of the institution	195 51.1%	104 27.3%	2 0.5%	49 12.8%	31 9.9%	381 100
2. Proper learning impact both students and lecturers academic capacity	203 53.3%	78 20.4%	-	82 21.5%	18 4.7%	381 100
3. Encouragement of learning increases the institutional rating	151 39.6%	107 28.0%	5 1.3%	76 19.9%	42 11.0%	381 100

**Source: Field Survey, 2020**

Table 2 above shows that 51.1%, 53.3% and 39.6% of the respondents strongly agree that continuous learning, proper learning and encouragement of learning increases affects the growth of the institution while 12.8%, 21.5% and 19.9% disagree that continuous learning, proper learning and encouragement of learning increases affects the growth of the institution.

**Table 3: What is the relationship between learning organizations and economic growth of MOUAU and Abia State University Uturu, Abia State**

	SA	A	U	D	SD	Total
1. Is there any relationship between learning and organizational growth in MOUAU and Abia State University Uturu, Abia State	191 50.1%	143 37.5%	-	35 9.2%	12 3.1%	381 100
2. Learning brings about increase in institutional reputation and better student performance	232 60.8%	100 26.2%	-	42 11.0%	7 1.8%	381 100
3. Learning improve student academic performance and places them at advantage over others	210 39.6%	170 28.0%	-	1 0.2%	-	381 100

**Source: Field Survey, 2020**

Table 3 above shows that 50.1%, 60.8% and 39.6% strongly agree that there is relationship between learning and organizational growth, learning brings about increase in institutional reputation and learning improve student academic performance while 9.2%, 11.0% and 0.2% disagree that there is relationship between learning and organizational growth, learning brings about increase in institutional reputation and learning improve student academic performance.

**Table 4: What are factors affecting learning organization on the growth of Nigeria?**

	SA	A	U	D	SD	Total
No interest or passion to learn	148 38.8%	120 31.5%	-	72 18.8%	41 10.7%	381 100

No orientation	257 67.4%	90 23.6%	-	34 8.9%	-	381 100
Poor empowerment	200 39.6%	115 28.0%	4	39 10.2%	27	381 100
Poor system thinking and value system	138 36.2%	119 31.2%	10 2.6%	66 17.3%	48 12.5%	381 100

Source: Field Survey, 2020

Table 4 above shows that 38.8%, 67.4%, 39.6% and 36.2% strongly agree that no interest or passion to learn, no orientation, poor empowerment and poor system thinking and value system learning organization learning organization while 18.8%, 8.9%, 10.2% and 17.3% disagree that no interest or passion to learn, no orientation, poor empowerment and poor system thinking and value system learning organization learning organization.

**Table 5 What is assess the learning organizational strategies to improve growth MOUAU and ABSU**

	SA	A	U	D	SD	Total
1. Learning in a conducive environment	225 59.1%	82 21.5%	-	31 8.1%	43 11.3%	381 100
2. Harmonized lecturer and student relationship	209 54.8%	121 31.8%	-	50 13.1%	1 2.6%	381 100
3. Available instructional material	154 40.4%	118 30.9%	-	62 16.3%	47 12.3%	381 100

Source: Field Survey, 2020

Table 5 above shows that 59.1%, 54.8% and 40.4% strongly agree that learning in a conducive environment, harmonized lecturer and student relationship and available instructional material are learning organization strategies while 8.1%, 13.1% and 16.3% disagree that learning in a conducive environment, harmonized lecturer and student relationship and available instructional material are learning organization strategies.

### Test of Hypotheses

**H0<sub>1</sub>:** Learning organizations has no significant impact on the growth of MOUAU and ABSU

**Table 6: For Hypothesis 1, we specify Regression thus;**

Variable	Parameters	Coefficient	Std error	t – value
Constant	$\beta_0$	0.332	0.035	9.485***
LO (X <sub>1</sub> )	$\beta_1$	3.194	2.811	3.938**
<b>R-Square</b>		0.8321		
<b>Adjusted R – Square</b>		0.8010		
<b>F – statistics</b>		9.121***		

\*\*\*, \*\*, and \* denotes significance of coefficient at 1%, 5%, and 10% level respectively

Source: Field Survey, 2020. (SPSS Vision 22)

Table 6 above The result of coefficient of multiple determination ( $R^2$ ) was 0.83 which implies that 83% of the variations in dependents were explained by changes in the independent variables while 18% were unexplained by the stochastic variable indicating a goodness of fit of the regression model adopted in this study which is statistically significant at 5% probability level.

The coefficient of learning organizations (3.194) was statistically significant and positively related to growth of MOUAU and ABSU. This implies that learning is part of organizational growth since it allows staff to build in themselves and concurrently help in contributing to the growth of the firm.

**H0<sub>2</sub>:** There is no significant relationship between learning organization and economic growth of MOUAU and ABSU

**Table 7 For Hypothesis 2, we specify correlation coefficient Correlations**

		Learning Organization	Economic Growth of MOUAU and ABSU
Learning Organization	Pearson Correlation	1	.510*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.012
	N	381	381
Economic Growth of MOUAU and ABSU	Pearson Correlation	.510*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.012	
	N	381	381

\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Thus, the correlation coefficient shows that there is significant relationship between learning organizations and growth of MOUAU and ABSU. This implies that through learning and relearning organization particularly public institution will experience significant improvement and this will bring about organizational growth in both the long and short run.

**H0<sub>3</sub>:** No interest or passion to learn, no orientation, poor empowerment, poor thinking and value system have no significant impact on the growth of MOUAU and ABSU

**Table 7: For Hypothesis 3, we specify Regression thus;**

Variable	Parameters	Coefficient	Std error	t – value
Constant	$\beta_0$	0.332	0.035	9.485***
NIPL (X <sub>1</sub> )	$\beta_1$	2.934	1.108	2.648**
NO (X <sub>2</sub> )	$\beta_2$	3.310	1.271	2.604**
PE (X <sub>3</sub> )	$\beta_3$	3.218	1.211	2.657**
PTVS (X <sub>4</sub> )	$\beta_4$	2.529	1.003	2.521**
<b>R-Square</b>		0.8211		
<b>Adjusted R – Square</b>		0.7910		
<b>F – statistics</b>		10.021***		

\*\*\*, \*\*, and \* denotes significance of coefficient at 1%, 5%, and 10% level respectively

Source: Field Survey, 2020 (SPSS Vision 22)

Table 7 above The result of coefficient of multiple determination ( $R^2$ ) was 0.82 which implies that 82% of the variations in dependents were explained by changes in the independent variables while 18% were unexplained by the stochastic variable indicating a goodness of fit of the regression model adopted in this study which is statistically significant at 5% probability level.

The coefficient of no interest or passion to learn (2.934) was statistically significant and positively related to growth of MOUAU and ABSU. This implies that staff who has little or no passion to learn affects the firm's growth of their institutions and this in the long run can lead to poor student performance. The coefficient of no orientation (3.310) was statistically significant and positively related to growth of MOUAU and ABSU. No orientation from staff affects their relationship and consequently leads to poor performance. The coefficient of poor empowerment (3.218) was statistically significant and positively related to growth of MOUAU and ABSU. Thus, low staff

empowerment affects institutional goals and objectives because staff who are not empowered are mostly unhappy and will be highly unproductive.

The coefficient of poor thinking and value system (2.529) was statistically significant and positively related to growth of MOUAU and ABSU. Thus, this shows that in value system and poor thinking is a factor affecting the growth of public institution

**H04:** Working in conducive environment and harmonized lecturer and student relationships has no significant impact on the growth of MOUAU and ABSU

**Table 7: For Hypothesis 3, we specify Regression thus;**

Variable	Parameters	Coefficient	Std error	t – value
Constant	$\beta_0$	2.538	1.005	2.525**
LCEN (X <sub>1</sub> )	$\beta_1$	4.430	1.448	3.059***
HLSR (X <sub>2</sub> )	$\beta_2$	3.572	1.421	2.513**
<b>R-Square</b>		0.7511		
<b>Adjusted R – Square</b>		0.7310		
<b>F – statistics</b>		8.011***		

\*\*\*, \*\*, and \* denotes significance of coefficient at 1%, 5%, and 10% level respectively

Source: Field Survey, 2020 (SPSS Vision 22)

Table 8 above The result of coefficient of multiple determination ( $R^2$ ) was 0.73 which implies that 73% of the variations in dependents were explained by changes in the independent variables while 27% were unexplained by the stochastic variable indicating a goodness of fit of the regression model adopted in this study which is statistically significant at 5% probability level.

The coefficient of learning in a conducive environment (4.430) was statistically significant and positively related to growth of MOUAU and ABSU. This implies that learning in conducive environment affects working in a conducive environment to a great extent significantly enhances staff performance and subsequently leads to organizational growth.

The coefficient of harmonized lecturer and student relationships (3.572) was statistically significant and positively related to growth of MOUAU and ABSU. Harmonize lecturer and student relationships affects institutional growth particularly MOUAU and ABSU.

### Summary of Findings

- i. Learning organizations has significant impact on the growth of MOUAU and ABSU.
- ii. There is significant relationship between learning organization and economic growth of MOUAU and ABSU.
- iii. No interest or passion to learn, No orientation, poor empowerment, poor thinking and value system have significant impact on economic growth of MOUAU and ABSU.
- iv. Working in conducive environment and harmonized lecturer and student relationships has significant impact on the growth of MOUAU and ABSU.

### Conclusion

Maintaining the effectiveness of a learning organization requires the total commitment of the leadership and all of the other members of the organization. The successful organizational leader is able to move the organization toward becoming a true learning organization by establishing a shared organizational identity and is able to clearly convey this identity to all members of the organization. Effective leaders of learning organizations are those individuals who encourage the pursuit of individual and organizational knowledge by creating a shared vision of the future of the

organization. They possess the ability to identify the role that each individual member plays in the organizational system and allow for the open exchange of information between all members. These are the skills that will allow leaders to be successful within learning organizations.

## Recommendations

- i. There is need for management of the studied organizations to inculcate the spirit of learning since its leads to better and well improve organizational learning
- ii. Management of the studied organizations should put into consideration the importance of learning and its impact on the growth of both the institution and the staff in general; this in the long run will lead to organizational growth
- iii. Management of the selected institutions should imbibe the spirit of learning since a good number of staff no longer shows the zeal and passion to learn, this in the long run will improve institutional growth and the academic rating on a national scale
- iv. There is need for the management of the selected institutions to provide a conducive working environment which will allows staff of the institution to perform excellently well in the duties. This in the long run will lead to better and improve institutional growth.

## References

- Akbar, H., (2003). Measurement practice for knowledge management. *Journal of Workplace Learning: Employee Counseling Today*, 11(8), 304-11.
- Argote, E. and Ingram (2010). The synergistic effect of market orientation and learning orientation on organization performance. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 27(4) 411-427.
- Azme, J.B., Kassim, W.B. and Sulaiman, M. (2012). Firm Resources and Sustained Competitive Advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17 (1), 99-120.
- Akbar Anuradha, Gopalan, N., Daneshgar, P., Parirokh, R., Ajmal, J., Kekale, H., Gunsel, N., Siachou (2011). A turkish translation, validity and reliability study of the dimensions of the learning organization questionnaire. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 2(4), 368-374.
- Allenby. N. (2009). Managing an organization learning system by aligning stocks and flows. *Journal of Management Studies*, 39(4), 437-70.
- Azme, A., Kassim S. and Sulaiman, A. (2012). Measuring the impact of learning organization on job satisfaction and individual performance in Greek advertising sector. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 173, 367-375.
- Argote, E., and Oke, C. (2011). Measuring organizational performance in the absence of objective measures. *Strategic Management Research*, 3(5), 265-73.
- Avlonitis, G.K., Salavou, U.I., Bierly, H.M., Daly, H.O., Akhavan, C.G., Jafari, H.I., Austin, W.E., and Harkins, E.T., (2008). Measuring the learning organization culture, organizational commitment and job satisfaction in the lebanese banking sector. *Human Resource Development International*, 12(3), 189-208.
- Argote, C.M., and Oke, P., (2011). The relationship between the learning organization concept and firms financial performance: An empirical assessment. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 13(5), 5-21.
- Buckley, K. and Andersen, D. (2006). The mystification of organizational learning. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 14(1), 19-30.
- Bontis, N., Crossan, S. (2008). Learning in organizations: HR implications and considerations. *Human Resource Development International*, 4(3), 391-405.
- Bontis, T., Crossan S. and Hulland, J. (2008) Building a learning organization. *Harvard Business Review*. 7(2), 78-91.
- Balkundi, M. and Kilduff, H. (2006), Assessing the impact of organizational learning and innovation on performance in cultural organizations. *International Journal of Non-Profit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 15(3), 215-242.

- Bohm, H. (2003), Towards a knowledge-based theory of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17(4), 109–122.
- Bass, M.N. (1991). The learning organization: Some reflections on organizational renewal. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 16(8), 17-25.
- Bell, S. (2009), Developing a learning environment: Challenges for theory, research and practice. *Journal of European Training*, 18(3), 3-9.
- Ballantyne, F. (2009), Performance implications of strategic performance measurement in financial DBA *Africa Management Review September*, 6(1), 94-105.
- Bokeno, K. (2007). Impressions about the learning organization: Looking to see what is behind the curtain. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 6(2), 119-122.
- Chaston, Y., Badger A.W. and Sadler-Smit, O., Garcia-Morales (2011). The learning organization: tracking progress in a developing country: A comparative analysis using the DLOQ. *The learning organization*, 16(2), 103 – 121
- Chinowsky, I., Molenaar, C. and Realph, P. (2007). The balanced scorecard- measures that drive performance. *Harvard Business Review*, 70(1), 71-79.
- Day, K. and Antonakis, E. (2012). An assessment of development of the learning organization concept in Jordanian industrial companies. *The Learning Organization*, 13(5), 455-474.
- Erdem, M. and Ucar, A. (2013). Learning capability and business performance: A nonfinancial and financial assessment. *The Learning Organization*, 13 (2), 166-185.
- Easterby-Smith, and Lyles, E. (2008). Human resource management, manufacturing strategy and firm performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 836-866.
- Espinosa, S. and Porter, E. (2011). The construct of the learning organization: dimensions, measurement and validation. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 15(1), 31-55.
- Fry, K. and Griswold, D. Song, (2009). A resource-based view of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*. 5,(1), 171-180.
- Farago, S. and Skyrme, U. (2015). Market orientation and the learning organization. *Journal of Marketing*, 59, 63-74.
- French, X. and Bell, S., (2015). The learning organization: a foundation to enhance the sustainable competitive advantage of the service sector in Egypt. *Journal of Public Management Research*, 2(2), 37-62.
- Garvin, S. (1993). Organizational learning observations: Toward a theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 10, 175-203.
- Gho, K. (1998). *The construct validation of learning organization and its influence upon firm performance in mainland China*. 3(1), 45-55.
- Grieves, E. (2008). The learning organization, power, politics and ideology introduction. *Management Learning* June, 26(2), 193-213.
- Goh, U. (2001). Entrepreneurship: an organizational learning approach. *Journal of small business and enterprise development*, 16(5), 12-17.
- Gardiner, D., and Whiting W., (2007). The learning organization 15 years on: Some personal reflections. *The Learning Organization*, 6(5), 202-206.
- Ghafoor, F., Munir N. and Ahmad D. (2016). Learning organization and organizational performance: mediation role of intrapreneurship. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 21(4), 547-555.
- Hurley, A. I. and Hult, V.E. (1998). The learning organization 15 years on: Some personal reflections. *The Learning Organization*, 6(5), 202-206.
- Huber, L. (2011). Learning organization and organizational performance: mediation role of intrapreneurship. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 21(4), 547-555.
- Huber, G.P. (1991). *Organizational learning: The contributing process and the literatures*. *Organization Science*, 2(1), 88-95.
- Islam, R., Kassim L. and Sadiq, D. (2014). Learning organization culture, organizational performance and organizational innovativeness in a Public Institution of Higher Education in Malaysia: A preliminary study. *Economics and Finance*, 37, 512 – 519.

- Johnson, Y.N. (2009). Impressions about the learning organization. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 6(2), 119-122.
- Jamali, V. (2006). The Learning organizations: tracking progress in a developing country. A comparative analysis using the DLOQ. *The Learning Organization*, 16(2), 103-121.
- Jacobs, J. (2012). High impact learning: building and diffusing learning capability. *In Organizational Dynamics*, 22(2), 52-66.
- Johnson, R. (2009). Learning organization and its cultural manifestations: Evidence from a global white goods manufacturer. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 210, 154 – 163.
- Kingsley, U.O. (2012). A four-level learning organization benchmark implementation model. *Learning Organization*, 10(2), 98-105.
- Karash, L. (2002). Quantitative assessment of a Senge learning organisation intervention. *Learning Organization*, 13(4), 369-383.
- Kogut, T. and Zander, D. (2013). From learning organisation to knowledge entrepreneur. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 4(1), 7-14.
- Kassim, K. and Azizah, S. (2005). Organizational dilemmas as barriers to learning. *Emerald Group Publishing*. 5(4), 193-201.
- Kassim, S. Ortenblad, T. and Tsang W. (2010). Exploring dimensions and demographics in relation to learning organization. *The International Journal of Business & Management*, 3(3), 334-340.
- Kliucininkas, U. (2001). Organizational learning and the learning organization: A dichotomy between descriptive and prescriptive research. *Human Relations*, 50(1), 73-89.
- Kotter, R. (2001). Applying organizational learning: Lessons from the automotive industry. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 20(10), 1236-1251.
- Kinicki, N. and Williams, W. (2011). Knowledge creation and transfer: Role of learning organization. *International Journal of Business Administration*, 2(3), 61.
- Kingsley, V. (2012). Learning process in new product development teams and effects on product success: A socio-cognitive perspective. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 35(2), 210-224.
- Lawrence, W. (2012). Organizational learning: From experience to knowledge. *Organization science*, 22(5), 1123-1137.
- Lawrence, R.N. (2012). Impact of organizational learning on organizational performance: Study of higher education institutes. *System*, 4(1), 1-16.
- Liao, P. and Wu, L. (2010). An examination of the relationships between organizational learning culture, structure, organizational innovativeness and effectiveness: *Evidence from Taiwanese organizations*. 3(1), 23-44.
- Marquardt, E. (2011). Organizational learning and management information systems. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 2(2), 113-123.
- Marquardt, D.K. (2011). Foundations for a learning organization: organization learning mechanisms. *The Learning Organization*, 10(2), 74-82.
- Mackenzie, Z. (2009). How Folk Beliefs about Free Will Influence Sentencing. *New Criminal Law Review: In International and Interdisciplinary Journal*, 16(3), 449-493.
- Murray, H. and Donegan, D. (2001). Learning orientation, market orientation, and innovation: Integrating and extending models of organizational performance. *Journal of market-focused management*, 4(4), 295-308.
- Mumford, D. (2009). The effect of introducing important incremental innovations on market share and business survival. *Strategic Management Journal*, 16(1), 161-182.
- Marsick, K. and Watkins R. (2009). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 51(6), 1173.
- McGill, D., Slocum, P. and Lei L. (2013). Organizational learning culture, learning transfer climate and perceived innovation in Jordanian organizations. *International journal of training and development*, 9(2), 96-109.
- Moilanen, U. (2009). The richness of diversity in knowledge creation: an interdisciplinary overview. *J. UCS*, 9(6), 491-500.



- Nattrass, K.E. (2013). Organizational learning: an empirical assessment of process in small UK manufacturing firms. *Journal of small business Management*, 39(2), 139-151.
- Nonaka, P.A., and Takeuchi, Y. (2009). Sustainability, complexity and learning: insights from complex systems approaches. *The Learning Organization*, 18(1), 54-72.
- Ortenblad, H. (2010). Influence of internal communication on technological pro-activity, organizational learning, and organizational innovation in the pharmaceutical sector. *Journal of Communication*, 61(1), 150-177.
- Ortenblad, R. (2011). A review of innovation research in economics, sociology and technology management. *Omega*, 25(1), 15-28.
- Oke, I. (2010). Innovativeness: Its antecedents and impact on business performance. *Industrial marketing management*, 33(5), 429-438.
- Poulis, L., Poulis S. and Jackson, N. (2013). Innovation, market orientation, and organizational learning: an integration and empirical examination. *The Journal of Marketing*, 42-54.
- Pearce, B. and Conger, N. (2012). Learning organization and its effect on organizational performance and organizational innovativeness: A proposed framework for Malaysian Public Institutions of Higher Education. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 130, 299-304.
- Prieto, V. and Revilla K., (2006). An integrated scale for measuring an organizational learning system. *The Learning Organization*, 17(4), 303-327.
- Riggio, S., Murphy, A. and Pirozzolo, L. (2011). The link between self-managed work teams and learning organizations using performance indicators. *The Learning Organization*, 11(3), 244-259.
- Rajnish, K. E., Kriti, F.H., Nupur, E., Khattar, D. and Agarwal P. (2014). The effect of functional roles on group efficiency using multilevel modeling and content analysis to investigate computer-supported collaboration in small groups. *Small Group Research*, 35(2), 195-229.
- Rose, F.L. and Kumar, G. (2009). Multinational organization context: Implications for team learning and performance. *Academy of management journal*, 49(3), 501-518.
- Skerlavaj, J. and Huber, G. (2011). The relationship between Organizational innovations, internal Sources of knowledge and Organizational performance. *International Journal of Managing Value and Supply Chains*, 6(1), 67.
- Song, M., Uhm, K. and Yoon L. (2011). diversity, mode of market entry, technological learning, and performance. *Academy of Management journal*, 43(5), 925-950.
- Strijbos, U. (2004). International expansion by new venture firms: International diversity, mode of market entry, technological learning, and performance. *Academy of Management journal*, 43(5), 925-950.
- Shamsul, N., and Kassim, L. (2014). The Emotional Intelligence of Transformational Leaders: A Field Study Of Elected Officials, *Journal of Social Psychology*, 146(1): 51-64.
- Senge, M. (2006). Defining And Implementing The Learning Organization: Some Strategic Limitations. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 127(3), 311-335.
- Simon, J. (2008). A learning organization: exploring employees' perceptions. *Management & Change*, 12(2), 29-46.
- Senge, H., and Ali, F. (2012). How can schools build learning organizations in difficult education contexts? *South African Journal of Education*, 30(2), 621-633.
- Senge, K. (2002). The relationship between the learning organization and productivity in Iran physical education organization. *World Journal of Sport Sciences*, 2(3), 160-164.
- Song, J. (2009). Toward a unifying framework to support informal learning theory, research and practice. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 21(4), 265-275.
- Skerlavaj, M.N. (2007). The learning organization: towards an integrated model. *The Learning Organization*, 11(2): 129-144.
- Senge, G. (1994). Measuring the learning organization culture, organizational commitment and job satisfaction in the Lebanese banking sector. *Human Resource Development International*, 12(2), 189-208.

- Syed, W., and Samreen, P. (2010). Learning at work: organizational affordances and individual engagement. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 18(5): 279-297.
- Steiber, C., Zaied, X., Louati A. and Affes D. (2015). Organizational learning and resistance to change in Estonian companies. *Human Resource Development International*, 5(3), 313-331.
- Senge, P. (1990). Organization and development of woman managers in Pakistan. *Human Resource Development International*, 12(1), 105-114.
- Senge, P. and Ali, S.U. (2012). Business environmental factors: Implications on the survival and growth of business organizations in the manufacturing sector of Lagos metropolis. *Business and Management Research*, 2(3), 147-148
- Thomas, M., and Brown, N. (2011). Creative thinking in the classroom. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 47(3), 325-338.
- Umar, R., and Haruna, P. (2016). Improving creativity of organizational work groups. *Academy of Management Executive*, 17(1), 96-111.
- Velaquez, et al., (2011). Keeping innovation alive after the consultants leave. *Research Technology Management*, 43(5), 17-22.
- Watkins, Q. and Marsick, D. (2009). Creative thinking in the classroom. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 47(3), 325-338.
- Wright, V., Dunford, S. and Snell, L. (2001). Building effective organizations: transformational leadership, collectivist orientation, work-related attitudes and withdrawal behaviors in three emerging economies. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 14(7), 1083-1101.
- Wernerfelt, P. (1984). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: a self concept based theory. *Organization Science*, 4(4), 577-594.
- Wernerfelt, P., Barney, A. and Grant, O. (1991-1996). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107-142.
- Yukl, L. and Heaton A. (2002). The effects of transformational leadership on teacher attitudes and student performance in Singapore. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16(4), 319-333.