

KNOWLEDGE SHARING AND ORGANIZATIONAL LEARNING ON OUTCOMES-BASED EDUCATION AMONG FACULTY MEMBERS IN A PRIVATE UNIVERSITY IN THE PHILIPPINES

Gerby R. Muya* and Ma. Theresa H. Velasco

Affiliation; email address

ABSTRACT

This study sought to analyze the contribution of knowledge sharing to organizational learning on outcomes-based education (OBE) among faculty members in a private higher education institution in the Philippines. Using the descriptive-case study design, this study involved 111 randomly selected faculty members. Data were drawn using survey, focus group discussion, and key informant interviews. Results revealed that a great majority of the faculty members had only moderate level of knowledge on OBE, but they had highly positive attitudes and practices regarding OBE. In terms of knowledge sharing behavior, the faculty members were more OBE-related knowledge seekers than knowledge donors. Attitudes and practices had significant linear relationship with knowledge sharing behavior. The respondents positively perceived that there was organizational learning on OBE in the institution. The study concluded that knowledge sharing on OBE positively affected organizational learning.

Keywords: knowledge sharing, organizational learning, outcomes-based education, social network analysis, private university

Article Information
Date received:
Date revised:
Date accepted:
Date uploaded: 20220711

INTRODUCTION

In an era of knowledge society where knowledge is viewed as an equally important resource as land, labor and capital, knowledge management (KM) becomes essential for organizational success (Rasula, Jelena, Vuksic, Vesna Bosilj & Stemberger, 2012). The idea that knowledge and communication are drivers of positive social change that can be harnessed to improve development strategies makes KM an important approach in Development Communication. Knowledge Management is defined as “the process of applying a systematic approach to the capture, structuring, management, and dissemination of knowledge throughout an organization to work faster, reuse best practices, and reduce costly rework from project-to-project” (Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1995; Dalkir, 2011). While numerous definitions of KM have emerged in literature, the World Bank (2003) describes it in general as the process by which organizations create, retain and share knowledge. “A component of the KM process, knowledge sharing has attracted more attention in the research and practice of KM” (Yi, 2009; World Bank, 2003).

Knowledge sharing is a communication process between two individuals whereby one communicates knowledge and the other assimilates it (Schwartz, 2006). In the organizational level, Cummings (2003) posits that it is a means by which an organization obtains access to its own and other organizations’ knowledge. The importance of sharing knowledge across organizational and national boundaries has been established in previous research (Fey & Furu, 2008; Swart & Kinnie, 2003; Li, 2010). According to Wang & Noe (2010) and Riege (2005), knowledge sharing is a factor of knowledge management success. The dynamics of the knowledge society requires KM specialists to harness the benefits of knowledge sharing as a means not only to create knowledge but also to acquire and apply knowledge. Thus, through knowledge sharing, employees can contribute to knowledge creation, innovation, and ultimately, the competitive advantage of the organization (Sánchez, Sánchez, Collado-Ruiz, & Cebrián-Tarrasón, 2013). Moreover, knowledge sharing fosters economic growth and technological development (Cummings, 2003) and promotes creativity and diffusion of innovation (Kim & Nelson, 2000).

The literature abounds with studies on knowledge sharing. However, little is known about the factors affecting individual’s knowledge sharing behavior in an organizational context (Bock & Kim, 2001; Wu & Zhu, 2012). Moreover, since knowledge management as a concept historically started in the management field (Wiig, 2000; Prusak, 2001; Ives, Torrey, & Gordon, 1997), most knowledge sharing studies were conducted in private commercial sectors (Argote & Ingram, 2000). On the other hand, in the field of Development Communication, knowledge sharing has been a topic of interest. Knowledge sharing is recognized in most studies in Development Communication as a

communication behavior that promotes creativity and innovation among stakeholders and the organizations in general. However, most of these studies were conducted in public and private development-oriented agencies. There is a dearth of studies in development communication focusing on knowledge sharing in higher education setting, particularly private universities.

Meanwhile, although a significant number of researches on knowledge sharing has emerged, its impact on what, when and how organizations learn needs further investigation. Taken as the context in this study, organizational learning is also an area in the knowledge management practice. As technologies are rapidly changing, organization managers and researchers search for alternative ways to develop capabilities of organizations to adapt and anticipate the need for change (Scott, 2011; Nonaka, 1994). One of these alternative ways is organizational learning defined by Dalkir (2011) as learning what worked and what did not work from the past and effectively transferring this experientially learned knowledge to present-day and future knowledge workers.

While a comprehensive model for organizational learning remains elusory, the depth and breadth of scholarly conversation and debate has spurred rich insights into the central questions of how and what people learn in organizational settings (Scott, 2011). Argyris & Schön (1992) argued that organizational learning is an outcome of organizational inquiry. This means that whenever there is difference between the expected outcomes and the actual outcome, an individual (or group) will engage in inquiry to understand and if necessary, solve this inconsistency. 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. Such interaction may happen in knowledge sharing activities. Along this line, this study will attempt to find out the influence of knowledge sharing on organizational learning.

In the field of Development Communication, there is lack of studies on knowledge sharing and its influence in organizational learning. While most studies in Development Communication look at knowledge sharing as the outcome, this study will attempt to expand on previous studies to describe if knowledge sharing as a communication process can contribute to organizational learning.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

In general, this study aimed to analyze if knowledge sharing on OBE contributed to organizational learning on OBE. Specifically, this study sought to determine the current knowledge, attitudes, and practices on OBE of faculty members; analyze knowledge sharing behavior

of respondents toward OBE in terms of knowledge donating and knowledge collecting; analyze the organizational learning behavior toward OBE in terms of the following dimensions: experimentation; risk taking; interaction with the external environment; dialogue; and participative decision-making; and analyze if a relationship existed between knowledge sharing behavior and organizational learning on OBE.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In the emergence of the knowledge economy, it is widely recognized that knowledge is a critical asset for an organization to succeed in the increasingly competitive environment. As Cheng, et al. (2009) argued, the dynamics of this economy requires organization to not only create knowledge but also to acquire and apply knowledge quickly. They pointed out that one possible way to do this is to share knowledge effectively.

According to Gibbert and Krause (as cited in Bock, Zmud, Kim, & Lee, 2005), knowledge sharing concerns the willingness of individuals in an organization to share with others the knowledge they have acquired or created. The sharing could be done directly via communication or indirectly by means of some knowledge archive.

De Vries (2006), on the other hand, conceptualized knowledge sharing in terms of knowledge behavior and knowledge attitudes. In his study, knowledge sharing behavior refers to knowledge donating—communicating one's personal intellectual capital to others—and knowledge seeking—consulting others to get them to share their intellectual capital. Knowledge attitudes refer to eagerness to share knowledge and willingness to share knowledge. De Vries measured knowledge donating using the following:

1. When I've learned something new, I tell my colleagues about it.
2. I share information I have with my colleagues.
3. I think it is important that my colleagues know what I am doing.
4. I regularly tell my colleagues what I am doing.

Knowledge seeking, on the other hand, include the following statements:

1. When I need certain knowledge, I ask my colleague about it.
2. I like to be informed of what my colleagues know.
3. I ask my colleagues about their abilities when I need to learn something.
4. When a colleague is good at something, I ask them to teach me how to do it.

Most studies on knowledge sharing are dominated by those focusing on business organizations, which are obviously profit-oriented. However, this issue is equally important for academic institutions in which knowledge creation is a core activity.

In the review of Wang and Noe (2010) on knowledge sharing literature, they found five factors associated with knowledge sharing: 1) organizational context (organizational culture and climate, management support, rewards and incentives, and organizational structure); 2) interpersonal and team characteristics (interpersonal and team characteristics and diversity and social networks); 3) cultural characteristics; 4) individual characteristics; and 5) motivational factors (beliefs of knowledge ownership, perceived benefits and cost, interpersonal trust and justice, individual attitudes). Future knowledge sharing research directions, according to Wang and Noe, include expanding the theoretical perspectives used in knowledge sharing, reason for sharing and not sharing knowledge (including impression management and attribution, power perspective, evaluation apprehension, social cost, knowledge sharing as a learning experience of the sharer), examining knowledge sharing from interactional and process perspectives, understanding differences between interpersonal and technology-aided knowledge sharing, the influence of organizational and national culture on knowledge sharing, and methodological issues in knowledge sharing.

In another review, Asrar-ul-Haq and Anwar (2016) identified trust, team climate, rewards system and motivation, organizational structure, social relations, knowledge-centered culture, openness to change, information technology, top management support, and leadership as the antecedents of knowledge sharing and transfer. Future research directions, according to Asrar-ul-Haq and Anwar, may focus on knowledge sharing in the context of developing countries and relationship of knowledge sharing with social media, organizational politics, and communication in the organization.

Meanwhile, organization learning has been a topic of interest since 1965 when Cangelosi & Dill (1965) discussed the topic 30 years ago (Mary Crossan, Lane, & White, 1999). Since then, earlier studies on organizational learning (Pareek, 1988; Weick, 1991; Huber, 1991; March, 1991; Schein, 1996; Gherardi & Nicolini, 2001) were done in an attempt to analyze and develop theoretical frameworks on the learning processes of organizations, which were mostly private businesses.

Fiol and Lyles (1985) argued that an organization's strategic management must be aligned with its environment in order to remain competitive. Such alignment suggests that the organization must learn, relearn, and unlearn based on its past experiences. Fiol and Lyles stated that how an organization adjusts to the changing environment lead to its capacity to learn over time.

Considering the importance of knowledge as an organizational asset, organizational learning becomes necessary. Organizational learning is a key dimension to knowledge management, which involves a continuous assessment of organizational experience and converting that experience into knowledge and making it accessible to the organization as a whole. Thus, this study explored on organizational learning in higher education.

Guță (2014) considers organizational learning as highly significant in the survival of higher education institutions. However, Boratian (as cited in Guță, 2014) argued that although a university engages in the learning processes, it is not necessarily a learning organization. Bratianu (2007) identified two processes in an organization: production and management processes. In the context of universities, the production process is the learning process but in order for a university to be a learning organization, the management process needs to be a learning process too.

However, Popper & Lipshitz (1998) argued that there remains lack of consistency in the concepts and definitions of organizational learning and that research in organizational learning are broad and encompass all areas of organizational change.

As Neefe (2001) argued, little is known about the relative organizational learning in HEIs. Thus, in her study, she compared organizational learning maturity between institutions pursuing alternative accreditation (based on Malcom Baldrige) processes and those using the traditional accreditation process. Results revealed that higher education practices the characteristics of learning organizations. The non-traditionally accredited institutions demonstrated a higher organizational learning index measured in terms of shared vision/mission, organizational culture, team work and team learning, sharing of knowledge, systems thinking, and leadership. The results indicated that non-traditionally accredited universities are more mature in terms of organizational learning.

Crossan and Berdrow (2003), in their review of organizational learning literature, claimed that a general theory of organizational learning has remained elusive. They pointed out the narrow conceptualization of organizational learning which previous studies described as an emergent, trial and error and even random process, and as a rational process in decision-making and choice from the setting of performance targets, to meeting the targets and acquiring and processing information about alternatives. Crossan and Berdrow cited that such focus on choice and decision making does not capture organizational learning in the context of interpretive systems, communities of practices, dialogue, and memory.

Thus, to examine organizational learning more deeply, Crossan and Berdrow looked at organizational learning from the perspective of strategic renewal which the authors defined as the tension between

exploration and exploitation. Using the qualitative case study method, the authors found that organizational learning processes are not inherently positive nor negative. They claimed that before judging the effectiveness of the learning process, researchers need to demystify organizational learning by considering whether an organization's context determines its pattern of learning. In this view, studies on organizational learning focused on organization factors such as information technology mechanisms (Kane & Alavi, 2007; Graham & Nafukho, 2008), leadership and culture (Abdullah and Kassim, 2008), job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and job involvement (Malik and Danish, 2010) as determinants of organizational learning processes.

Moreover, previous studies attempted to develop OL models by identifying OL dimensions and developing instruments to assess the latter. For instance, Veisi (2010) identified shared mission and vision (building a sense of commitment in a group, organizational culture, norms and values guide employees' behavior); team work and team learning (developing the practices of dialogue and discussion, develop shared understanding about complex issues, coordinate activities, and share best practices); systems thinking (seeing interrelationships rather than things, seeing the structures and processes that underlie complex situations); leadership (provides system to facilitate learning, encourages people to contribute new ideas, ensures the sharing of knowledge, allocates resources to demonstrate the organization's commitment to learning, and shares leadership); and employees' skills and competencies (reskilling of employees so that their minds and creative abilities can be mobilized for achieving organizational objectives) as dimensions of OL.

Likewise, Guță (2014) tested a model for measuring organizational learning as a process in universities as well as in private organizations, two companies from business fields. Adopting Huber's (1991) constructs, they made an observation to include organizational memory that cannot be considered a process. Results show a positive relationship between organizational learning and organizational performance.

While literature in organizational learning abounds, most of these studies were conducted in business context. Little is known about dimensions of organizational learning in the academe, thus the current study aimed to explore OL in higher education. To provide deeper understanding of the OL construct, the current study also looked into OL as a factor of knowledge sharing.

Previous studies pointed out that organizational learning and knowledge sharing are closely connected. Yang (2010) explained that knowledge sharing empowers organizational leaders to keep the individual learning flowing throughout the company and to integrate it for practical applications. Yang also stated that when people shared

their thoughts, beliefs, knowledge and experiences, they establish common understanding thereby creating organizational knowledge.

In a study among 615 international tourists in Taiwan, Yang (2010) found that leaders who served as mentors, facilitators, and innovators and who nurtured a supportive environment contributed to a positive attitude toward knowledge sharing, resulting in the transformation of individual knowledge to organizational knowledge. This, in turn, resulted in advancement of organizational learning and thus, improved organizational effectiveness.

The study of Skinnarland and Sharp (2011) supported the claim that knowledge sharing is related to organizational learning, which in turn affects competitiveness. The authors opined that informal knowledge sharing, such as face-to-face sharing of knowledge or experiences contributes to learning. They established the link between learning and sharing and organization's effectiveness.

Likewise, Suveatwatanakul (2013), who studied 302 Thai tourism and hospitality industries, identified knowledge sharing variables such as leadership, culture, mission and strategy, management practices, organization structure, organizational climate, and motivation as correlates of organizational learning measured in terms of experiential learning, team learning and generative learning.

Abu-shanab, Haddad, and Knight (2014), who studied a major telecommunications company in Jordan, claimed that there is a significant positive relationship between knowledge sharing practices and ongoing organizational learning. They recommended that organizations pay attention to the role of organizational learning in sustaining competitive advantage and provide needed tools to encourage knowledge management practices. In a similar vein, Ali, Ali, and Shima (2015) found that knowledge sharing infrastructure measured in terms of culture, structure and information technology had meaningful relation to organizational learning.

Based on the results of the structural equation modeling approach on 244 Spanish hotels, Iebra Aizpurúa, Zegarra Saldaña, and Zegarra Saldaña (2011) confirmed a positive relationship between knowledge sharing and organizational learning. The authors also found that both knowledge sharing and organizational learning were positively associated with the company's innovation.

Although, some authors argued that organizational learning and knowledge sharing are complementary, there are few studies that have empirically tested the relationship between them (Iebra Aizpurúa, Zegarra Saldaña, and Zegarra Saldaña (2011). Locally, little is known about the contribution of knowledge sharing to organizational learning. Thus, this research explored on this area to fill this research gap.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Since this study analyzed the influence of knowledge sharing on organizational learning on OBE among faculty members in a private higher education institution, the researcher considered the socio-psychological tradition as the study's theoretical underpinning. From the socio-psychological lens, the individual is viewed as a social being influenced by his or her interpersonal interaction but remains independent in his or her actions. This tradition focuses on individual social behavior, psychological variables, personality traits, perception, and cognition. Informed by socio-psychological theory, this study is guided by the Social Learning Theory (SLT) of Alfred Bandura. A theory that evolved from operant conditioning, Bandura's (1969) SLT states that our behavior is shaped by observing and imitating the behavior of other people. Bandura used the term modelling to explain how human beings can very quickly learn specific behavior from other people and incorporate this behavior into their own behavior. He argued that people are goal-driven, they actively gather information about their action in order to determine what actions would be of benefit to them.

This study is anchored on four governing processes of SLT: i) Attention, ii) Representation, iii) Behavioral Production, and iv) Motivation (Feist & Feist, 2008). Attending a model through observation and inquiry is basic in SLT. Under representation, verbal coding is used in knowledge donating and collecting. The agency of verbal coding through language can be used to evaluate behaviors and choose which ones to try and discard in knowledge sharing. It also helps to rehearse the behavior symbolically, that is, to invoke and perform knowledge sharing and collecting over and over again to oneself and others. Attending to a model and retention of what has been observed lead to producing the behavior, that is, behavioral production. It answers the questions "How can I do this?" as to experimentation and risk-taking (symbolic rehearsal), "What am I doing?" as to interaction to the environment (self-monitoring) and "Am I doing this right?" as to dialogue and participative decision-making (evaluation of performance) in organizational learning on OBE. SLT is most effective if learners are motivated to perform the modeled behavior. Motivation in this case could be projected on the relevance and value of OBE as determined by knowledge sharing behavior and organizational learning.

Using the SLT lens, this study aims to find out the knowledge, attitudes and practices of faculty members regarding OBE, the knowledge sharing behavior toward OBE and how these variables contribute to organizational learning. The present study tried to capture the influence of other faculty members who could serve as models of OBE in the organization on the practices, knowledge sharing and organizational learning behaviors toward OBE among faculty members.

METHODOLOGY

Using the descriptive research design, this study determined the current knowledge, attitudes, and practices regarding OBE among faculty members of Lyceum of the Philippines University-Batangas (LPU-Batangas). Following the case study method, this study analyzed the knowledge sharing and organizational behavior toward outcomes-based education among the respondents and analyzed the contribution of knowledge sharing on OBE to organizational learning on OBE. The study was conducted at LPU-Batangas located in Capitol Site, Batangas City. This campus was headed by its President, Dr. Peter P. Laurel, at the time of the study. LPU-Batangas has started its OBE implementation in 2007.

All faculty members, full-time or part-time, served as the population of this study. Out of 270 faculty members, 111 were randomly employed as sample. Based on GPower, a sample of 111 was significant with α of 0.05, effect size of 0.32, and power of 0.95.

The researcher sought permission first from the president of LPU and then from the Deans of the different colleges before she proceeded with the study. Once approval was granted, the researcher administered the survey among faculty members from December 2017 to February 2018. To comply with ethical considerations, the respondents were asked to sign the informed consent form/s before they were provided with the survey questionnaire. To validate and provide more insights on the survey results, the researcher also conducted key informant interviews and focus group discussion (FGD) among faculty members coming from the different colleges of LPU-Batangas.

The research instrument in this study was a survey questionnaire consisting of three parts. The first part composed of items to describe the knowledge, attitudes, and practices of the respondents regarding OBE. The items on attitudes toward OBE were based on the review of previous studies while the items on practices were drawn from Spady's four principles of OBE. The second part of the instrument sought information about the respondents' knowledge sharing behavior, which was adapted and modified from Van Den Hooff and Hendrix (as cited in De Vries, et al., 2006). Finally, the last part of the instrument consisted of items measuring perceived organizational learning adapted and modified from Chiva, Alegre, and Lapiedra (2007).

Before the actual conduct of the survey, the questionnaire was pretested among 30 faculty members from a private university in Laguna to check for clarity of questions and instructions. The faculty members noted that the questions and instructions were clear. Cronbach Alpha was used to measure the reliability of the sections with statements measured using a Likert Scale. The Cronbach Alpha was 0.994, which was higher than the acceptable reliability coefficient of 0.70 (Peterson, 2013); thus, the instrument was highly reliable.

The descriptive statistics, such as frequency, percentage, and weighted mean were used in the analysis and presentation of profile variables.

Knowledge sharing behavior was measured using the two knowledge-sharing behavior scales developed by Van Den Hooff and Hendrix (2004 as cited in De Vries, et al., 2006). Organizational learning was measured using the Organizational Learning Capability Scale developed by Chiva, Alegre, and Lapidra (2007).

Data were coded and analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) Version 19.0 software. Pearson correlation coefficient was used to determine the relationships of the variables. Tables and graphs were used in presenting the data.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

KNOWLEDGE SHARING BEHAVIOR TOWARD OBE

One of the challenges of managers and leaders is how to effectively manage knowledge as an organizational resource. To make knowledge available, every unit in an organization must be involved in the process of knowledge sharing. Knowledge sharing/transfer is a critical aspect in knowledge management, especially in organizations like the academe (Ghodsian, Khanifar, Yazdani, & Dorrani, 2017).

As previously defined, knowledge sharing refers to two central behaviors: knowledge donating, communicating one's personal intellectual capital to others; and knowledge seeking, consulting others to get them to share their intellectual capital. This study adopted De Vries' (2006) measures of knowledge sharing behavior, which consists of four statements each for knowledge seeking and knowledge donating. The results on knowledge sharing behavior of faculty members toward OBE are presented on Table 1.

As gleaned from the table, LPU faculty members were more of knowledge collectors (WM=3.42) than knowledge donors (WM=3.38). In collecting OBE-related knowledge, they highly positively liked to be informed about their co-faculty's new OBE knowledge or technology. This shows the eagerness of the faculty members to learn about new OBE knowledge. The rest of the indicators were only rated as "positive" like asking anybody about new OBE knowledge or technology (WM=3.42), among others. This means that faculty members had positive knowledge collecting behavior. They ask from anybody who knows OBE and who have the abilities when they need information about OBE.

As to OBE-related knowledge donating, results revealed that no highly positive response was recorded, although they were "positive" that it is important that their colleagues know what they are doing

Table 1. Knowledge sharing behavior toward OBE

Knowledge Sharing Measures	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
Knowledge donating		
1. When I've learned something new about outcomes-based education, I tell my co-faculty about it.	3.35	Positive
2. I share the information I have about outcomes-based education with my co-faculty.	3.40	Positive
3. I think it is important that my co-faculty know what I am doing in outcomes-based education.	3.49	Positive
4. I regularly tell my co-faculty what I am doing in outcomes-based education.	3.27	Positive
Mean	3.38	Positive
Knowledge collecting		
5. When I need certain new outcomes-based education knowledge/technology, I ask from anybody who knows about it.	3.42	Positive
6. I like to be informed of what my co-faculty know about the new outcomes-based education knowledge/technology.	3.50	Highly positive
7. I ask from anyone about their abilities when I need to learn about new outcomes-based education knowledge/technology.	3.37	Positive
8. When somebody is good at new outcomes-based education knowledge/technology, I ask them to teach me how to do it.	3.41	Positive
Mean	3.42	Positive

Note: 4.00-3.50 – Highly Positive, 2.50-3.49 – Positive, 1.50-2.49 – Negative, 1.00-1.49 – Highly Negative

related to OBE ($M=3.49$) and that they share information about OBE with their co-faculty ($M=3.40$). This result indicates that the faculty members also have positive knowledge donating behavior, suggesting that they are also eager to share their knowledge about OBE with their co-faculty.

Considering that faculty members had positive behavior toward both knowledge collecting and knowledge donating, this result indicates that they value the importance of OBE. Thus, OBE-related knowledge will accumulate if the faculty members continue to seek knowledge and be motivated to donate this knowledge with colleagues.

From Table 2, one could say that knowledge level on OBE was not significantly related to both knowledge sharing behavior in terms of knowledge donating (p value=0.697) and knowledge collecting (p value=0.850), thereby contradicting the knowledge-attitude-practice

hierarchy of effect (Chaffee & Roser, 1986). This result means self-reported knowledge level on OBE does not influence faculty members to share OBE-related knowledge with their colleagues. The results of the present study support previous claims that knowledge does not directly translate into practice, as there are other intervening factors that may affect behavior (Mocan & Altindag, 2014; Tan, Pan, Zhou, Wang, & Xie, 2007; Glasman & Albarracín, 2006; Chaffee & Roser, 1986). In the case of the present study, this no or negligible relationship may be attributed to self-reported knowledge level of the respondents and therefore, actual knowledge, how much and what they knew about OBE, was not measured more accurately. As Rimal (2000) puts it, the link between knowledge and behavior in the literature was only moderate at best and directions for future studies should gear toward testing rigorously the circumstances under which this relation vary.

Meanwhile, the respondents' attitudes toward OBE was significantly related to knowledge sharing behavior in terms of knowledge donating (p value=0.000) and knowledge collecting (p value=0.000). Note that there was a strong direct correlation here with the former at 0.582 and the latter at 0.610. This finding means that the more positive the attitudes are toward OBE, the more positive as well the knowledge sharing behavior.

As revealed earlier, faculty members had highly positive attitudes toward OBE, which explains why they had positive knowledge sharing behavior. The relationship between attitudes and knowledge sharing behavior revealed in this study confirmed previous conclusions that affective aspects are antecedents of knowledge sharing (Park, Jaegal, & Joy Saplan-Catchapero, 2012; Leng, Lee, & Lim, 2016; Alhalhouli, Hassan, & Abualkishik, 2013).

Table 2. Knowledge level, attitudes, and practices regarding OBE as correlates of knowledge sharing behavior

	Knowledge	Knowledge	Practices
Knowledge donating	0.037	0.582**	0.601**
Knowledge collecting	-0.018	0.610**	0.602**

Notes: * and ** indicate that the correlation is significant at the 0.05 and the 0.01 levels (2-tailed).

Finally, the practices regarding OBE was significantly related to knowledge sharing behavior in terms of knowledge donating (p value=0.000) and knowledge collecting (p value=0.000). The correlation coefficient was also strong and direct with the former at 0.601 and the latter at 0.602. This means that the more the faculty members seek and donate OBE-related knowledge, the more the OBE-related practices are regarded positively. Similar to the findings on attitudes, the faculty members also demonstrated a highly positive regard for OBE practices; thus, contributing to why they have favorable behavior toward knowledge sharing.

ORGANIZATIONAL LEARNING BEHAVIOR TOWARD OBE

In line with organizational learning behavior toward OBE, among the five dimensions, data revealed that none got a rating of “highly positive.” All the five dimensions only got weighted mean scores not lower than 3.00 but not higher than 3.50, which is interpreted as respondents generally “agreeing” on the statements. This means the faculty members have positive organizational learning behavior toward OBE.

The dimension that garnered the highest weighted mean score (3.43) was “dialogue,” which is interpreted as positive. In this dimension, the result means that respondents were positive that there was sharing of ideas about OBE. Specifically, the respondents positively perceived that their managers facilitate communication about OBE, that there is a free and open communication about OBE within the department and college, and that employees are being encouraged to communicate about OBE. Among the statements on Table 3, #12 received the highest weighted mean score (3.45) similar to that of statements #9 and #10, which are both under the dialogue dimension. This result revealed that the faculty members were positive that they were involved in the decision-making related to OBE.

The dimension with the lowest weighted mean score, on the other hand, has something to do with risk taking (3.21), which is also interpreted as positive. This means the respondents generally were positive that they were being encouraged to take risks and that they often ventured into unknown territory pertinent to OBE. However, this result implies that while there was positive behavior toward risk-taking, the management may further encourage the faculty members to take risks in their implementation of OBE, which could be in the aspect of teaching methodologies, performance assessments, among others, since risk-taking is an indicator of organizational learning (Chiva, et al., 2007).

Table 3. Organizational learning on OBE

Organizational Learning Measures	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
Experimentation		
1. People receive support and encouragement when they present new ideas about OBE.	3.37	Positive
2. OBE-related initiatives often receive a favorable response here, so people feel encouraged to generate new ideas.	3.38	Positive
Mean	3.38	Positive
Risk taking		
3. People are encouraged to take risks in this organization.	3.27	Positive
4. People here often venture into unknown territory.	3.16	Positive
Mean	3.21	Positive
Interaction with the environment		
5. It is part of the work of all staff to collect, bring back, and report information about OBE outside the institution.	3.30	Positive
6. There are systems and procedures for receiving, collating and sharing information about OBE from outside the institution.	3.36	Positive
7. People here are encouraged to interact with the environment (universities, partners, competitors, etc.) regarding OBE.	3.42	Positive
Mean	3.35	Positive
Dialogue		
8. Employees are encouraged to communicate about OBE.	3.40	Positive
9. There is a free and open communication regarding OBE within my department/ college.	3.45	Positive
10. Managers facilitate communication about OBE.	3.45	Positive
Mean	3.43	Positive
Participative decision-making		
11. It is a common practice in our institution that people from different areas work on OBE implementation as a team.	3.43	Positive
12. Managers in this institution frequently involve employees in important decisions about OBE.	3.45	Positive

Organizational Learning Measures	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
13. OBE policies are significantly influenced by the views of the people.	3.43	Positive
14. People feel involved in main institutional decisions regarding OBE.	3.39	Positive
Mean	3.42	Positive
Overall Mean	3.37	Positive

Note: 4.00-3.50 – Highly Positive, 2.50-3.49 – Positive, 1.50-2.49 – Negative, 1.00-1.49 – Highly Negative

KNOWLEDGE SHARING BEHAVIORS AND ORGANIZATIONAL LEARNING ON OBE

It is the primary aim of the study to analyze the contribution of knowledge sharing to organizational learning. While previous studies found that these variables are connected, very few studies have empirically tested the correlation between the two (Iebra Aizpurúa, Zegarra Saldaña, and Zegarra Saldaña, 2011). Thus, this current study attempted to bridge this research gap.

While knowledge sharing was considered in this study in terms of knowledge collecting and knowledge donating, organizational learning, on the other hand, refers to five dimensions (Chiva, et al., 2007): experimentation, risk-taking, interaction with the environment, dialogue, and participative decision-making.

This study found that knowledge donating and collecting were significantly related to all the five dimensions of organizational learning on OBE, with strong direct relationship, as can be gleaned on Table 4. This means that the more the faculty members donate and collect OBE-related knowledge, the higher the organizational learning on OBE.

Based on the results using Pearson correlation, one can say that the more the faculty members seek and donate knowledge about OBE, the more positively they perceive that people in the institution receive support and encouragement when they present new ideas and that the more they feel that people are encouraged to present new ideas about OBE because they often receive favorable response to their OBE initiatives. Moreover, as faculty members share knowledge, the more positively they perceived that they were encouraged to take risks and to interact with the external environment regarding OBE. In addition, the higher the level of knowledge sharing, the more positive the faculty members perceive that there is free and open communication regarding OBE in their department or college and that their managers frequently involved them in important decisions about OBE.

Table 4. Correlation between knowledge sharing and organizational learning

Item	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Knowledge donating						
2. Knowledge collecting	.885**					
3. Experimentation	.525**	.577**				
4. Risk-taking	.436**	.460**	.758**			
5. Interaction with the environment	.530**	.565**	.871**	.783**		
6. Dialogue	.539**	.573**	.821**	.644**	.896**	
7. Participative decision-making	.543**	.584**	.773**	.573**	.842**	.932**

CONCLUSIONS

The faculty may have had only moderate knowledge about OBE at the time of the study, but they had highly positive attitudes and practices toward OBE. The more knowledge they possessed, the more positive their attitudes toward OBE were; and the more positive their attitudes, the higher their level of practice on OBE. Results of the study further revealed that the faculty were more of knowledge collectors than donors.

Overall, the faculty of LPU-Batangas had positive organizational learning behavior toward OBE. The more OBE-related knowledge was shared and collected, the more positively they perceived organizational learning on OBE. Likewise, an increase in the level of knowledge collecting and attitudes also meant an increase in the level of organizational learning.

The study further concluded that social learning theory informed the direct correlation between knowledge sharing on OBE and organizational learning on OBE, as learning took place as a direct outcome of interaction with other members of the organization. In the language of social learning, the role of models in the knowledge sharing interaction was influential in how members of the organizations learn. This finding contributes to understanding development communication practice, as knowledge sharing is a component of knowledge management which is a communication approach to development communication. Therefore, this result confirms previous findings that knowledge sharing is a critical factor to the success of development communication initiatives. Future research may be directed on the role OBE champions may play toward development of OBE-informed curriculum.

REFERENCES

- Abdullah, K. A. S., & Kassim, N. A. (2008). Perceptions of organizational learning practices among Yemeni university librarians. *Malaysian Journal of Library and Information Science*, 13(1), 77–90.
- Acquaro, D., & Stokes, H. (2016). Female Teacher Identities and Leadership Aspirations in Neoliberal Times. *Isea @Bullet*, 44(1), 129–145.
- Alhalhouli, Z. T., Hassan, Z. B. H., & Abualkishik, A. M. (2013). An updated model to enhance knowledge sharing among stakeholders in Jordanian hospitals using social networks. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 25(2), 270–280. <https://doi.org/10.5829/idosi.wasj.2013.25.02.13287>
- An, I. (2014). Impact of outcome-based education instruction to accountancy students in an Asian University. *Pacific Journal of Education, Arts and Sciences*. Retrieved from <http://research.lpubatangas.edu.ph/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/APJEAS-Impact-of-Outcome-Based-Education-Instruction-to-Accountancy.pdf>
- Antal, A. B., & Dierkes, M. (2007). Organizational Learning and Knowledge : Reflections on the Dynamics of the Field and Challenges for the Future. In *Handbook of Organizational Learning and Knowledge*. <https://doi.org/Book Chapter>
- Argote, L., & Ingram, P. (2000). Knowledge Transfer: A Basis for Competitive Advantage in Firms. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 82(1), 150–169. <https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.2000.2893>
- Argyris, C., & Schön, D. (1992). What is an organization that it may learn? On Organizational Learning, 8–29.
- Argyris, C., & Schön, D. A. (1996). *Organizational Learning II: Theory, Method, and Practice*. Reading (Vol. 1). Retrieved from <http://books.google.com/books?id=0X3MPgAACAAJ&pgis=1>
- Asrar-ul-Haq, M., & Anwar, S. (2016). A systematic review of knowledge management and knowledge sharing: Trends, issues, and challenges. *Cogent Business & Management*, 3(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2015.1127744>
- Ba, S., & Pavlou, P. (2002, January 1). MIS Quarterly. *MIS Quarterly*. *JOURNAL OF RESCUE & RELIEF*. <https://doi.org/130.233.243.235>
- Bakhari Ismail, M., & Mohammad Yusof, Z. (2009). Demographic Factors and Knowledge Sharing Quality among Malaysian Government Officers Communications of the IBIMA Demographic Factors and Knowledge Sharing Quality among Malaysian Government Officers. *Communications of the IBIMA*, 9, 1–8. Retrieved from <http://ibimapublishing.com/articles/CIBIMA/2009/385564/385564.pdf>
- Balogun, A. G. (2014). Demographic Variables predicting Employees Willingness to share Tacit Knowledge in Service Occupations, 22(2), 42–49. Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1657548974?pq-origsite=gscholar>
- Bandura, A. (1969). Social-Learning Theory Of Identificatory Processes. *Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19371918.2011.591629>
- Bess, K. D., Perkins, D. D., & McCown, D. L. (2011). Testing a measure of organizational learning capacity and readiness for transformational change in human services. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community*, 39(1), 35–49. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10852352.2011.530164>
- Boateng, H., Dzandu, M. D., & Agyemang, F. G. (2015). The effects of demographic variables on knowledge sharing. *Library Review*, 64(3), 216–228. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LR-07-2014-0080>

- Bock, G., & Kim, Y. (2001). Breaking the myths of rewards: An exploratory study of attitudes about knowledge sharing. *Pacis 2001 Proceedings*. Retrieved from <http://aisel.aisnet.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1161&context=pacis2001>
- Bock, G., Zmud, R., Kim, Y., & Lee, J. (2005). Behavioral intention formation in knowledge sharing: Examining the roles of extrinsic motivators, social-psychological forces, and organizational climate. *MIS Quarterly*. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25148669>
- Borsoto, L. D., Lescano, J. D., Maquimot, N. I., Santorce, M. J. N., Simbulan, A. F., & Pagcaliwagan, A. M. (2014). Status of Implementation and Usefulness of Outcomes-Based Education in the Engineering Department of an Asian University. *Asian Journal of Management Science and Economics*, 1(1), 31–42. Retrieved from <http://www.multidisciplinaryjournals.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/STATUS-OF-IMPLEMENTATION.pdf>
- Bratianu, C. (2007). the Learning Paradox and the University. *Journal of Applied Quantitative Methods*, 2(4), 375–386.
- Busch, M. (2006). Examining organizational learning for application in human service organizations., (December). Retrieved from http://www.researchgate.net/profile/Monique_Busch/publication/35388483_Examining_organizational_learning_for_application_in_human_service_organizations_Monique_Busch/links/00b495238f1a0de230000000.pdf
- Cabaces, J., Blanco, A. J. S., Cabanas, J. E. A., Casapao, C. G., Guzman, J. P. De, Villa, M. A. C. De, & Derla, R. V. R. (2014). Perception and Awareness of Nigerian Students toward Outcome-Based Education. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARPED/v3-i1/761>
- Caguimbal, D. A., Delacion, D. C., Medina, A-G. O., Mendoza, M. S., Joy Mendoza, R. M., & Sanchez, M. M. (2013). Level of Awareness of the Maritime Students on the Outcomes Based Education. *Educational Research International Educational Research International Educational Research International ISSN-L*, 2(1), 2307–3713. Retrieved from http://www.academia.edu/download/32257252/ERInt_-_LEVEL_OF_AWARENESS_OF_THE_MARITIME_STUDENTS_ON_THE_OBE.pdf
- Cangelosi, V. E., & Dill, W. R. (1965). Organizational Learning: Observations Toward a Theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 10(2), 175–203. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2391412>
- Chaffee, S. H., & Roser, C. (1986). Involvement and the consistency of knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors. *Communication Research*, 13(3), 373–399. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009365086013003006>
- Cheng, M., Ho, J. S., & Lau, P. M. (2009). Knowledge sharing in academic institutions : a study of multimedia university malaysia. *Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management*, 7(3), 313–324. <https://doi.org/ISSN 1479-4411>
- Chiva, R., Alegre, J., & Lapiedra, R. (2007). Measuring organisational learning capability among the workforce. *International Journal of Manpower*, 28(3/4), 224–242. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437720710755227>
- Crossan, M., & Berdrow, I. (2003). Organizational learning and strategic renewal. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24(11), 1087–1105. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.342>
- Crossan, M., Lane, H., & White, R. E. (1999). An Organizational Learning Framework : From Intuition to Institution. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 24(3), 522–537. <https://doi.org/10.2307/259140>
- Crossan, M. M., Lane, H. W., White, R. E., & Djurfeldt, L. (1995). Organizational learning: Dimensions for a theory. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 3(4), 337–360. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb028835>

- Cummings, J. (2003). Knowledge Sharing : A Review of the Literature. *ASLIB Proceedings* (Vol. 55). <https://doi.org/10.1108/00012530310472615>
- Dalkir, K. (2011). Knowledge Management in Theory and Practice. *Knowledge Management* (Vol. 4). Retrieved from <http://www.amazon.com/Knowledge-Management-Theory-Practice-Dalkir/dp/0262015080>
- De Geus, A. P. (1988). Planning as Learning. *Harvard Business Review*, 66(2), 70–74. Retrieved from <http://www.sims.monash.edu.au/subjects/ims5042/stuff/readings/degeus.pdf>
- Dodgson, M. (1993). Organizational Learning: A Review of Some Literatures. *Organization Studies*, 14(3), 375–394. <https://doi.org/10.1177/017084069301400303>
- Donnelly, K. (2007). Australia's adoption of outcomes based education: A critique. *Issues in Educational Research*, 17(2), 183–206.
- Ellis, S., & Shpielberg, N. (2003). Organizational Learning Mechanisms and Managers' Perceived Uncertainty. *Human Relations*, 56(200310), 1233–1254. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00187267035610004>
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A., & Buchner, A. (2007). Statistics textbooks in the social. *Behavior Research Methods*, 39(2), 175–191.
- Feist, J., & Feist, G. J. (2008). Theories of personality.
- Fey, C. F., & Furu, P. (2008). Top management incentive compensation and knowledge sharing in multinational corporations. *Strategic Management Journal*, 29(12), 1301–1323. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.712>
- Fiol, C. M., & Lyles, M. A. (1985). Organizational Learning. *The Academy of Management Review*, 10(4), 803–813. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258048>
- Fiol, M., & Lyles, M. (1985). Organizational learning. *The Academy of Management Review*, 10(4), 803–813. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258048>
- Garud, R., Dunbar, R. L. M., & Bartel, C. a. (2011). Dealing with Unusual Experiences: A Narrative Perspective on Organizational Learning. *Organization Science*, 22(3), 587–601. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1100.0536>
- Gherardi, S., & Nicolini, D. (2001). The Sociological Foundations of Organizational Learning. *Learning*, 15(2), 35–60. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09696470410548836>
- Ghodsian, N., Khanifar, H., Yazdani, H., & Dorrani, K. (2017). Narges, Hossein, Hamidreza, Kamal - Google Scholar. *Journal of Medical Education*, 16(2). Retrieved from https://scholar.google.com.ph/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=Narges%2C+Hossein%2C+Hamidreza%2C+Kamal&btnG=
- Glasman, L. R., & Albarracín, D. (2006). Forming attitudes that predict future behavior: A meta-analysis of the attitude-behavior relation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 132(5), 778–822. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.132.5.778>
- Graham, C. M., & Nafukho, F. M. (2008). Exploring Organizational Learning Mechanisms in Small-Size Business Enterprises. *New Horizons in Adult Education & Human Resource Development*, 22(1), 4–23. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/1238186092?accountid=17215%5Cnhttp://limo.libis.be/resolver?url_ver=Z39.88-2004&rft_val_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:journal&genre=article&sid=ProQ:ProQ:ericshell&title=Exploring+Organizational+Learning+Mechanisms+in+Small-
- Grubić-Nešić, L., Matić, D., & Mitrović, S. (2015). the Influence of Demographic and Organizational Factors on Knowledge Sharing Among Employees in Organizations, 22(4), 1005–1010. <https://doi.org/10.17559/TV-20141216213746>
- Guță, A. L. (2014). Measuring organizational learning . Model testing in two Romanian

universities. *Management & Marketing Challenges for the Knowledge Society*, 9(3), 253–282.

- Hernaus, T., Škerlavaj, M., & Dimovski, V. (2008). Relationship between organisational learning and organisational performance: The case of Croatia. *Transformations in Business and Economics*, 7(2), 32–48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2006.07.009>
- Huber, G. (1991). *Organizational Learning : The Contributing Processes and the Literatures*. Author (s): George P . Huber Source : *Organization Science* , Vol . 2 , No . 1 , Special Issue : Organizational Learning : Papers in Honor of (and by) James G . March (1991) , pp. *Organization Science*, 2(1), 88–115.
- Iebra Aizpurúa, L., Zegarra Saldaña, P. E., & Zegarra Saldaña, A. (2011). Learning for sharing: An empirical analysis of organizational learning and knowledge sharing. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 7(4), 509–518. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-011-0206-z>
- Ives, W., Torrey, B., & Gordon, C. (1997). Knowledge Management: An Emerging Discipline with a Long History. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 1(4), 269–274. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EUM0000000004598>
- Jolaei, A., Nor, K. M., Khani, N., & Yusoff, R. M. (2014). Factors affecting knowledge sharing intention among academic staff. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 28, 413–431. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-03-2013-0041>
- Jolodar, S. Y. E., & Jolodar, S. R. E. (2012). The relationship between organizational learning capability and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 2(1), 15–27. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijhrs.v2i1.1242>
- Kane, G., & Alavi, M. (2007). Information technology and organizational learning: An investigation of exploration and exploitation processes. *Organization Science*. Retrieved from <http://pubsonline.informs.org/doi/abs/10.1287/orsc.1070.0286>
- Kathiravelu, S. R. (2013). Factors Influencing Knowledge Sharing Behavior During Disaster. pdf. Retrieved from https://scholar.google.com.ph/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=Factors+Influencing+Knowledge+Sharing+Behavior+%28KSB%29++among+Employees+of+Public+Services+in+Malaysia&btnG=
- Kim, L., & Nelson, R. (2000). Technology, learning, and innovation: Experiences of newly industrializing economies. Retrieved from [https://www.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=fsxXIR0aj2wC&oi=fnd&pg=PR7&dq=+\(Kim+%26+Nelson,+2000\).&ots=3idP5Jxngt&sig=FRR2Nu8S-RTNVzvbjpBqQ9CQljw](https://www.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=fsxXIR0aj2wC&oi=fnd&pg=PR7&dq=+(Kim+%26+Nelson,+2000).&ots=3idP5Jxngt&sig=FRR2Nu8S-RTNVzvbjpBqQ9CQljw)
- Knight, M. B., Abu-Shanab, E., & Haddad, M. (2014, October 14). Knowledge Sharing Practices and the Learning Organization: A Study. *The IUP Journal of Knowledge Management*. Retrieved from https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2509789
- Knowledge Sharing (KS), Organizational Learning and Competitive Advantage in a Scandinavian Hotel Company. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/wbs/conf/olkc/archive/olkc6/papers/id_110_sharp_p_skinnarland_k.pdf
- Kurland, H., Peretz, H., & Hertz-Lazarowitz, R. (2010). Leadership style and organizational learning: the mediate effect of school vision. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 48(1), 7–30. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578231011015395>
- Laguador, J., & Dotong, C. (2014). Knowledge versus Practice on the Outcomes-Based Education Implementation of the Engineering Faculty Members in LPU. *International ...*. Retrieved from http://research.lpubatangas.edu.ph/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/IJARPED-Knowledge-versus-Practice_on_the-Outcomes-Based-Education_Implementation_of_the_Engineering_Faculty_Members_in-LPU.pdf
- Lawson, M. J., & Askill-williams, H. (2007). Outcomes – Based Education. *Association of Independent Schools of SA*, (April), 1–19. Retrieved from <https://www.ied.edu.hk/obl/>

- Leng, N. C., Lee, A. S. H., & Lim, T. M. (2016). Affect TPB: A model to predict knowledge sharing behavior by considering affect, social communication behavior and social collaboration behavior. *ARPN Journal of Engineering and Applied Sciences*, 11(22), 13271–13278.
- Li, W. (2010). Virtual knowledge sharing in a cross-cultural context. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 14(1), 38–50. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13673271011015552>
- Limpibuntern, T., & Johri, L. M. (2009). Complementary role of organizational learning capability in new service development (NSD) process. *The Learning Organization*, 16(4), 326–348. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09696470910960419>
- Linsangan, N. B., Santiago, R. V. M., Ballado Jr., A. H., Navalta, C. V., & Caluyo, F. S. (2011). Shifting to Outcomes-Based Education : The Mapúa Institute of Technology Experience. In *World Congress on Engineering and Computer Science (Vol. I)*. Retrieved from http://www.iaeng.org/publication/WCECS2011/WCECS2011_pp288-293.pdf
- Malan, S. (2000). The 'new paradigm' of outcomes-based education in perspective. *Journal of Family Ecology and Consumer Sciences*. Retrieved from https://journals.co.za/content/famecs/28/1/AJA03785254_98
- Malik, M. E., & Danish, R. Q. (2010). Impact of Motivation to Learn and Job Attitudes on Organizational Learning Culture in a Public Service Organization of Pakistan. *South Asian Studies A Research Journal of South Asian Studies*, 25(2), 217–235.
- March, J. (1991). Exploration and Exploitation in Organizational Learning Author (s): James G . March Published by : INFORMS Stable URL : <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2634940> REFERENCES Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article : You may need to log in to. *Journal of Management*, 2(1), 71–87.
- March, J. G. (1991). Exploration and Exploitation in Organizational Learning. *Organization Science*, 2(1), 71–87. <https://doi.org/Doi.10.1287/Orsc.2.1.71>
- McNeir, G. (1993). Outcomes-Based Education: Tool for Restructuring. *OSSC Bulletin*, 36(1), 36. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/recordDetail?accno=ED357457&nhttp://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/detail?accno=ED379765&nhttp://www.inter-disciplinary.net/wp-content/uploads/2010/06/ce08ever1240510.pdf#page=120>
- Mocan, N., & Altindag, D. T. (2014). Education, cognition, health knowledge, and health behavior. *The European Journal of Health Economics : HEPAC : Health Economics in Prevention and Care*, 15(3), 265–79. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10198-013-0473-4>
- Moynihan, D. P., Landuyt, N., & Landuyt, N. (2009). How Do Public Organizations Learn ? Bridging Cultural and Structural Perspectives Published by : Wiley on behalf of the American Society for Public Administration Stable URL : <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40469030> How Do Public Organizations Learn ? Bridgi. *Public Administration Review*, 69(6), 1097–1105.
- Neefe, D. O. (2001). Comparing Levels of Organizational Learning Maturity of Colleges and Universities Participating in Traditional and Non-Traditional (Academic Quality Improvement Project) Accreditation Processes, 1–130.
- Nonaka, I. (1994). A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation. *Organization Science*. Retrieved from <http://pubsonline.informs.org/doi/abs/10.1287/orsc.5.1.14>
- Pareek, U. (1988). Organizational learning diagnostics (OLD): Assessing and developing organizational learning. *The 1988 Annual: Developing Human Resources*.
- Park, T., Jaegal, D., & Joy Saplan-Catchapero, V. (2012). Predicting knowledge sharing intentions in the public sector: Comparing tam with tpb. *International Review of Public Administration*, 17(2), 93–120. <https://doi.org/10.1080/12294659.2012.10805229>

- Peterson, R. A. (2013). Meta-analysis of Alpha Cronbach 's Coefficient. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 21(2), 381–391. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btr476>
- Popova-Nowak, I. V, & Cseh, M. (2015). The meaning of organizational learning: A meta-paradigm perspective. *Human Resource Development Review*, 14(3), 299–331. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484315596856>
- Popper, M., & Lipshitz, R. (1998). Organizational learning mechanisms: A structural and cultural approach to organizational learning. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 34(2), 161–179. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886398342003>
- Prusak, L. (2001). Where did knowledge management come from? *IBM Systems Journal*, 40(4), 1002–1007. <https://doi.org/10.1147/sj.404.01002>
- Rasheed, M. F. (2014). Factors Affecting the Organizational Learning Process : A comparative Study of Textile Sector.
- Rasula, Jelena, Vuksic, Vesna Bosilj & Stemberger, M. I. (2012). The Impact of Knowledge Management on Organizational Performance. *Economic and Business Review*, 14(2), 147–168. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v11n23p153>
- Riege, A. (2005). Three-dozen knowledge-sharing barriers managers must consider. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 9(3), 18–35. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13673270510602746>
- Rimal, R. N. (2000). Closing the Knowledge -- Behavior Gap in Health Promotion: The Mediating Role of Self-Efficacy. *Health Communication*, 12(July 2015), 219–238. <https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327027HC1203>
- Rush, R. B. (2011). Learning Organisation Principles: The Impact on a Midwest State Government as Perceived by it Employees (Thesis Phd), 110, 126.
- Sánchez, J. H., Sánchez, Y. H., Collado-Ruiz, D., & Cebrián-Tarrasón, D. (2013). Knowledge Creating and Sharing Corporate Culture Framework. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 74, 388–397. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.03.029>
- Schein, E. H. (1996). Three Cultures of Management: The Key to Organizational Learning. *Sloan Management Review*, 38(1), 9–20. <https://doi.org/Article>
- Schwartz, D. (2006). Aristotelian view of knowledge management. *Encyclopedia of Knowledge Management*. Retrieved from [https://www.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=sbP16CXUev8C&oi=fnd&pg=PA10&dq=The+Encyclopedia+of+Knowledge+Management+\(Schwartz,+2006\)&ots=_xDrFiGU54&sig=-WDEwTDgaiXmJ0ysUKZ1NjeZeuQ](https://www.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=sbP16CXUev8C&oi=fnd&pg=PA10&dq=The+Encyclopedia+of+Knowledge+Management+(Schwartz,+2006)&ots=_xDrFiGU54&sig=-WDEwTDgaiXmJ0ysUKZ1NjeZeuQ)
- Scott, B. (2011). Organizational learning: a literature review. Queens University. Retrieved from <http://irc.queensu.ca/sites/default/files/articles/organizational-learning-a-literature-review.pdf>
- Stata, R. (1989). Organizational learning: the key to management innovation. *Sloan Management Review*, 32, 1–14. <https://doi.org/Article>
- Stevens, J. (2007). Effect Size and Statistical Power :, (541).
- Suseno, Y., Salim, L., & Setiadi, P. (2017). Local contexts and organizational learning for innovation in an emerging economy : the case of two Malaysian firms in Indonesia, 1–50.
- Suveatwatanakul, C. (n.d.). EFFECT OF KNOWLEDGE SHARING FACTORS ON THE LEARNING ORGANISATION IN TOURISM AND HOSPITALITY. Retrieved from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/40f4/e2f7f9b2f7f6d9c58a83f28f6036a1990149.pdf>
- Swart, J., & Kinnie, N. (2003). Sharing knowledge in knowledge-intensive firms. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 13(2), 60–75. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-8583.2003.tb00091.x>

- Tan, X., Pan, J., Zhou, D., Wang, C., & Xie, C. (2007). HIV/AIDS knowledge, attitudes and behaviors assessment of Chinese students: A questionnaire study. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 4(3), 248–253. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph2007030009>
- Templeton, G., Lewis, B., & Snyder, C. (2002). Development of a measure for the organizational learning construct. *Journal of Management*. Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/07421222.2002.11045727>
- Tsang, E. W. K. (1997). Organizational Learning and the Learning Organization: A Dichotomy Between Descriptive and Prescriptive Research. *Human Relations*, 50(1), 73–89. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679705000104>
- Veilleux, R. (1995). A nationwide descriptive study about the the status of organizational learning in United States' businesses as perceived by human resource development.
- Veisi, H. (2010). Organizational Learning in the Higher Education Institutions (A Case Study of Agricultural and Natural Recourses Campus of University of Tehran). *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 2(1), 21–36.
- Vries, R. De. (2006). Explaining knowledge sharing the role of team communication styles, job satisfaction, and performance beliefs. *Communication* Retrieved from <http://crx.sagepub.com/content/33/2/115.short>
- Wang, S., & Noe, R. a. (2010). Knowledge sharing: A review and directions for future research. *Human Resource Management Review*, 20, 115–131. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2009.10.001>
- Weick, K. E. (1991). The Nontraditional Quality of Organizational Learning THE NONTRADITIONAL QUALITY OF ORGANIZATIONAL LEARNING *. Source: *Organization Science*, 2(1), 116–124. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/2634942%5Cnhttp://www.jstor.org/stable/2634942?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents%5Cnhttp://about.jstor.org/terms
- Wiig, K. M. (2000). Knowledge management: An Emerging Discipline with a Long History. In *Knowledge horizons: the present and the promise of knowledge management* (pp. 3–26). <https://doi.org/10.1108/EUM0000000004598>
- Wu, Y., & Zhu, W. (2012). An integrated theoretical model for determinants of knowledge sharing behaviours. *Kybernetes*, 41, 1462–1482. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03684921211276675>
- Yang, J.-T. (2010). Antecedents and consequences of knowledge sharing in international tourist hotels. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29(1), 42–52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IJHM.2009.05.004>
- Yi, J. (2009). A measure of knowledge sharing behavior: scale development and validation. *Knowledge Management Research & Practice*, 7(1), 65–81. <https://doi.org/10.1057/kmrp.2008.36>