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

*Associate Professor, Lyceum of the Philippines Laguna

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 (HEI) in the Philippines. Using the descriptive case study design, this study involved 111 randomly selected faculty members. Data were drawn using a survey, focus group discussion, and key informant interviews. Results revealed that a great majority of the faculty members had only a moderate knowledge of 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 a significant linear relationship with knowledge-sharing behavior. The respondents positively perceived 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: 20190115
Date accepted: 20191022
Date uploaded: 20210715

INTRODUCTION

In a 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 et al., 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. KM 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. Knowledge sharing, as a component of the KM process, has attracted much 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). At 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 and Noe (2010) and Riege (2005), knowledge sharing is a factor in KM success. The dynamics of the knowledge society require 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 organization's competitive advantage (Sánchez et al., 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 an individual's knowledge-sharing behavior in an organizational context (Bock & Kim, 2001; Wu & Zhu, 2012). Moreover, since KM as a concept started in management (Wiig, 2000; Prusak, 2001; Ives et al., 1997), most knowledge-sharing studies have been 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 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 the higher education setting, particularly in private universities.

Meanwhile, although a significant number of researches on knowledge sharing have emerged, its impact on what, when, and how organizations learn needs further investigation. In the context of this study, organizational learning is also an area in KM practice. As technologies are rapidly changing, organization managers and researchers search for alternative ways to develop the 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 elusive, the depth and breadth of scholarly conversation and debate have spurred rich insights into the central questions of how and what people learn in organizational settings (Scott, 2011). Argyris and Schön (1992) argued that organizational learning is an outcome of organizational inquiry. This means that whenever there is a difference between the expected and actual outcomes, 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 determine the influence of knowledge sharing on organizational learning.

In the field of development communication, there is a lack of studies on knowledge sharing and its influence on 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

This study aimed to analyze if knowledge sharing on OBE contributed to organizational learning. Specifically, this study sought to determine the current knowledge, attitudes, and practices on OBE of faculty members; analyze the knowledge sharing behavior of respondents toward OBE in terms of knowledge donating and knowledge collecting; analyze the organizational learning behavior toward OBE (i.e., 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 an increasingly competitive environment. As Cheng et al. (2009) argued, the dynamics of this economy require an organization to not only create knowledge but also 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 et al., 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 a knowledge archive.

On the other hand, De Vries et al. (2006) 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. De Vries et al. measured knowledge donating using the following:

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

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

1. When I need certain knowledge, I ask my colleagues 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.
4. When a colleague is good at something, I ask them to teach me how to do it.

Knowledge attitudes refer to eagerness to share knowledge and willingness to share knowledge.

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 where 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, the reason for sharing and not sharing knowledge (including impression management and attribution, power perspective, evaluation apprehension, social cost, and 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. According to Asrar-ul-Haq and Anwar, future research directions may focus on knowledge sharing in the context of developing countries and the relationship of knowledge sharing with social media, organizational politics, and communication in the organization.

Meanwhile, organizational learning has long been a topic of interest since 1965, when Cangelosi and Dill (1965) discussed the topic 30 years ago (Crossan et al., 1999). Since then, earlier studies on organizational learning (Gherardi & Nicolini, 2001; Huber, 1991; March, 1991; Pareek, 1988; Schein, 1996; Weick, 1991) have been 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 to remain competitive. Such alignment suggests that the organization must learn, relearn, and unlearn based on past experiences. Fiol and Lyles stated that how an organization adjusts to the changing environment leads to its capacity to learn over time.

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

Guţă (2014) considers organizational learning highly significant in the survival of higher education institutions (HEIs). However, Boratian

(as cited in Guţă, 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. In the context of universities, the production process is the learning process, but for a university to be a learning organization, the management process needs to be a learning process too.

However, Popper and Lipshitz (1998) argued that there remains a lack of consistency in the concepts and definitions of organizational learning and that research in organizational learning is broad and encompasses 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 Malcolm Baldridge) processes and those using the traditional accreditation process. Results revealed that HEIs exhibit 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, teamwork, 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. It is also described as a rational process in decision-making and choice, from setting performance targets to meeting the targets and acquiring and processing information about alternatives. Crossan and Berdrow cited that such a 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 or 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 organizational factors, such as information technology mechanisms (Graham & Nafukho, 2008; Kane

& Alavi, 2007); leadership and culture (Abdullah & Kassim, 2008); and job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and job involvement (Malik & Danish, 2010) as determinants of organizational learning processes.

Moreover, previous studies attempted to develop organizational learning models by identifying organizational learning 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); teamwork and team learning (developing the practices of dialogue and discussion, developing a shared understanding about complex issues, coordinating activities, and sharing best practices); systems thinking (seeing interrelationships rather than things, seeing the structures and processes that underlie complex situations); leadership (providing system to facilitate learning, encouraging people to contribute new ideas, ensuring the sharing of knowledge, allocating resources to demonstrate the organization's commitment to learning, and sharing 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 organizational learning.

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

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

Previous studies pointed out that organizational learning and knowledge sharing are closely connected. Yang (2010) explained that knowledge sharing empowers organizational leaders to keep individual learning flowing throughout the company and to integrate it for practical applications. Yang also stated that when people share their thoughts, beliefs, knowledge, and experiences, they establish a 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 nurtured a supportive environment contributed to a positive attitude toward knowledge sharing, resulting in the transformation of

individual knowledge into organizational knowledge. This, in turn, resulted in the 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 the 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 et al. (2014), who studied a major telecommunications company in Jordan, claimed 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 KM practices. In a similar vein, Ali et al. (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 et al. (2011) confirmed a positive relationship between knowledge sharing and organizational learning. The authors also found that knowledge sharing and organizational learning are positively associated with the company's innovation.

Although some authors argue that organizational learning and knowledge sharing are complementary, only a few studies have empirically tested their relationship (Iebra Aizpurúa et al., 2011). Locally, little is known about the contribution of knowledge sharing to organizational learning. Thus, this research explored 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 HEI, 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 their interpersonal interaction but remains independent in their 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 Albert Bandura. A theory that evolved from operant conditioning, Bandura's (1969) SLT states that our behavior is shaped by observing and imitating other people's behavior. Bandura used the term modeling to explain how human beings can quickly learn specific behavior from others and incorporate it into their own behavior. He argued that people are goal-driven; they actively gather information about their actions to determine what actions would be of benefit to them.

This study is anchored on four governing processes of SLT: (1) attention, (2) representation, (3) behavioral production, and (4) 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 retaining 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 with 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. This study tried to capture the influence of other faculty members who could serve as models of OBE in the organization by their practices, knowledge sharing, and organizational learning behaviors.

METHODOLOGY

Using a descriptive research design, this study determined the 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 examined knowledge sharing and organizational behavior and analyzed the contribution of knowledge sharing on OBE to organizational learning

on OBE. LPU-Batangas 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 selected as a 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 into the survey results, the researcher also conducted key informant interviews and a focus group discussion (FGD) among faculty members from the different colleges of LPU-Batangas.

The research instrument in this study was a survey questionnaire consisting of three parts. The first part comprises items describing the respondents' knowledge, attitudes, and practices 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 (1994) 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 et al. (2007).

Before conducting 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's alpha was used to measure the reliability of the sections, with statements measured using a Likert scale. Cronbach's alpha was 0.994, which was higher than the acceptable reliability coefficient of 0.70 (Peterson, 2013); thus, the instrument was highly reliable.

Descriptive statistics, such as frequency, percentage, and weighted mean, were used to analyze and present 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 et al. (2007).

Data were coded and analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) 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 challenge for managers and leaders is managing knowledge effectively 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 of KM, especially in organizations like the academe (Ghodsian et al., 2017).

As previously defined, knowledge sharing refers to two central behaviors: knowledge donating or communicating one's personal intellectual capital to others; and knowledge seeking or consulting others to get them to share their intellectual capital. This study adopted De Vries et al.'s (2006) measures of knowledge sharing behavior, consisting of four statements for knowledge seeking and knowledge donating. The results on the knowledge-sharing behavior of faculty members toward OBE are presented in 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 wanted to be informed about their co-faculty member'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," such as 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 anybody who knows about OBE and who has the abilities when they need information about OBE.

As to OBE-related knowledge donating, results revealed no highly positive response, although they were "positive" that it is important that their colleagues know what they are doing 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 they are eager to share their knowledge about OBE with their co-faculty.

Considering that faculty members had positive behavior toward 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 to colleagues.

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

From Table 2, one could say that knowledge level on OBE was not significantly related to knowledge-sharing behavior both in terms of knowledge donating (p=.697) and knowledge collecting (p=.850), thereby contradicting the knowledge-attitude-practice hierarchy of effect (Chaffee & Roser, 1986). This result means that self-reported knowledge level on OBE does not influence faculty members to share OBE-related knowledge with their colleagues. The results of this study support previous claims that knowledge does not directly translate into practice, as other intervening factors may affect behavior (Chaffee & Roser, 1986; Glasman & Albarracín, 2006; Mocan & Altindag, 2014; Tan et al., 2007). In the case of the present study, this absence or negligible relationship may be attributed to the 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 relationship varies.

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

	Knowledge	Attitudes	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).

Meanwhile, the respondents' attitudes toward OBE were significantly related to knowledge-sharing behavior in terms of knowledge donating (p=.000) and knowledge collecting (p=.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 toward OBE, the more positive 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 (Alhalhouli et al., 2013; Leng et al., 2016; Park et al., 2012).

Finally, the practices regarding OBE were significantly related to knowledge sharing behavior in terms of knowledge donating (p=.000) and knowledge collecting (p=.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 donate and seek OBE-related knowledge, the more OBE-related practices are regarded positively. Similar to the findings on attitudes, the faculty members also demonstrated a high positive regard for OBE practices, thus, contributing to their favorable behavior toward knowledge sharing.

Organizational Learning Behavior toward OBE

In line with the five dimensions of organizational learning behavior toward OBE, data revealed that none got a rating of "highly positive." All 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" with 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 free and open communication about OBE within the department and college, and that employees are encouraged to communicate about it. Among the statements in Table 3, #12 received the highest weighted mean score (3.45), similar to 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 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 were generally positive that they were being encouraged to take risks and 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, and performance assessments, among others, since risk-taking is an indicator of organizational learning (Chiva et al., 2007).

Knowledge Sharing Behaviors and Organizational Learning on OBE

The study's primary aim is 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 et al., 2011). Thus, this current study attempted to bridge this research gap.

While knowledge sharing was considered in this study in terms of knowledge donating and knowledge collecting, 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.

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

Table 3. Continued

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

This study found that knowledge donating and collecting were significantly related to all the five dimensions of organizational learning on OBE, with a strong direct relationship, as can be gleaned in 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 the more they feel that people are encouraged to present new ideas about OBE because they often receive a favorable response to their OBE initiatives. Moreover, as faculty members share knowledge, the more positively they perceive that they are encouraged to take risks and 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 involve 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 influences how members of organizations learn. This finding contributes to understanding development communication practice, as knowledge sharing is a component of KM which is a communication approach to development communication. Therefore, this result confirms previous findings that knowledge sharing is critical to the success of development communication initiatives. Future research may be directed toward the role OBE champions play in developing OBE-informed curricula.

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.

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

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? In *Organizations as Systems*, (pp. 128–137). Open University Press, Milton Keynes.

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

Bandura, A. (1969). Social learning theory of identificatory processes. In *Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research*. https://doi.org/10.1080/19371918.2011.591629

Bock, G., & Kim, Y. (2001). Breaking the myths of rewards: An exploratory study of attitudes about knowledge sharing. *Pacis 2001 Proceedings*. 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*. http://www.jstor.org/stable/25148669

Bratianu, C. (2007). The learning paradox and the university. *Journal of Applied Quantitative Methods*, *2*(4), 375–386.

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

Cummings, J. (2003). Knowledge sharing: A review of the literature. *ASLIB Proceedings, 55*. https://doi.org/10.1108/00012530310472615

Dalkir, K. (2011). Knowledge management in theory and practice. *Knowledge Management 4*. http://www.amazon.com/Knowledge-Management-Theory-Practice-Dalkir/dp/0262015080

De Vries, R. E., Van den Hooff, B., & De Ridder, J. A. (2006). Explaining knowledge sharing: The role of team communication styles, job satisfaction, and performance beliefs. *Communication Research*, *33*(2), 115–135.

Feist, J., & Feist, G. J. (2008). *Theories of personality*. Pustaka Pelajar.

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

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). The effective contributing factors in knowledge sharing and knowledge transfer among academic staff at tehran university of medical sciences: A qualitative study. *Journal of Medical Education*, *16*(2).

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.

Guţă, A. L. (2014). Measuring organizational learning: Model testing in two Romanian universities. *Management & Marketing Challenges for the Knowledge Society*, *9*(3), 253–282.

Huber, G. (1991). Organizational learning: The contributing processes and the literatures *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

Kane, G., & Alavi, M. (2007). Information technology and organizational learning: An investigation of exploration and exploitation processes. *Organization Science, 18*(5)*, 796–812*. http://pubsonline.informs.org/doi/abs/10.1287/orsc.1070.0286

Kane, G. C., & Alavi, M. (2007). Information technology and organizational learning: An investigation of exploration and exploitation processes. Organization Science, 18(5), 796-812.

Kim, L., & Nelson, R. (2000). *Technology, learning, and innovation: Experiences of newly industrializing economies*. https://www.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=fsxXIR0aj2wC&oi=fnd&pg=PR7&dq=+(Kim+%26+Nelson,+2000).&ots=3idP5Jxgnt&sig=FRR2Nu8S-RTNVzvbjpBqQ9CQljw

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

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

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. *Organization Science*, *2*(1), 71–87. https://doi.org/Doi 10.1287/Orsc.2.1.71

Mocan, N., & Altindag, D. T. (2014). Education, cognition, health knowledge, and health behavior. *The European Journal of Health Economics : Health Economics in Prevention and Care*, *15*(3), 265–79. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10198-013-0473-4

Neefe, D. O. (2001). Comparing levels of organizational learning maturity of colleges and universities participating in traditional and non-traditional (academic quiality improvement project) accreditation processes. University of Wisconsin – Stout.

Nonaka, I. (1994). A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation. *Organization Science, 5*(1), 14–37. http://pubsonline.informs.org/doi/abs/10.1287/orsc.5.1.14

Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge-creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*. Oxford University Press

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

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

Rasula, J., Vuksic, Bosilj, V., & 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*, 219–238. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327027HC1203

Sánchez, J. H., Sánchez, Y. H., Collado-Ruiz, D., & Cebrián-Tarrasón, D. (2013). Knowledge creating and sharing corporate culture framework. P*rocedia - 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.

Schwartz, D. (2006). Aristotelian view of knowledge management. *Encyclopedia of Knowledge Management.* 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. http://irc.queensu.ca/sites/default/files/articles/organizational-learning-a-literature-review.pdf

Skinnarland, K. I. T., & Sharp, P. (2011). Knowledge sharing (KS), organizational learning, and competitive advantage in a Scandinavian Hotel Company. *Proceedings of the Organization Learning, Knowledge and Capabilities Conference*, (pp. 1–26).

Spady, W. G. (1994). *Outcome-based education: Critical issues and answers*. American Association of School Administrators.

Stata, R. (1989). Organizational learning: The key to management innovation. *Sloan Management Review*, 32, 1–14.

Stevens, J. (2007). Effect size and statistical power. https://pages.uoregon.edu/stevensj/workshops/slides.pdf

Suveatwatanakul, C. (2013). Effect of knowledge sharing factors on the learning organisation in tourism and hospitality. 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

Veisi, H. (2010). Organizational learning in the higher education institutions a case study of Agricultural and Natural Resourses Campus of University of Tehran). *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, *2*(1), 21–36.

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. *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