

# EXPLORING RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL LEARNING AND INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS PERFORMANCE

Akinbola Olufemi Amos<sup>1</sup>  
Alaka, Nureni Sanusi<sup>2</sup>  
Kowo Solomon Akpoviroro<sup>3</sup>

## Abstract

*International Corporations globally are seeking ways of being ahead of other competitors in the industry of operations. Companies ranging from production to service firms in globally strive harder to meet the challenges posed to them by environmental changes. Also the consulting industry is an integral part of service industry due to the sum they contribute to the growth of the economy. The study tried to situate positions whether organizational learning could serve as a strategic tool for enhancing organizational performance as regards employee commitment and organizational competitiveness. 240 copies of questionnaire were administered to selected international audit service firms considered for the study in Nigeria to get primary data that treated appropriate research questions and hypotheses were tested accordingly. The study found that opportunity for individual learning makes employees in the global firms to be committed and that organizational conditioning has significant effect on competitiveness. The study recommends that international service firms should endeavour to direct more resources to the area of organizational learning in order for them to be able to achieve better global industry relevance.*

*Keywords: Organizational Learning, Organizational Competitiveness, Commitment, Corporate Performance*

JEL CODES: M1, M12.

## 1. Introduction

The quest for industry leadership and global business continuity has put a competitive demand on business managers to come up with outstanding innovative learning platforms. Few organizations are able to remain the same for very long. The reason for this is that companies must constantly adapt to the ever changing external business environment and market situation. Most organizations strive to do things differently and better in order to differentiate their offer from those of the competitors in the minds of the customers and clients. In this way they can gain competitive advantage and so maintain the loyalty and support of their stakeholders. This is essential for growth and survival. For example, technology constantly develops; legislation changes and community interests evolve. Market dynamics change as consumer demands and expectations alter, often as the result of new fashions; new competitors come into the market; or existing competitors become more aggressive. The organization itself learns from its collective experience of success and failure and develops good practice in the management of its processes and systems.

Organizational learning can be referred to as a process of acquiring, maintaining and sharing of knowledge within an organization for the purpose adapting to the dynamic business environment. Thus, organizational learning is the application of knowledge for a purpose and learning from the process and from the outcome. For simplification sakes, organizational learning can be defined as process in which an organization involves itself in learning (i.e a learning organization). Organizational learning has emerged as one of the most outstanding concepts in strategic management. It has received increased attention from managers and practitioners alike as a means to address how firms respond to rapidly changing environments (Crossan and Guatto, 1996). Many researchers have suggested that the only sustainable competitive advantage may be an organization's ability to learn faster than its competitors (De

---

<sup>1</sup> Department of Business Administration, College of Management Sciences, Federal University of Agriculture, Abeokuta, E-mail: akinbolaoa@funaab.edu.ng

<sup>2</sup> Department of Business Administration, Lagos State University, Malete. E-mail: alaka\_jnr@yahoo.com

<sup>3</sup> Department of Business and Entrepreneurship, Kwara State University, Malete. E-mail: kowosolomon@gmail.com

Geus,1988; Slater 1995). Hence, the creation and sharing of knowledge; the continual enrichment of their intellectual capital and the development of learning capabilities rest at the core of their strategy. Therefore, they have to prepare their employees according to the changing needs of customer in the wake of changing technology and optimal use of scarce resources. They have to develop each function and employee to outperform the competitors and this requires developing and maintaining a learning culture and adaptability to change.

### **1.1 Statement of Research Problems**

Although organizational learning has become an increasingly important and popular topic in both the academic and the popular business press, the field has been troubled with conceptual ambiguity and with a dearth of practical, empirical research. These two deficiencies have limited the impact of what many believe could be a rich mine of both theoretical insights and practical interventions. According to Njugun (2009), there is a narrow conceptualization of organizational learning as it relates to strategy. Strategy research has been criticized for its overly analytical orientation, top management bias, lack of attention to action and learning, and neglect of the elements that lead to the creation of strategies. Organizational learning has therefore been disconnected from strategy because it has been viewed as an emergent trial-and-error, even random process; a learning model suggests that the acquisition and processing of information about alternatives takes place in a relatively costly process of search'; and it viewed as a more rational process within the domain of decision-making and choice.

In addition, in employer-employee relationship, trainings are mainly performed occasionally, and not connected with organizational strategy, nor do they have some strategic significance. They are mostly enforced when business problems occur or are perceived that are considered relievable or solvable by organizing a training, course or seminar for some of the employees. Employees view the training as an imposed obligation, rather than a way to maximize their potential and they do not realize that by improving their performances and innovation of their knowledge they may contribute to better business results of the organization they belong to. Unfortunately, top managers do not realize this as well. From their relationship with the employees as the employees are still treated as an expense, rather than assets worthy of investing. Lima and Filion, (2011),

Based on this, the study intends to answer if there is significant relationship between individual learning and employee's commitment and if organizational conditions have effects and organizational competitiveness? In support of these unanswered questions the following hypotheses were formulated.

**H<sub>01</sub>** There is no significant relationship between individual learning and employee's commitment.

**H<sub>02</sub>** Organizational conditions have no effects and organizational competitiveness.

## **2. Literature Review**

### **Conceptual Framework**

#### **• Nature of Learning in International Organizations**

Learning has been referred to as the way new knowledge is being created in order to improve oneself. Learning also means the process of conceiving, reflecting and acting out what has been conceived. Learning organizations develop as a result of the pressures facing modern organizations and enables them to remain competitive in the business environment. Peter Senge and his colleagues were the brain behind the concept of Learning Organization (Senge, 1994) which encourages organizations to shift to a more interconnected way of thinking. He advised that Organizations should become more like communities that employees can feel a commitment to. They will work harder for an organization they are

committed to. A learning organization is one that seeks to create its own future; that assumes learning is an ongoing and creative process for its members; and one that develops, adapts, and transforms itself in response to the needs and aspirations of people, both inside and outside itself

The concept of organizational learning is often confused with the concepts of learning organization, knowledge management and/or organizational knowledge. Distinction between organizational learning and the learning organization is explained to the extent that organizational learning refers to the study of learning processes of, within and between organizations, largely from academic point of view. On the other hand, the learning organization is considered as an entity an ideal form of organization, which has the capacity to learn effectively and hence to prosper (Tsang, 1997). Organizational learning draws much of its appeal from the presumption that organizations are capable of intelligent behavior, and that learning is a tool for intelligence, though sometimes an intriguingly unreliable one. The basic image is that organizations collect experiences, draw inferences, and encode inferences in repositories of organizational knowledge, such as formal rules and informal practices. In this view, organizations are shaped by complex learning processes which combine current experiences with lessons learned in the past.

Organizational learning includes the process of acquiring, maintaining and sharing of knowledge within an organization for the purpose adapting to the dynamic business environment. Thus, organizational learning entails the application of knowledge for a purpose and learning from the process and from the outcome. For simplification sake, organizational learning can be defined as process in which an organization involves itself in learning (i.e a learning organization). That is, organizational learning is the ‘activity and the process by which organizations eventually reach the ideal of a learning organization’. Organizational learning further extends to the ability of an organization to gain insight and understanding from local and international experience through experimentation, observation, analysis, and willingness to examine both successes and failures.

Organizational learning also assists in “the detection and correction of error” (Argyris and Schon, 1978), however organizational learning needs to go beyond detecting and correcting errors. Organizational learning can be described as a dynamic process of creation, acquisition and integration of knowledge aimed at the development of resources and capabilities that contribute to organizational performance (Ollo-Lopez and Aramendia-Muneta, 2012). Organizational learning is a very useful instrument used for gaining and sustaining competitive advantage. Organizational learning is the effective way of making use of past experience and adapting to environmental changes.

#### **• Step involved in Organizational Learning**

According to Skervaj and Dimovski (2006), Organizational learning is a sequence of three phases: information acquisition, information interpretation and behavioural and cognitive changes.

##### **i. Information Acquisition:**

This is the process by which firms actively seek out and gather useable information (Kohli and Jaworski, 1990). Information can be acquired from three distinct sources (Slater and Narver, 1995). First, organizations can acquire information through direct experience. These experiences can have either an internal focus (e.g., process improvement) or an external focus (e.g., primary market research). Second, firms can gather information based on the experience of others. For example, Kohli and Jaworski (1990) suggest that informal discussions with customers are often fruitful in terms of supplying new market intelligence. Third, information can be acquired from the organization’s own memory mechanisms. Although as a fundamental outcome of organizational learning, memory also serves as a warehouse for information within the firm. In fact to a large extent, the contents of a firm’s

memory play a significant role in the type of market information that is acquired and how it is interpreted (Moorman and Miner, 1997). The purpose of information acquisition is to limit uncertainties (Daft and Lengel, 1986).

#### **ii. Information Interpretation:**

Organization that has only acquired information is not involved in learning; it must ensure that the information acquired is well understood by the persons who will be making use of the information. This will involve the process of communication and the use of the right terms and right language in which information can easily flow within the organization.

#### **iii. Behavioural and Cognitive changes:**

Organizational learning reflects in 'accompanying changes' (Garvin, 1993). If no behavioural or cognitive changes occur, organizational learning has in fact not occurred and the only thing that remains unused is potential for improvements (Fiol and Lyles, 1985; Garvin, 1993). When discussing cognitive changes two levels of learning can be observed. Lower-level learning reflects changes within organizational structure, which are short-term and only partially influence organization. Higher-level learning reflects changes in general rules and norms (Fiol and Lyles, 1985). In essence, organizations stressing learning must first acquire information, interpret it to fully understand its meaning and transform it into knowledge. At the same time, they must not forget the most important part – to implement behavioural and cognitive changes – in order to convert words into action.

#### **iv. Information Quality:**

It is not enough for organizations to acquire and interpret information; the quality of information acquired is also very important for enhancing the quality of decisions and services of an organization. This is a measurable variable for organizational learning in recent research. Eppler (2003) pointed that information quality is important in terms of reducing information overload focusing towards comprehensive, accurate, clear, applicable, concise, consistent, correct, easily accessible information with possibility for users to self-adjust format and content of reports.

### **Types of Learning**

Argyris and Schon (1978) proposed three major types of learning:

#### **i. Single Loop Learning**

This error involves detecting and correcting errors (i.e performance gaps) enabling organizations to act upon present policies and objectives. Here, outcomes are measures against organizational norms and expectations. It is appropriate for the routine and repetitive jobs because it helps get everyday job done

#### **ii. Double Loop Learning**

This Learning occurs when the organization is willing to question long-held assumptions about its mission, customers, capabilities, or strategies.

#### **iii. Deutero Learning**

This type of learning is concern with how single loop and double loop learning are carried out. Deutero-learning is a proactive learning processes where there is a continuous effort to strive for perfection.

### **• Characteristic of Organizational Learning**

According to Peter Senge, a learning organization exhibits five main characteristics: systems thinking, personal mastery, mental models, a shared vision, and team learning.

- i. System thinking:** This simply signifies that organizational learning should be viewed from a wholistic angle. That is, putting into consideration all the departments, processes and activities carried out within an organization. Learning should be focused on just one aspect of a firm but it should encompass the whole system.

- ii. **Personal mastery:** this refers to the commitment of an individual in the process of learning. Organizations learn only through individuals who learn. Individual learning does not guarantee organizational learning. But without it no organizational learning occurs' (Senge 1990). That is, there is no way organizational learning can take place without the involvement of individual because it is the individual that makes the whole. Personal mastery can also be a competitive advantage for a firm whose workforce can learn more quickly than the workforce of other organizations. Individual learning is acquired through staff training and development; however, learning cannot be forced upon an individual who is not receptive to learning.
- iii. **Mental models:** These are 'deeply ingrained assumptions, generalizations, or even pictures and images that influence how we understand the world and how we take action' (Senge 1990). This has to do with unlearning certain things that one have been accustomed to from individual culture, beliefs, values and norms and then embracing new skills and developing new orientations. In creating a learning environment it is important to replace confrontational attitudes with an open culture that promotes inquiry and trust. To achieve this, the learning organization needs mechanisms for locating and assessing organizational theories of action. Unwanted values need to be discarded in a process called 'unlearning'.
- iv. **Shared vision:** Visions built should be the one that is accepted by everyone in the organization and also common to individual visions. The development of a shared vision is important in motivating the staff to learn, as it creates a common identity that provides focus and energy for learning. The most successful visions build on the individual visions of the employees at all levels of the organization, thus the creation of a shared vision can be hindered by traditional structures where the company vision is imposed from above. Therefore, learning organizations tend to have flat, decentralized organizational structures.
- v. **Team learning:** This is when several individuals are involved in learning together as a group. This brings forth good result for the organization and members will grow more rapidly than going through the learning process alone. This is built on personal mastery and shared vision but requires individuals to engage in dialogue and discussion; therefore team members must develop open communication, shared meaning, and shared understanding.

- **Organizational Learning Processes**

As summarized by Argyris and Schon (1978), Organizational Learning Processes are discovery, invention, production, and generalization. Sydner (2006) also agrees that successful learning occurs when organizations engage in all four processes, that is, they discover errors or dissonance between their desired state and their current state; diagnose the causes of gaps and invent appropriate solutions to alleviate them; produce the solutions through organizational actions; and draw conclusions about the effects of the solutions as well as generalizing the learning to other relevant situations. Garvin et al., (2008) also identified that learning processes includes the generation, collection, interpretation, and dissemination of information and experimenting with new ideas. Based on this contribution, Snyder (2006) says that knowledge must be shared in systematic and clearly defined ways among individuals, groups or whole organizations and can move laterally or vertically within a firm. The knowledge sharing process can be internally focused toward taking corrective action, and externally oriented by interacting with subject-matter consultants, customers. Together, these processes ensure that essential information moves quickly and efficiently into the hands and heads of those who need it.

### • **Individual Learning to Employee's Commitment**

**Individual learning** is the ability of individuals to pursue self-development. It requires individuals take personal responsibility for their own learning and development through a process of assessment, reflection, and action. Individual learning helps the employee continually update skills and remain marketable in the workplace. Commitment according to Jaw and Liu (2004) is not only a human relation concept but also involves generating human energy and activating human mind. Employee's commitment is represented as an affective commitment of an individual to the organization. There are three component of commitment according to Allen and Meyer (1993): affective, continuous and normative commitment. High commitment work practice according to Guest, Michie, Conway and Sheehan (2003) is an approach to managing employees, which emphasizes is on the need to develop organizational commitment amongst employees based on the assumption that it will lead to positive outcomes such as low labour turn over, absenteeism, better motivation and improved performance.

### • **Organizational Performance and Organizational Competitiveness**

Organizational performance is defined in terms of quality, productivity, profitability, organizational competitiveness, and employee commitment indicators. Pemberton and Stonehouse (2000) pointed out that, organizations develop new knowledge and core competencies in order to gain competitive advantage through organizational learning. One of the reasons behind this research work is to test if organizational learning actually improves organizational performance through competitive advantage. Competitive advantages that are inimitable ought to be characterized with complexity. Complexity in this sense means that it must have a lot of resources or parts contributing towards it. Complexity results from the interrelationship between skills, and between skills and assets. Complexity arises from core competencies which entails ambiguity and results in a barrier to imitation. For an organization to be successful in sustaining a competitive advantage, it must be able to match its strength and key success factors (KSF) which are industry specific. Organizations with high ratings of KSF outperform competitors. Garvin et al. (2008) also found that organizational condition is strongly influenced by the behavior of leaders which makes the organization competitive. People feel encouraged to learn when leaders provide opportunities to speak and facilitate the promulgation of 'dialogue and debate'. This is the job of leaders to consider different viewpoints to feel employees encouraged present new ideas and options.

## **2.2 Theoretical Framework**

The following theories are related to the concept of organizational learning which refers to a dynamic process of creation, acquisition and integration of knowledge aimed at the development of resources and capabilities that contribute to organizational performance. The theories include:

### **2.2.1 Complexity theory**

Darwin, Johnson, and McCauley (2002) provide a convincing survey of the emergence of complexity theory within the organisation behaviour literature. Capra (1996) traces the emergence of the concept of self-organization from the early years of 'cybernetics'. Darwin, Johnson and McCauley (2002) also note that the interest in within management studies has derived from the attempt to understand problems relating to planning systems which appear not to predict the future when we look at the weather forecasts, for example, certainly those beyond the hours of duration. Fraher (2005) seek to show how organizations adapt not by valuing consensus above all but rather by stimulating innovation through processes emphasizing tension, conflict, contention and debate. Emery (2004) goes well beyond this position in presenting an analysis of open systems theory-based action research as an enabler of learning and change. Emery's starting point is that learning is essential to sustainable change. Second she

argues that to achieve sustainable change practitioner must work with people at all levels of organisation involved; from senior executives to customer-facing staff. Moreover all levels and functional areas must be involved in some sort of process in which they can engage with this learning. This creates problems for some practitioners who may, for example, be members of an 'elite' with their own 'language', frameworks and meaning systems. In reality it can be hard work to operate collaboratively, at least in the perception of the often thousands of employee involved and impacted by a set of intended changes, whatever the intentions of those involved. For sustainable change to be achieved every step of the process must lead to learning which engages and energizes action but people learn at different rates and through different learning styles. Also, and inevitably, people positioned differently in any large organization have very different opportunities depending on many factors.

### **2.2.2 Leavitt Organizational Change Theory**

Leavitt's model is useful to describe and explain organizational resistance. An organization's elements, according to Leavitt (1965), include its structure, its technology, its people and its tasks. A change in one element may result in changes in the others. For example, changing the technology by introducing IT may generate change in other elements of the organization. Similarly, change in the basic tasks performed by an organization is almost inevitably accompanied by a change in technology, that is, modifications in the way in which tasks are accomplished. Managers may bring IT into a unit to facilitate change in a particular task by changing the method of performing the task: to make the task easier to complete, to enhance accuracy, to achieve better access to information, and/or to obtain greater control over the task. These changes may require modifications in other elements of the organization such as the people performing the task. Employees may require training to learn the new method, they may ask for changes in their job titles to reflect their changed duties, which, in turn, impact the organization's structure. In general, the ultimate way to reduce resistance is to change all the elements simultaneously. Organizational resistance causes many system failures. There is a need to "unfreeze" organizations before implementing a new system (Keen, 1981; Kolb and Frohman, 1970). Elements of the organization must adjust in order to benefit from introducing new systems. For example, workers' attitudes and values may have to change accordingly. Top level commitment may also be a key for managing the social adjustment that accompanies the change in the organization.

## **2.4 Empirical Framework**

Yalabik, Chen, Lawler and Kim (2008), came about four key lessons learned and three biggest causes of failure which he got from his work, whose objectives is to provide real-life lessons from the experiences of project teams recently or currently involved in business process re-engineering projects. The three main reasons for the astonishing high 70% failure rate of all business change initiatives. The gap between the strategic vision and a successful programme implementation and the lack of a practical change management model and tools to bridge that gap, the "hidden and built in resistance of change" of organization cultures, and the lack of processes and change management methodologies to address this, several academic researches on human resource management practices suggested that high commitment human resource practices will increase organizational effectiveness by creating a condition whereby employees become highly motivated and involved in the organizational activities aimed at achieving organizational goals (Boxall, Macky and Rasmussen 2009).

Findings by Opoku and Fortune (2011) revealed that change-efficiency can improve greatly when management realise that "people do not resist their own ideas" open information sharing, teams and networks, knock power hierarchies flat when it comes to rigid innovation and change. By looking at how things change in nature, the authors observed that major changes in the environment can precipitate a ubiquitous process of transformation. Essentially

the system moves away from efficient control and refinement and disintegrates into creative chaos. As all the various dormant mutations and experiments begin to assert themselves in the evolutionary school, many fail, but a few of them ‘fit’ successfully and may reproduce. Thus, they move through a transformational phase, back into a higher level of control. Watching the system as a whole, it appears to move through four distinct cyclical phases, which run as a response to events shifting in the environment, or the “change field” self-organising perturbations occur spontaneously, old ways disintegrate. The system then moves into a creative, “free for all” state of chaos, eventually new people, groups, ideas, and for actions emerge, cluster and maybe resonate, time, energy, resources and management can now be applied to enable the new systems to synergise and develop. Profits occur as higher order control and efficiency rule temporarily. Then depending on the stability of the environment, or market competition, it all starts over again as a continuous cycle of change.

### 3. Methodology

The first phase of the research examined existing literature on organizational learning and how it enhances organizational performance. The study adopted survey method with the aid of questionnaire to get data from respondents which is basically the employees of two leading international firms among the top four audit firms in Nigeria. The purpose of the survey was to get primary data. The motive to use questionnaire is the ability to reach a large target group in a practical and efficient way. A pilot study was also be used to test the quality, clarity, time scale and bias of the questionnaire as pointed by Naoum (2002).

Due to difficulty in studying the whole population, the researcher considered simple random sampling technique in which each individual of the population has the equal chance or probability of selection of the individuals for constituting a sample as to get firsthand information from the respondents; to this end a total of two hundred and forty (240) questionnaires were distributed to represent the entirety of the service firms population. The reliability test of the instrument was conducted using test re-test reliability approach which yielded  $r = 0.81$  and internal consistency was measured by Cronbach Alpha of 0.854. See the distribution table below:

**Table: 1                      Distribution of respondents and response rate**

<b>Respondents Occupation</b>	<b>Questionnaire administered (sampled)</b>	<b>Percentage of total response (%)</b>
Partner	16	7.5
Senior Manager	24	11.2
Manager	14	6.5
Senior	73	34.1
Audit Assistant	87	40.7
Total	214	100.0
<b>Gender/Category</b>	<b>Questionnaire administered (sampled)</b>	<b>Percentage of total response (%)</b>
Male	121	56.5
Female	93	43.5
No of Returned	214	89
No of Not Returned	26	11
Total no of Questionnaires	240	100

Source : Field Survey 2017



#### 4. Data analysis and Hypothesis Testing

**Table 2: The Descriptive statistics of Organizational Learning and Corporate Performance**

Responses	Total (N)	Mean
<b>Individual Learning and Organizational Condition</b>		
The investment of our organization in individual learning has encouraged employees' loyalty to the organization.	214	4.46
Employees' Personal development plans are encouraged by the firm.	214	3.84
Employees are sometimes compensated when they engage in individual learning that would benefit the organization.	214	3.57
The organization ensures that employees are carried along on the current issues of the firm.	214	3.89
The company ensures environment is conducive for employees to operate efficiently.	214	3.86
<b>Corporate Performance</b>		
<b>Level of Employee Commitment and Organizational Competitiveness</b>		
Employees are committed to the goals of the organization through continuous learning.	214	3.78
Employees are motivated to be committed to the organization because of the organization's culture of learning.	214	3.47
The opportunity for continuous training in the organization has reduced employees' turnover.	214	3.58
The condition of our organization has enhanced the competitiveness of our organization.	214	3.73
The learning environment of our organization is conducive for industry competition.	214	3.55

Source : Field Survey 2017

#### Hypothesis One

Ho<sub>1</sub> There is no significant relationship between individual learning and employee's commitment.

Correlations			
		INDIV LEARNING	EMPLOYEE COMMITMENT
INDIVLEARNING	Pearson Correlation	1	1.000(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	214	214
EMPLOYEECOMMITMENT	Pearson Correlation	1.000(**)	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	214	214

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

#### Coefficient of Determination (C.O.D)

The coefficient of determination is obtained using the formula  $C.O.D = r^2 \times 100\%$

Where r=Pearson Correlation

Thus;

$$C.O.D = (1.000)^2 \times 100\%$$

$$C.O.D = 1 \times 100\%$$

$$C.O.D = 100\%$$

#### Interpretation of results

The Pearson correlation of  $r=1.000$  therefore implies 100% shared variance between individual learning and employee's commitment. The relationship between the variables (individual learning and employee's commitment) was investigated using Pearson correlation coefficient. The results from the table above show that there is a significant correlation of (1.000) between both variables at a 0.0001 level of significance

Thus, as obtained from the table  $\{r=1.000, p<0.0001, n=214\}$

### Decision

Haven found out that there is a significant relationship between individual learning and employee's commitment., we therefore reject the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ), and accept the alternative hypothesis ( $H_1$ ).

### Hypothesis Two

Ho<sub>2</sub> Organizational conditions have no significant effects on organizational competitiveness.

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.817(a)	.667	.666	.42301

a Predictors: (Constant), ORGCONDITION

This table above is the model summary. It shows how much of the variance in the dependent variable (organizational competitiveness) is explained by the model (organizational competitiveness). In this case the R square value is .667. Expressed by a percentage, this means that our model explains 66.7% of the variance in the dependent variable of organizational competitiveness. The adjusted R square shows .666, while the error of estimate indicates .42301 which signifies the error term that was not captured in the model.

ANOVA(b)						
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	76.152	1	76.152	425.580	.000(a)
	Residual	37.935	212	.179		
	Total	114.086	213			

a Predictors: (Constant), ORGCONDITION

b Dependent Variable: ORGCOMPETITIVENESS

### Decision

This table shows the assessment of the statistical significance of the result. The ANOVA table tests the null hypothesis to determine if it is statistically significant. From the results, the model in this table is statistically significant (Sig =.0001) and hence the null hypothesis should be rejected.

Coefficients(a)						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta	B	Std. Error
1	(Constant)	.559	.164		3.416	.001
	ORGCONDITION	.845	.041	.817	20.630	.000

a Dependent Variable: ORGCOMPETITIVENESS

This table also shows which if the variables included in the model contributed to the prediction of the dependent variable. This study is interested in comparing the contribution of the independent variable; therefore beta values are used. In this table, the beta co-efficient of the independent variable is .845. This means that change in organizational condition contributes strongly to explaining the dependent variable which is organizational competitiveness.

### Discussion on Findings

The result of hypothesis one which confirms that there is a significant relationship between individual learning and employee's commitment is tangential to the findings of Boxall & Macky, 2009) suggested that high commitment human resource practices will

increase organizational effectiveness by creating a condition whereby employees become highly motivated and involved in the organizational activities aimed at achieving organizational goals thereby developing themselves individually alongside.

The result of hypothesis two further proved that Organizational conditions have significant effects on organizational competitiveness which is similar to the research of Garvin et al. (2008) who found that that organizational condition is strongly influenced by the behavior of leaders which makes the organization competitive. People feel encouraged to learn when leaders provide opportunities to speak and facilitate the promulgation of 'dialogue and debate in an organization'. This is the job of leaders to consider different viewpoints to feel employees encouraged present new ideas and options, this further pointed that Nigeria findings as regards organizational conditioning of corporations is similar to past findings. Therefore poor organizational conditioning has the tendency to make a business not to be competitive in the current dynamic business world.

It can be abridged and construed from this study that the following applies to the Nigerian business terrain:

- i. Since it has been discovered that there is a significant relationship between individual learning and employee's commitment. Organizational learning scholars posit that compatibility with the environment is an essential condition for organizations to remain competitive and innovative, a state that is vital to their long-term development and survival. This need for compatibility is a basic premise in strategic management and according to Fiol and Lyles (1985), the need for compatibility means that organizations should regard the ability to learn, unlearn and relearn from past, present and potential future behaviour.
- ii. Also, competitive advantage can be viewed as the relative advantage a firm gains on one particular resource (such as profitability or market share) by virtue of its ability to capitalize on other resources" (Smith et al., 1997).
- iii. Moreover, Collis and Montgomery, (1995) pointed Sustainable competitive advantage is the ability to offer superior customer value on an enduring or consistent basis, a situation in which competitors are unable to easily imitate the firm's capacity for value creation. Competitive advantage can result from the possession of internal competencies such as learning capabilities, and other resources that is used to achieve competitive advantage.

### **Conclusion and Recommendations**

The success of organizations today depends on their ability to understand the business environment in which they are operating. Businesses all over the world go as far as possible to acquire equipments and products that they perceive would aid their business transactions and performance. This study provides information for organizations to know the essence of organization learning for certain business functions so that result can be achieved with less stress. The is also poised to assist new entrants into the industry to know the inherent value of organizational learning and outsource such activity where they cannot handle all services alone but delegate part of business responsibilities to another party via building and sustaining business relationships that is poised to make business process to be easy. It will also be an opportunity for learning and training organizations to venture into the areas in which the needs of service industry would be met.

Based on the findings of this research work, the following recommendations are given here below

- i. Findings in this study have showed that there is a relationship between individual learning and employee's commitment. Therefore organizations must keep engaging in organization learning to get employees commitment which will indirectly enhance corporate performance.

- ii. Organizations should ensure information technology aspect of their business that they have no competence to manage should be outsource to reputable firms in order to compete efficiently in the competitive industry and affect business performance positively since it has been proven that organizational conditions have effects and organizational competitiveness.
- iii. Finally consulting or international audit service firms as well as other kind of organizations should involve in extensive employee empowerment through trainings to encourage sustenance of organizational growth in the competitive business environment.

### **References:**

- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1993). Organizational commitment: Evidence of career stage effects? *Journal of Business Research*, 26, 49-61.
- Argyris, C. Schön, D.A. (1996): *Organizational Learning II: Theory, Method and Practice*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.
- Boxall, P., Macky, K. and Rasmussen, E. (2003). 'Labour turnover and retention in New Zealand: the causes and consequences of leaving and staying with employers'. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 41: 195-214.
- Capra, F., 1996. *The Web of Life*. New York, NY, Anchor Books.
- Collis, David J., and Cynthia A. Montgomery. 1995. "Competing on resources: Strategy in the 1990s." *Harvard Business Review*, 73 (July-August): 118-128.
- Crossan M, Guatto T. 1996. Organizational learning research profile. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 9, 1, 107-112.
- Daft, R. L., Lengel, R. H. (1986), "Organizational information requirement media richness and structural design", *Management Science*, Vol. 32, No. 5, pp. 554-571.
- Darwin, J., Johnson, P., McAuley, J. (2002). *Developing strategies for change*. London: Financial times. Prentice Hall
- David A. Kolb and Alan L. Frohman, (1970) "An Organization Development Approach to Consulting," *Sloan Management Review*, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 51-65.
- DeGeus, A. (1988). Planning as learning. *Harvard Business Review*, March-April: 70-74.
- Emery M (2004) Open systems theory. In: Boonstra JJ (ed) *Dynamics of organizational change and learning*. Wiley, Chichester, UK, pp 43-69
- Fiol, M. C., Lyles, M. (1985). "Organizational Learning". *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 803-813.
- Fraher, A. L. 2005. 'Team Resource Management (TRM): A Tavistock Approach to Leadership in High-Risk Environments.' *Organisational and Social Dynamics*, 5(2): 163-182.
- Garvin, D., Edmondson, Amy C., Gino, Francesca (2008). Is Yours a Learning Organization. *Harvard Business Review*, March. 109-116.
- Guest, D.E., Michie, J., Conway, N., and Sheehan, M. (2003). Human Resource Management and Corporate Performance in the UK. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 41 (2): 291-314.
- Jaw, B., and Liu, W. (2004). Promoting Organisational Learning and Self Renewal in Taiwanese Companies: The Role of HRM. *Human Resource Management*, 42 (3), 223 -241.
- Keen, P. (1981). Information systems and organizational change. *Communications of the ACM*, 24, 24-33.
- Kohli AK, Jaworski BJ. 1990. Market orientation: the construct, research propositions, and managerial implications. *Journal of Marketing* 54(April): 1-18.
- Leavitt, H. J. (1965). Applied organizational change in industry: structural, technical and humanistic approaches, in March, J. G. (ed.), *Handbook of Organizations*, 1144-1170.

Lima, E. and Filion, L.J. (2011), "Organizational Learning in SMEs' Strategic Management: A Descriptive and Systemic Approach", *A Presentation at International Council Small Business, Stockholm, Sweden*

Moorman C, Miner AS. 1997. The impact of organizational memory on new product performance and creativity. *Journal of Marketing Research* 34(February), pp 91–106.

Naoum, S. G. (2002), "Dissertation Research and Writing for construction students", Oxford: Butterworth Heinemann.

Njugun, J. (2009), "Strategic Positioning For Sustainable Competitive Advantage: An Organizational Learning Approach", *KCA Journal of Business Management*, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 32-43.

Olló-López, A. and Aramendia-Muneta, M. E. (2012), 'ICT impact on competitiveness, innovation and environment,' *Telematics and Informatics*, 29(2), 204-210.

Opoku, A. and Fortune, C. (2011), "Organizational Learning and Sustainability in the Construction Industry", *The Built & Human Environment Review*, Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 98-107.

Pemberton JD and Stonehouse GH. 2000. Organizational learning and knowledge assets-an essential partnership. *The Learning Organization* 7 (4): 184-193. Penrose ET. 1959. *The Theory of the Growth of the Firm*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.

Senge, P. M. (1990). *The Fifth Discipline: The Art & Practice of the Learning Organization*. New York Doubleday

Slater S.F, Narver J.C. 1995. Market orientation and the learning organization. *Journal of Marketing* 59(July): 63–74.

Skerlavaj, M., Dimovski, V. (2006), "Influence of organizational learning on organizational performance from the employee perspective: The Case of Slovenia", *Management*, Vol. 11, No. 1, pp. 75-90.

Smith, K. G., Grimm, C., Young, G. & Wally, S. 1997. Strategic groups and rivalrous firm behavior. *Towards a reconciliation. Strategic Management Journal* 18: 149-157.

Snyder, W. M. (1996), "Organization Learning and Performance: An Exploration of the Linkages between Organization Learning, Knowledge, and Performance", A PhD Thesis submitted to the Department of Business Administration, University of Southern California.

Tsang, E.W.K. (1997). Organizational Learning and the Learning Organization – A Dichotomy between Descriptive and Prescriptive Research, *Human Relations*, 50, 1, pp. 73-89

Yalabik, Z.Y., Chen, S.J., Lawler, J. and Kim, K. (2008), 'High-performance work system and organizational turnover in east and southeast Asian countries', *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society*, Vol. 47, No. 1, pp. 145–52, available online at <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com>.