CHAPTER TWO

SURVEY OF LITERATURE
In this study survey of literature had concentrated on the following parameter of issues:

i  **Major Components of Learning Organization.**

ii  **Organizational Variables (Organizational Climate and Team Cohesiveness) and Learning Organization Dimensions.**

iii  **Personal Variables (Innovative Work Behaviour, Learning Behaviour Styles and Commitment) and Learning Organization Dimension.**

iv  **Approaches for measurement of Learning Organization Dimensions.**

Accordingly, the relevant facts of theoretical assumptions, empirical findings, etc have been presented in the following section;

**2.1 Major Components of Learning Organization.**

Major components of learning organization for the present study were considered on the basis of the following empirical study:

_Bhatnagar, (2006)_ conducted a research to measure Organizational Learning Capability (OLC) perception in the managers of public, private and multinational organizations and establish the link between OLC and firm performance. The data were collected from a sample of 612 managers randomly drawn from Indian industry, using a questionnaire survey. Organizational capability perception for the managers of the IT sector and of multinational firms was the highest, while it was lowest for the engineering sector. Mixed results were found for the market indicators of firm performance, where _financial turnover was predicting organizational learning capability._
McCracken et al (2006), conducted research on barriers to learning amongst life assurance managers in Scotland has identified intrinsic and extrinsic factors affecting participation. The managers play a key role in widening participation of low-skilled and excluded groups in learning at work could potentially be damaging because of poorly qualified managers. They also suggest a need for renewed efforts to ensure that management development remains a priority and that appropriate support is provided for learning at work.

Raper et al (2006), took a critical look at the concept of the 'learning organization'. Investigating eight companies like, Bank A, Bank B, Textiles A, Textiles B, Distribution A, Distribution B, Retail A, Retail B in particular, they drew upon new research which helps to clarify some of the fine detail of current organizational practices with regard to skill formation. It is found that there are in fact some features of contemporary organizational practices which do accord with the concept of the learning organization but that, in the main, the abstract and aspirational character of the concept renders organizations a poor guide to understanding the dilemmas and activities of real organizations, and that on balance, the concept is more of a hindrance than a help.

Blackman, & Henderson, (2005), used Shrivastava’s (1983) typology which outlines four perspectives of organizational learning: adaptation; developing knowledge of action-outcome relationships; assumption sharing; and institutionalized experience. In their study, it was held that a transformational learning organization could be clearly distinguished from non-learning organizations. Case studies were developed for two organizations considering them to be learning organizations (Company 2 and Company 4) and two that did not (Company 1 and Company 3). The results showed that in order to achieve a certain goal most knowledge is action-oriented and incrementally developed. Certain events lead to a perceived need for certain behaviours and the organizational procedures and policies will encourage actions.

Di'ez et al (2005), principally aimed to discover what perception Spanish managers have of the organizational contexts in which they work and, in particular, in what way they consider that these conform to the characteristics of a continuously learning organization. Data were collected in accordance with the questionnaire of Pedler.
Organizational environments in what used to be state monopolies do not yet conform to the conditions that define a continuously learning organization. The greatest number of individual differences with respect to the perception of whether the organization is a learning organization is concentrated in individual variables such as age and professional level, real situation, in order to gain the capacity to understand what is occurring.

Khandekar and Sharma (2005), intended to analyze the role of organizational learning and strategic human resource management (HRM) in sustainable competitive advantage. The empirical research was done on a random sample of 300 line or human resource (HR) managers from nine Indian and foreign global organizations, chosen purposefully from New Delhi. The study reveals that there is a positive relationship between organizational learning, strategic HRM and sustainable competitive advantage. The study recommends that work-based learning strategies and HR interventions involving people can help in developing strategic capabilities for sustainable competitive advantage.

Hailey and James (2002), attempted to answer such questions as: why is learning seen as so important for NGOs? How do successful NGOs actually learn? And what role do key individuals or leaders play in this process? The study conducted of South Asian NGOs, which suggests that an NGO's ability to learn is dependent on its organizational culture and in particular the development of an internal learning culture. The creation of the 'learning culture' derives primarily from the attitude of the leadership towards learning: at the heart of a learning organization is a 'learning leader' and staffed by learning people.

Padaki (2002), considered the learning organization (LO) is both a concept and a particular methodology within the larger domain of organizational development (OD). Through the action-research paradigm to non-profit development NGOs at South India researcher tried to find out the key features of learning organization. He found that to fully appreciate the premises of LO, it is necessary to fall back on the main premises of OD, beginning with the view of the organization as an open system. Many of the established concepts of systems science as applied to organizational systems-such as system robustness, system intelligence, and system proactivity have a
direct bearing on the capacity for continuous learning in the organization. Moving on from concepts to action, an organization needs a set of working practices to acquire the characteristics of a learning organization. One particularly useful 'gateway' for the LO process is a comprehensive performance management system that compels the organization's membership to re-examine ideas of performance and the assumptions about organizational processes underlying management practices.

Clarke (2004), investigated the organizational influences on the assessment of learning, obtained from a national survey of specialized healthcare organizations (hospices) in the UK. Of those completing questionnaire, 37.5 per cent (45) were nursing directors, 27.5 per cent (33) were chief executives, 4.2 per cent (5) were medical directors, 10 per cent (12) were HR personnel and 21 per cent (25) categorized themselves as other (such as education/training specialists). Twelve per cent (14) were male and 88 per cent (105) were female. The mean age of respondents was 47 (SD 8.36). Empirical findings are confirmed the importance of providing opportunities for developing individuals as being related to better organizational development. Findings suggesting that different aspects of an organization's training and development system are likely to differentially determine the extent to which either formal or informal learning is assessed.

Smith, (2003), reviewed the conceptualizations of workplace learning and its cognitive bases. The evidence available from workplace-based research indicates that learners prefer to learn within a socially constructed context like a learning organization and are not typically either self-directed or independent. A general preference for learning within a structured environment where the structure of the training program is clear to the learner is also indicated. Workplace expertness develops through a range of learning activities, including practice, demonstration, and mentoring by expert others. Workplaces often are not able to provide learners with the structured support and guidance required to develop knowledge through the effective deployment of a wide range of learning strategies within a community of practice. Training structures and policies need to be supportive of learning in the workplace, and training personnel need to be skilled in developing learner self-directedness. Self-directedness in learners not only involves an ability to identify their own learning
goals and pursue them independently but also requires skills in effectively engaging the assistance of others within a socially constructed community of practice.

Rampersad, (2002), introduced a knowledge management audit, at Business Jet consisting of 50 statements regarding organization's knowledge and learning orientation, divided in the dimensions: general, leadership style, strategic vision, internal processes and human resources. It is recommended, based on this checklist, to judge the orientation in relation to organizational knowledge and learning and to check as a team why this is characteristic for your organization and where maximum score was 200. The total score seemed to be 138 points; this implies that, in the area of knowledge management, insight is also needed in the present knowledge & learning situation in order to increase organizational learning ability.

Griego et al (2000), were administered The Learning Organization Profile (Marquardt, 1996) and subsystems of the Learning Organization Practices Profile (O'Brien, 1994) to 48 working professionals those were randomly selected from a population of approximately 150 in a Human Resource Development Master's Degree program to take both instruments. Of the 48, 27 were female, 21 were male those were working professionals with diverse occupations. Participants held a wide variety of positions including human resource specialist, training managers, hospital administrator, educator, civil service manager, flight controller, military officers, and so forth. The independent variables, training and education, rewards and recognition, information flow, vision and strategy, and individual team development were assessed using the Learning Organization Practices Profile (O'Brien, 1994). The dependent variable was assessed using Marquardt's (1996) Learning Organization Profile listed in his text Building the Learning Organization. The profile has five subsystems. They include Learning dynamics: individual, group/team, and organizational; Organization transformation: vision, culture, strategy, and structure; People empowerment: employee, manager, customer, alliances, partners, and community; Knowledge management: acquisition, creation, storage/retrieval, and transfer/utilization; and Technology application: information systems, technology based learning, and electronic performance support systems. It was found that appropriate rewards and recognition are an under girding structure to the learning organization and that an environment of knowledge sharing and learning systems is an indication of a
**learning organization.** Results support the notion that interventions intended to aid in the metamorphose from a current organization state to that of a learning organization may wish to focus initially on these aspects.

**Lars (1998),** used the theories of Senge and Argyris and Schön in analyzing an attempt to develop a learning organization in a Swedish manufacturer of tools. Two surveys were carried out in a tools firm, with about 200 employees, located in Sweden. In the first survey white-collar workers and managers in the firm were interviewed about different ways of problem solving, and dilemmas experienced by employees. The second interview concerned operators in a product shop were semi structured with the support of an interview guide. The survey was followed by observation in different meeting and two product workshops. Here, the organizational learning theory used puts emphasis on the individual in the flow-group. Barriers to learning have been found because an individual’s mental models and metaphors are not consistent with management’s. *When, the ideology of organizational learning is not followed by values and norms for behaviour supporting the new ideology then barriers to learning occur.* Barriers to learning have been traced to dilemmas caused by the individual and the flow group, the organizational structure and managerial actions.

**McAdam, et al, (1998),** investigated the possibility of combining the fields of organizational learning and total quality to produce combined concepts, methodologies, tools and techniques, which will give increased business benefits and employee emancipation. To focus the study the field of organizational learning is primarily limited to that of the learning organization and total quality is taken as an umbrella term for a range of mechanistic change initiatives. A critical review of the definitions, historical contexts through the lens of critical theory reveals the underlying mechanistic organizational assumptions of total quality and the more organism or people-related assumptions of the learning organization. *A conceptual case is established for fundamentally integrating both total quality and organism or people-related assumptions to form a holistic framework of learning organization from which integrated methodologies, tools and techniques can be devised.*
McHugh et al (1998), were set out the agenda for, and examined the findings from, the initial stage of a longer-term project aimed at identifying the constraints which guide what are portrayed as self managed learning initiatives leading to the creation of "learning organizations". At this stage the project has focused on qualitative research with informants and groups of practitioners in North-West UK companies which have involved themselves in learning initiatives and analyses of official discourses and data relating to the criteria inherent in appraising such initiatives. The project has examined tacit agendas in training and development and concludes that the attempts to link individual development with organizational strategy inherent in the human resource practices necessary to underwrite a learning organization can serve to restrict the possibilities of creating such an organization.

McDougall and Beattie. (1996), considered the issues that Quality circles, project teams, autonomous work groups, and self-managed teams are very much a part of organizational life in today’s competitive and constantly changing work environment. They conducted a survey of senior executives from the above mentioned categories in over 50 organizations in the UK (Coulson-Thomas and Coe, 1991), considered the issues in developing groups as a focus for learning for individuals and the organization as a whole. They identified the “very important” or “important” management qualities which will enable organizations to implement the changes needed to respond effectively to future challenges were: understanding the business environment (100 per cent); ability to communicate (98 per cent); broad perspective of organization’s goals (95 per cent); commitment to ongoing learning (92 per cent); ability to contribute to teams (91 per cent). They suggested that lessons learned from the project can be applied to help to maximize learning and performance in groups in a wide range of organizational contexts to transform an organization as learning organization.

Virany et al (1992), in a study of 59 minicomputer firms, explored the executive succession as an important mechanism for organization learning and, thus, for organization adaptation. Executive succession can fundamentally alter the knowledge, skills and interaction processes of the senior management team. These revised skills and communication processes improve the team’s ability to recognize and act on changing environmental conditions. Results indicated that succession exerts a positive
influence on organization performance. Consistently high-performing organizations are managed to sustain a relatively high level of learning (through turnover of senior executives and strategic reorientation), and at the same time to maintain links with established organizational competencies.

The ascendancy of ‘learning’ to the position it now occupies as one of the most dominant themes within the management literature is predicated on the assumption that it may well be the most significant factor contributing to organizational success (Miner and Mezias, 1996; Barrie and Pace, 1998; Easterby-Smith et al., 1998). Especially in light of predictions that knowledge will rapidly supersede capital, labour and raw materials as the dominant means of production (Stewart, 1997). To this extent those now familiar sentiments expressed in this vein seem to have reached the status of orthodoxy: the rate at which individuals and organizations learn may become the only sustainable competitive advantage, especially in knowledge-intensive industries (Stata, 1989: 64), a consensus is emerging that the hallmark of tomorrow’s organizations will be their capacity to learn (Adler and Cole, 1983: 85).

From the above mentioned approaches for measuring dimension of learning organization it can be considered, “Learning is for individuals, for the team for the whole organization, for the organization-in-its-environment: the system. Learning is continuous and lifelong: so the learning organization is the learning system” (Lynton and Pareek, 2006).

Pareek, (2002), explained that the concept of learning organization is a natural extension of organizational learning. According to him the process, by which an organization acquires, retains and uses inputs for its development, and the process results in enhanced capacity for continued self-learning and self-renewal is called Organizational Learning. There are 5 elements of Organizational Learning which are:

- It is a process, a continual series of interlinked activities producing several changes.
- One of the three main subsystems of Organizational Learning is the process of acquiring input and examining it. Examples of input are: new structures, new technology or any change introduced in the organization.
- The second subsystem is concerned with retaining the acquired input.
• The third subsystem corresponds to the stabilization phase of organizational learning, is concerned with using the new input whenever it is needed.
• Learning will result in the increased capability of an organization to learn more on its own.

Based on the survey of literature following eight components for learning organization as opined by Pareek (2002) found robust to measure the dimension of learning organization:

1. **Holistic Frame**: This includes systems thinking, mainly perceiving interconnections, connecting the organization with environment, systematic problem solving and patterns amongst key variables Critical examining beyond the immediate and the present.

2. **Strategic Thinking**: This includes thinking of consequences / implications of each other then Choosing the most important ones, key variables making the most impact, prioritizing. Reframing information at the strategic level and differentiating roles of policy, strategy and operations at all levels, inviting comments and suggestions.

3. **Shared Vision**: This includes developing and communicating vision through participation by linking the vision with members' personal goals, valuing their creativity.

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

5. **Information Flow**: This includes sharing of authentic and critical free flow of information at all levels through formal channels of communication by encouraging and monitoring internal exchange of ideas.

6. **Emotional Maturity**: This includes essence of control over most part of one's destiny, optimism, self discipline, commitment, and moderate risk taking. The main items are: clear goals, commitment belief that one can influence events and taking bold and moderate risk.
7. **Learning**: Includes several mechanism and sources which are: valuing and encouraging self development, learning from outside, creating conducive climate for learning, openness and rewarding flexibility.

8. **Synergy**: Including collaboration and team work with empathy, accepting and making commitment to consensual decisions, coordinated action, consensus building and using cross-functional teams.

### 2.2 Organizational Variables (Organizational Climate and Team Cohesiveness) and Learning Organization Dimensions.

#### 2.2.1 Organizational Climate:

Srivastava (2005), in studying post merger integration for service industry has identified *10 typical elements that contribute to a favourable climate for organizational learning*. Those are: quality of leadership, amount of trust, communication- upward and downward, feeling of useful work, responsibility, fair rewards, responsible job pressures, opportunity, reasonable controls, structures and bureaucracy, employee involvement and participation.

Kirby et al (2003), through three studies reported concerning employees' approaches to learning at work and their perceptions of the workplace environment. Based on prior research with university students, two questionnaires were devised, - the Approaches to Work Questionnaire (AWQ) and the Workplace Climate Questionnaire (WCQ). These questionnaires were administered to two different samples of employees (sample size 139 and 166 respectively), and the factor structures of the questionnaires was explored. Correlations between perception of scores indicated that the *deep approach of employees learning in organization is positively associated with good supervision and choice-independence whereas the surface-disorganized approach is negatively associated with these two constructs and positively associated*
Surface-rational is negatively correlated, though less strongly associated with choice independence.

Parker et al (2003), used meta-analytic procedures to examine the relationships between individual-level (psychological) climate perceptions and work outcomes such as employee attitudes, psychological well-being, motivation, and performance as variable of learning organization. They reviewed the literature generated 121 independent samples of learning organization in which climate perceptions were measured and analyzed at the individual level. Findings indicate that psychological climate, operationalized as individuals’ perceptions of their work environment, does have significant relationships with individuals' work attitudes, motivation, and performance. But, according to them the construct of psychological climate is little more than an umbrella term for various work environment perceptions and that to understand their effects there is need to more specific theory related to job characteristics, leadership, etc. it garners as well as the fact the psychological climate perceptions do influence important individual-level as well as organizational-level outcomes for the development of learning organization.

Murillo et al (2002), in an exploratory study argued that practices in marketing and customer relationship management have not been able to capture knowledge from customers which is a key characteristics of a learning organization, that comes from social interactions with firm’s employees. They identified that without change of organizational climate this process can not be successful.

Moxnes et al (1991), conducted a study on first line supervisor (foreman) of 25 learning companies of Norway’s third largest private industry. The aim of the study was to find influence of three management training programs for the supervisors upon organizational climate. The main objective for two of the three programme was to change the organizational climate in a direction that would facilitate learning at work. Results indicate that the most process oriented training programme did change the organizational climate, as perceived by the supervisors, but paradoxically in an apparently negative direction, especially as far as interpersonal conflicts and supervisory skills were concerned. This finding is interpreted as reflecting changes in supervisors’ perception of organizational learning climate without any necessary
The supervisors' increased awareness of organizational climate factors was, on theoretical basis, considered to facilitate learning at work, thus explaining the apparent paradox.

A large number of scales have been developed to assess the various aspects of academic and school organizational climate (Owens, 1991; Rentoul and Fraser, 1983), but unfortunately these scales were restricted to assessment of social interaction between teachers and principal, and does not enable a broader view to be taken when assessing organizational behaviour, and human resource management in academic institutions. Climate research indicates that climate varies with the context like climate for organization, climate for academic institution etc. at the same time it also means all the thoughts are related to the development of positive or conducive climate (Murillo et al 2002). Apart from that perception of climate varies with supervisor (Moxnes et al 1991), Schneider's (1975) review of the literature on organizational climate concluded with the thought that the generic concept of organizational climate is so amorphous and inclusive that the results from the measurement of climate are conceptually amorphous. To Schneider it seemed that the measures had become so multifaceted that they no longer focused on Theory X or Theory Y managerial climate (McGregor, 1960), or on the inclination for banks to hire "right types" (Argyris, 1957), or on the fit of needs to campus characteristics (Stern, 1970), or on any specific kind of climate. He proposed the idea that climate has to have a focus, a target—that climate research has to be a climate for something. The something of interest might involve issues as diverse as the climate for safety (Zohar, 1980), the climate for sexual harassment (Fitzgerald, Drasgow, Hulin, Gelfand, & Magley, 1997), the climate for well-being (Burke, Borucki, & Hurley, 1992).

Literature survey highlighted the following components of organizational learning climate:

- Communication system (Srivastava 2005)
• Attitude (Parker et al 2003, Lewin et al 1939).

As a whole there is a need to consider a gestalt views about organization climate.

2.2.2 Team Cohesiveness:

Schippers et al (2003), examined the extent to which team composition (eg diversity, outcome interdependence, longevity, etc) affected team process (i.e., reflexivity) and in turn team outcomes (i.e., satisfaction, commitment, and performance) in a learning organization. The field study was conducted among 54 work teams from 13 different organizations. Analyses showed significant interaction effects of diversity and outcome interdependence and diversity and group longevity on the reflexivity, satisfaction, and performance. Also, reflexivity was shown to mediate these relationships, indicating that the moderating effects of outcome interdependence and group longevity on the relation between diversity and team outcomes are due to the effects on process.

Edmondson’s (2002), paper considered the role of team learning in organizational learning. He proposed that a group-level perspective provides new insight into how organizational learning is impeded, hindering effective change in response to external pressures. In contrast to previous theoretical perspectives, he presented data from an exploratory study of learning processes in 12 organizational teams engaged in activities ranging from strategic planning to hands-on manufacturing of products. These qualitative data are used to investigate two components of the collective learning process-reflection to gain insight and action to produce change-and to
explore how teams allow an organization to engage in both radical and incremental learning, as needed in a changing and competitive environment. Result showed that team members' perceptions of power and interpersonal risk affect the quality of team reflection, which has implications for their team's and their organization's ability to transform into a learning organization.

King, III, (2002), with survey research in different industries concluded that being able to effectively respond in the event a crisis is relevant to an organization. He found that potential crisis management teams (CMT) whose members are heterogeneous may be more likely to generate better ideas than teams whose members are homogeneous. Prior knowledge and information before interactions, team composition, task knowledge, leadership ability, learning organizational culture are the factors which may influence decision-making effectiveness in crisis management & team effectiveness.

Taggar, (2002), studied the performance of 94 groups on 13 different open-ended tasks. At the individual-team-member level, domain knowledge and performance relevant behavioral measures, individual creativity are related in prediction of individual differences. Support was found for new "cross-level" processes, labeled "team creativity-relevant processes." At the group level, these processes ("cross-level" and "team creativity-relevant") moderated the relationship between aggregated individual creativity and group creativity for a learning organization.

Eby and Dobbins (1997), using the research on expectancy theory, self-efficacy, locus of control, and individualism-collectivism, examined collectivism as both an individual difference variable and a group composition variable. One hundred and forty-eight individuals (comprising 33 groups) working on a complex and interdependent task comprised the research sample. Results indicated that individual difference, variables of self-efficacy for teamwork, need for social approval, and positive past experience working in teams were related to self-report collectivism. Additionally, team collectivistic orientation was examined as a group composition variable and found to be related to cooperative team behaviors. In turn, these cooperative team behaviors acted as a mediator of the relationship between team collectivistic orientation and team performance for new learning.
Szulanski (1996), studied best-practice transfers in eight companies in order to better understand the internal sickness that impedes the transfer of knowledge when those organizations were going to be the learning organization. He found that, the **major barriers to internal knowledge transfer are a lack of capacity to value, assimilate and apply new knowledge; ambiguity regarding the precise reasons for the success or failure in replicating a practice in a new setting; and mainly the quality of relationship which is important criterion for team cohesiveness.**

Argyris (1993), in organizational learning research emphasized cognitive and interpersonal factors to explain effectiveness. He found that individuals' tacit beliefs about interpersonal interaction inhibit learning behavior and give rise to ineffectiveness in organizations.

Edmondson (1991) conducted a study of 51 work teams in a manufacturing company, measuring antecedent, process, and outcome variables, show that team psychological safety is associated with learning in organization, but team efficacy is not, when controlling for team psychological safety. As predicted, **learning behavior mediates between team psychological safety and team performance. The results support an integrative perspective in which both team structures, such as context support and team leader coaching, and shared beliefs shape team outcomes.**

Goodman et al, (1987), argued against focusing on interpersonal factors. According to this research, **organization and team structures explain most of the variance in team effectiveness and the employees’ learning behaviour in the organization.**

Hackman’s (1987) studies on work teams of a variety of organizational settings have shown that **team effectiveness is enabled by structural features such as a well-designed team task, appropriate team composition, and a context that ensures the availability of such components of learning organization like, information, resources, and rewards.**
Many researchers have concluded that structure and design, including equipment, materials, physical environment, and pay systems, are the most important variables for improving work-team performance in organizational learning process (Goodman, Devadas, and Hughson, 1988; Campion, Medsker, and Higgs, 1993; Cohen and Ledford, 1994).

Many team studies, have used large samples and quantitative data but have not examined antecedents and consequences of learning behavior (eg, Goodman et al, 1988; Hackman, 1990; Cohen and Ledford, 1994).

Hence the components of team effectiveness for a learning organization may be as follows:

- **Empowerment (Edmondson 2002), like role clarity, autonomy, support and accountability (Edmondson 2002, Pareek, 2002),**


- **Role of leadership (King III 2002, Edmondson 2002).**
2.3 Personal Variables (Innovative Work Behaviour, Commitment and Learning Behaviour Styles) and Learning Organization Dimensions.

2.3.1 Innovative Work Behaviour:

Meyer & Garg (2005), with the help of secondary research on the industries of Asian country, opined that the only effective response to these *supply and demand pressures is to innovate which will become an important precondition for learning organization in Indian situation.*

Greenhalgh et al (2004), studied that how innovations could spread and sustain in health service delivery organization where organizational learning is the most important factor. The United Kingdom Department of Health explicitly commissioned this work, which was carried out between October 2002 and December 2003, for its National Health Service's extensive modernization agenda (UK Department of Health 2001). Overall, they found from the empirical studies that as a tool for the change management the *successful implementing and maintaining innovations in service organizations depends on pragmatic rather than an academic perspective where process information was systematically documented as per the norm of the learning organization.*

Farmer, et al (2003), conducted a study for a sample of Taiwanese employees to U. S. Eleven Taiwanese organizations engaged in some aspect of creative work were initially contacted, and 8 agreed to allow the participation of specific work units in which creativity was required. The sample consisted primarily of engineers, software developers, research scientists, dorsors, and pharmacists. Of the 260 surveys result showed that among the employees creativity was highest when a strong creative role identity was paired with perceptions that the employing organization valued creative work. It showed that *articulation of creativity in an organization depends on some different natures of organizational culture which seems to be a learning organizational culture which encourage employee to be creative.*
Janssen (2003), established that a worker's innovative behaviour interacts with job involvement in providing conflict with co-workers who want to prevent innovative change in safeguarding the existing paradigm or who want to avoid the uncertainty and insecurity surrounding change. According to him, in turn, this interpersonal conflict hinders the innovative worker in developing or maintaining satisfactory relations with those workers. Unfortunately, the individual worker takes the risk of having to pay the price of conflict and less satisfactory relationship with the coworkers for performing innovative activities (Janssen, 2003) which creates hindrance for maintaining the components of learning organization, namely, shared vision and synergy.

Belussi et al, (2002), in their longitudinal study at Italian industry identified that the internal level of technological knowledge and firm cognitive capability are the key factors that explain the innovative performance based on firm specific competencies. This implies that the process of technological change not just as a simple shift of techniques, but as a troublesome competitive race among firms to build 'knowledge-dealing' capabilities and learning abilities.

Villiers (2002), through a selective organizational history of the British NGO Action Aid from 1998 to 2001, tried to find out initial impact of the agency's new accountability system because of the events and changes. Organizational change is born of tension and succeeds best when it aims for alignment of purpose and action and attunement of the internal and external environment. It is impossible to avoid conflict, inertia, and confusion in this process; the only option is to make use of these forces by being aware of their potential. It seems that the frustrations of this time were necessary to develop the creativity needed for significant change. If a development organization makes it possible for its staff and partners to thrive on change, then it will be, in essence, a learning organization.

Janssen (2000), based on theoretical assumption of Kanter (1988) and Scott and Bruce (1994), developed the scale (consisting of idea generation, idea promotion and idea realization) and was rated innovative work behaviour in the work place of 170 non management employees from a Dutch industrial organization and among a
sample of teachers from a secondary school in the Netherlands. Analysis indicated two facts:

1. **Inter correlation between three components of innovative behaviour were high, and viewed as combining additively to create an overall scale of innovative work behaviour.**

2. **There exists a positive correlation between job demands and innovative work behaviour when employees perceived effort-reward fairness rather than under-reward unfairness.**

Zammuto, et al (2000), in the conclusion of their study on Managerial Ideologies, Organization Culture, and the Outcomes of Innovation in learning organization, draw attention to three points:

First, managers in control-oriented organizations should think twice before adopting the "latest" management tools. **Failed implementation efforts are expensive in terms of time and financial costs as well as the personal toll they take on the individuals involved.**

Second, managerial and technological innovations promising cultural transformation should be viewed skeptically. **Such innovations can change organizations' cultures, but, as often as not, changes may be in the opposite of the hoped-for direction.**

Third, even though organizations' cultures contain many idiosyncratic elements, their **underlying ideologies share a common basis in the managerial ideologies embedded in the larger social system.**

Scott and Bruce, (1994), in a hypothetical model, viewed **individual innovative behaviour in the learning organization as the outcomes of four interacting systems — individual, leader, work group and climate for innovation.**

Psychological definitions of creativity generally contain two separate components. In the first place, creativity requires that we make or think something new, or a new combination of existing elements. This is the element of novelty or innovation. But novelty is not enough. These criteria are to some extent to be dependent upon context. To be creative, the idea must also be useful or valuable i.e. ‘fitness for purpose’. An
idea might be new to the person who conceives of it, but as soon as this idea is expressed, it becomes clear that person have got the first.

Margaret Boden (1994), distinguishes between these two levels of innovation as 'P-creativity' – that which is new to the individual – and 'H-creativity' – that which is new to the world. For an idea to be innovative in business or in art, it must deviate from the historically established norms and conventions, not just from our personal history (Bilton, 2007). So Boden’s H-creativity is the prerequisite for the competitive advantage of the organization. But the idea or innovation must be tested against its external context. So the next stage or criterion in the creative process is that our idea has value or meaning in respect to utility, intention and time. And the last, but not the least that acceptance of the innovative ideas by the organization, by the formal group members and ultimately by the team members.

Bantel and Jackson (1989), examined the relationship between the social composition of top management teams and innovation adoptions in a sample of 199 banks. The following characteristics of top management teams were examined: average age, average tenure in the firm, education level, and heterogeneity with respect to age, tenure, educational background, and functional background. In addition, the effects of bank size, location (state of operation), and team size were assessed. Results indicate that more innovative banks are managed by more educated teams who are diverse with respect to their functional areas of expertise. These relationships remain significant when organizational size, team size, and location are in control.

Baba (1989), attempted to explain why some industries succeed in maturation by formulating the generation and utilization of new technologies into a continuous process. By reference to the performance of Japanese scale-intensive industries (i.e. automobile and consumer electronics durables), the analysis provides a theoretical foundation for the proposition that a certain type of positive-sum game played among a variety of market entrants generates specific 'inter-group dynamics' (hyper-learning process). In this industrial climate the firms' inclinations towards offensive management and product-cum-process innovation has resulted in the coupling of continuous innovation and industrial evolution.
Workers' innovative ideas for change in learning organization are likely to challenge the established framework of task relationship, informal norms and expectations that co-workers have on one another. As such, innovative change implies that new sets of task, role relationship and informal norms have to be developed or adopted to the needs of the new situation (Jones, 2001). Co-workers may tend to resist those changes because of the insecurity, uncertainty and stress they may bring (Argyris, 1957; Jones, 2001; Lewin, 1951; Kanter (1988), had indicated some steps for learning organization for organizational creativity:

Innovation idea coalition Idea realization Transfer and activation generation building Innovation activation diffusion

Antonelli, (2000) showed that a large share of innovation activity derives from knowledge exchange and learning among firms. In firms, the capability of generating innovations is based on a continuous effort to absorb external knowledge and to contaminate it with internal knowledge, and to capitalize on the opportunities of learning from all open communicative channels.

Michela and Burke (2000), propounded that support for innovation is basically a shared value that innovation is good. These expectations and values may be instilled explicitly in socialization or implicitly in cultural messages. In addition, although it does not directly influence innovation, a climate for excellence often is helpful because people striving for excellence will naturally seek innovation when appropriate. Similarly, a clear, attainable, and consensually shared vision or mission is helpful because people become motivated to reach the goal by appropriate means. Moreover, specific configurations of culture and climate factors were observed to coincide with particular levels of innovative or creative output. It has been seen that firm's most innovative division displayed relatively high conflict and low trust and harmony, although risk taking and debate were encouraged, as was playfulness.

Fichman and Kemerer (1997), in their study with software process innovations concluded that software process innovations and complex organizational technologies generally impose a substantial burden on would-be adopters in terms of the know-how
and technical knowledge needed to use them effectively. They found that organizations with higher learning-related scale, greater related knowledge, and greater diversity of knowledge and activities would be more prone to innovate, because such organizations can better amortize learning costs, can more easily acquire the knowledge needed to innovate, and have less they have to learn to begin with. Hence, where organization culture is emphasizing more on organizational learning, that culture promotes innovation in organization.

Fichman & Kemerer (1997), conducted a cross-sectional survey of IT departments in medium to large U.S.-based enterprises (sample size 608), to answering the question of which organizations should be more likely to innovate, even in face of high knowledge barriers, due to complex organizational technologies. It was proposed that organizations will innovate in the presence of knowledge barriers when the burden of organizational learning is effectively lower, either because much of the required know-how already exists within the organization, or because such knowledge can be acquired more easily or more economically. Only a small part of innovations is derived directly from R and D activity, as is assumed by standard economics (Edquist, 1997; Lissoni and Metcalfe, 1994).

Foray and Freeman (1993), in their study found that the right climate for innovation is:

1. Management Commitment: recognition and commitment to encourage innovation and facilitate an attitude.
2. Positive mind set for strategic change: Development and test of more than one solution to problems encountered
3. Bearing in mind a long term perspective: There is a need to test alternative courses of innovative action before implementation. So it demands time and long term process.
4. Flexibility and openness to deal with change: Capable of responding to changing situations, barriers between staff and executives are minimized, flat structure, decision making is pushed downwards; entrepreneurial flair present at all levels.
5. Accepting the possibility of risk and failure: Unless failure results from negligence, recklessness or complete incompetence, managers should not seek out scapegoats or exact revenge.
6. Encouraging Teamwork and Innovation: Climate is open, participation is encouraged, facts and information are readily available, change is managed positively, and resources are provided for training and development, rules are at a minimum, internal communications are good and more by mouth than memo, respect is given to all colleagues, teamwork often transcends departmental boundaries.

7. Competencies and learning capabilities: Must have background or prerequisite knowledge for the new learning or understanding the learning of others that in long run exhibit innovation.

Van de Ven et al (1992), developed a model of adaptive learning, which incorporates elements from laboratory models of learning and applies them to the field research setting. The learning model focuses on relationships between the goals, actions, and outcomes of an innovation team within the joint venture as it develops the innovation over time, and the influences that environmental events and external interventions by resource controllers in parent companies have on the learning process. The model is tested based on a real-time longitudinal study of the development of a biomedical innovation (therapeutic aphaeresis) from 1983 to 1988. Different patterns of learning were observed in different periods of innovation development. Event time series analyses clearly contradict the learning model during an initial expansion period, but strongly support the model during a subsequent contraction period. Explanations for why these different patterns of organizational learning occurred over time are provided, and focus on a set of organizational structures and practices which are commonly used to manage innovation development, but which inhibit learning. It is the result of a conjunct effort of specific internal search (R and D, engineering departments), external absorption and knowledge recombination (Cohen and Levinthal, 1990).

Fricke (1983), undertook a project on workers working in unskilled condition and under extreme stress where they were willing, interested and participate in changing their working condition. Source of potential was ‘innovatory qualifications’. Researcher found that innovatory qualifications are often unrealized because of the maintenance of hierarchical organization structure in decision making and planning.
Jones et al (1971), argued that cognitive representation and report of IWB of employees are more subtle because employees have much more information about the historical, contextual, intentional and other background of work activities.

Effectiveness of innovative work behaviour is possible because of the following factors:

• Reality oriented implementation and maintenance (Greenhalgh et al, 2004)

• Individuals (Scott and Bruce, 1994) in interaction of cognitive and motivational process (Amabile et al. 1996; Oldham and Cummings, 1996; Scott and Bruce, 1994; Woodman et al., 1993); knowledge and cognitive capability (Belussi et al, 2002; Cohen et al, 1990; Jones et al, 1971).

• Development of team (Janssen, 2003); disagreement and frustration, (Villiers, 2002); coworkers (Jones, 2001; Argyris, 1957; Likert, 1967; Lewin, 1951; Bantel et al, 1989); presence of adapter and innovator (Kirton, 1984) insecurity, uncertainty and stress they may bring (Argyris, 1957; Jones, 2001; Lewin, 1951; Likert, 1967).

• Perceived work related problems (Drucker, 1985); job demands (Kanter, 1988 and Scott and Bruce, 1994; Bunce et al, 1994; West, 1989; Organ et al, 1989); feedback and recognition (Scott and Bruce, 1994; Organ et al, 1989).

• Social activities (Galbraith, 1982; Kanter, 1983,1988; Festinger, 1954; Antonelli, 2000)


• Individual, leader, work group and climate for innovation (Scott and Bruce, 1994; West and Farr 1989); organization structure and practices (Van de Ven et al, 1992)

• Difficult to isolate from change management (Greenhalgh et al, 2004); coupling of continuous innovation and industrial evolution (Baba, 1989).

• Long term survival of organization (Amabile, 1988; Ancona and Caldwell, 1987; Oldham and Cummings, 1996; Shalley, 1995; Van de Ven, 1986; West and Farr, 1989, 1990; Woodman, Sawyer and Griffin, 1993) and related innovativeness (Datta and Ray, 2003; Datta, 1997)

2.3.2 Organizational Commitment

Friedman & Lobel (2003), conducted approximately 100 interviews in 25 organizations over a period of four years (1999-2002). The focus of the research was in professional services, financial services, and manufacturing. They asked questions about the firm's approach to work / life culture change, the role of senior executives in making it happen, and the challenges encountered along the way. They also asked about site-specific issues, such as implementation of a particular pilot project on flexible work arrangements. Then they did follow-up interviews in other communities - employees’ flourish when senior leaders help them focus on what matters most not only at work but in all aspects of their lives-at home, in their communities, and in their pursuit of physical, emotional, and spiritual well-being. Conclusive remark made by them is committed people drive hard to achieve superior performance that changes the organization into learning organization.

Ruppel and Harrington (2000), surveyed 111 managers to test whether trust, influences perceptions of commitment and innovation. Findings suggest that
Atmosphere of trust, i.e., one of the components of learning organization may add to the understanding of commitment and innovation above and beyond employee trust's effect.

Stmghamber & Vandenberghe (2003), using a sample of 238 employees, conducted a longitudinal study to examine the linkages between some of the components of learning organization, namely, favorableness of intrinsically and extrinsically satisfying job conditions, perceived organizational support, perceived supervisor support, affective commitment to the organization and supervisor, and turnover. Affective commitment to the supervisor was found to completely mediate the effect of perceived supervisor support on turnover, whereas neither perceived organizational support nor organizational affective commitment were significantly related to turnover. Perceived organizational support partially mediated the effect of favorable intrinsically satisfying job conditions on organizational affective commitment and fully mediated the effect of extrinsically satisfying job conditions on organizational affective commitment. Finally, perceived supervisor support totally mediated the effect of favorable intrinsically satisfying job conditions on affective commitment to the supervisor.

Fritz et al (1999), conducted a study in one large service-providing organization. About 1000 members participated in this study as part of the organization's regularly scheduled ethics survey. Of the 868 participants, found that, depending on organizational level, awareness of an organization's ethical standards is predicted by managerial adherence to and organizational compliance with those standards and/or discussions with peers. Regardless of level, organizational commitment was predicted most strongly by managerial adherence to organizational standards as learning organization.

Balfour and Wechster's (1996), investigated organizational commitment in the public sector organization. A total of 2002 employees of 12 government organization were surveyed randomly with the help of a questionnaire. Results suggested that the public sector employees not predisposed to commitment on the basis of personal characteristics. Instead, commitment is influenced by experiences at work, the impact of organizational arrangements, and characteristics of the job itself. The
organization and its attributes as learning organization are the key determinants of organizational commitment. Opportunity for advancement also acts to strengthen exchange commitment and as a result desire to remain. This finding helps to explain 

**better the strong indirect effects of exchange commitment and learning on turnover intent.** It indicates that when individuals perceive limited opportunities for advancement, for more interesting or stimulating jobs, or for significant improvement in their exchange relationship with the organization, they are likely to conclude that leaving the organization is the only way to make positive changes in their work lives.

**Tang, Robertson and Lane (1996)**, through literature survey, found that there exists two perspectives – one suggests that commitment is perceived on an individual’s subjective state of mind, that is, one’s psychological attachment to the organization. By contrast, the rational choice perspective argues that credible commitment among organizational participants, if objective conditions exist, discourage or prevent them from free riding on each other’s collective efforts. In their study they tried to explore the types of commitment which are relevant with different learning status of organization. They found that more and more public sector organizations are moving away from the traditional bureaucratic form, in which tasks are structured and assigned to individuals, toward newer forms of learning organizations, in which teams are used more readily and values of professional relationship is more important. In learning organization as individual accountability and responsibility decrease and team-based or shared responsibility and accountability increase, commitment needs in these organizations are likely to change and mechanism for generating commitment will have to adapt accordingly.

**Shore et al (1995)**, developed a model incorporating antecedents and outcomes of measures of manager-rated employee affective and continuance commitment was tested with 231 managers and 339 subordinates. **Organizational citizenship behavior, which is a significant features of learning organization, predicted manager-rated affective commitment**, where as side bets (age, tenure, and education) predicted manager-rated continuance commitment. Further, affective commitment was positively and continuance commitment negatively related to a variety of outcomes, including managerial potential and promotability.
Lincoln, and Kalleberg (1985), with data from a survey of over 8,000 employees in nearly 100 plants in Japan and the United States, estimated a multilevel model of the processes shaping individuals' organizational commitment and work satisfaction. Consistent with a theory of "corporatist" control, they found that participatory work structures and employee services ("paternalism") are more typical of Japanese plants yet function in both countries to raise commitment and morale.

Luthans et al (1985), compared the levels of organizational commitment among American, Japanese, and Korean employees by means of a self-report measure of organizational commitment rather than by inference from other indicators. They surveyed on 450 selected employees from different industries like electronics, trading, construction petroleum, investment/finance, banking and government. The results of this study indicate that Japanese and Korean employees, who showed no difference in levels of organizational commitment where organizations of the both nations practice learning organization culture are both less organizationally committed than U.S. employees. Since country by itself accounted for only 7 percent of the variance, the difference found between the United States and the two Asian countries may be of little practical significance, but the finding certainly refutes the widespread belief that Japanese workers are more committed.

The term commitment is broadly used to refer to antecedents and consequences, as well the process of becoming attachment itself, it is the psychological attachment that seems to be the construct of common interest (O'Reilly and Chatman, 1986). Essentially three classes of variables seem to emerge as antecedents of commitment in learning organization. The first category includes personality-need variables and value orientations. That led Hall et al. (1970) to conclude "that some 'right type' of person would be most likely to identify strongly with a particular organization; the specific component characteristic would depend upon the particular goals and climate of the employing organization". Thus, an important determinant of commitment seems to be person-organization fit. The second category of antecedents includes job characteristics and work experiences such as job challenge, feedback, and opportunity for social interaction, task identity, group attitudes, and organizational dependability (Buchanan, 1974; Hall & Schneider, 1972). A common theme linking many of these variables is their traditional role as antecedents and correlates of other affective-
motivational responses, such as job satisfaction. It is possible, then, that job satisfaction serves as an intervening variable in the job characteristics-commitment relationship. A third category of antecedents of commitment includes personal-demographic variables, particularly age and tenure (Hall et al., 1970). Presumably the positive relationships of these variables with commitment reflect processes of growth and personal change involved in the development of identification.

From the above literature survey the following determinants of commitment for learning organization are identified:

- Personal variance like hard driving to achieve superior performance (Friedman and Lobel, 2003); experiences at work, (Balfour et al, 1996); loyalty and duty (Wiener, 1982); with kind of personality trait, age and tenure (Hall et al., 1970)

- Organizational environment like trust (Ruppel and Harrington, 2000); organization and its positive attributes, opportunity for advancement (Balfour et al, 1996); opportunity for creative and innovative (Klein et al., 1996; O'Reilly et al 1991); satisfying job conditions (Stinglhamber et al 2003 ); promotability (Shore et al, 1995);

- Supervisor- perceived support (Stinglhamber et al, 2003), adherence to organizational standards (Fritz et al, 1999); managerial potential (Shore et al, 1995)

- Characteristics of the job itself (Balfour et al, 1996); job challenge, feedback, and opportunity for social interaction, task identity, group attitudes, and organizational dependability (Buchanan, 1974; Hall & Schneider, 1972)

- Participatory work relationship (Tang et al, 1996; Lincoln, et al 1985; Mowday et al., 1979)
2.2.3 Learning Behaviour Styles

Hamidah et al (2009) distributed Learning Style Survey to 531 students. When age is taken into consideration, young learners are found to prefer Avoidant and Competitive styles (O’Faithaigh, 2000; Elison and Moore, 1979) while older learners prefer Dependent and Participatory learning styles. The result indicated that in the students between the age of 18 to 20 years, there is a significant relationship only for Avoidant.

Ajiboye and Tell (2007), studied the undergraduate students’ learning behaviour with the objective to enhance the quality in higher education. They viewed that many times information seeking behaviour is related to learning behaviour of the curriculum and evaluation system. An earlier study (Burdick, 1996), has indicated that male are less likely to enjoy working in a socially connected environments than female.

O’Faithaigh (2000) and Kraft (1976) showed that males adopt more Independent and Competitive styles than females. Women normally would experience fear of failure and they depend on trainer or mentor. Test shows, that there is no significant association between gender and social interaction in the learning environment. Those came from urban area appear to be more Avoidant and Competitive than those from the rural area. However, the test shows that there is no significant association between hometown and social interaction.

Deng and Tsacle (2006) conceptualized organizational learning as a result of the collective learning behaviour of knowledge agents in a learning organization. Each agent provides a range of attributes that may be required to perform organizational tasks. They (2003) proposed a computational learning model for artificial organizations. An artificial organization was regarded as a knowledge market, and consists of knowledge agents collaborating in accomplishing tasks. In this artificial organization, the broker agent identified a group of agents for the organizational tasks. This group of knowledge agents will compete for the privilege of providing their expertise or services to buyer agents. A major assumption of that model was that none of the knowledge agents has enough knowledge to complete the task alone. Individual
knowledge agents possess partial but complementary knowledge, and they must collaborate for task completion. Observing the simulated results they found that the simulated organization exhibited aspects of both single loop and double loop learning, in repeatedly performing the same task, and 'learning to perform the task' with the smallest possible team.

Yazici (2005), in his research aims to examine the influence of learning style preferences of business students enrolled in an operations management class. Students were found to be collaborative learners. Students' collaborative orientation complements participation and helps students to compete, which in turn increases team performance. While personal model and formal authority teaching styles fit best undergraduates' learning preferences, at the graduate level, instructor role changes to facilitator and delegator. Self-directed work teams are seen as an important mechanism for dealing with today's complex and rapidly changing business environment. Team learning is an attempt to prepare students to real world experiences. But not all teamwork is effective.

Kennedy et al (2003), found that in learning organization, in the use of technologies women prefer social collaboration, contextual information and personal identification. Men's use of information and technologies are determined by preferences of individual work and competition.

Kim & Allen (2002), investigated how cognitive style (field dependence vs. field independence), online database search experience (novice vs. experienced searchers), and task type (known-item vs. subject search tasks) influence user's search behaviour on the Web Users'. They found that, individual differences and tasks were important factors that influenced the way of using information systems for learning.

Higgins & Hawamdeh (2001), highlighted that in learning organization, females conceptualized information need as a social event, as opposed to individualistic approach of males.

Lou et al (2001), quantitatively synthesized the empirical research on the effects of social context (i.e., small group versus individual learning) when students learn using
computer technology. In total, 486 independent findings were extracted from 122 studies involving 11,317 learners. The results indicated that, on average, small group learning had significantly more positive effects than individual learning on participant’s individual achievement (mean ES = +0.15), group task performance (mean ES = +0.31), and several process and affective outcomes. Findings on both individual achievement and group task performance were significantly heterogeneous. Through weighted least squares univariate and multiple regression analyses, they found that variability in each of the two cognitive outcomes could be accounted for by a few technology, task, grouping, and learner characteristics in the studies. A Meta analysis (Lou, et al, 2001) that examined studies involving learners using technology found that overall small group achievement in cooperative learning exceeded that of individualistic learning when working alone.

**Badger et al (2000),** conducted a survey of learning style and perception of competences relative to competitors in small manufacturing firms, to acquire additional empirical data, on literature – ie, relationship of organizational learning as a route through which to acquire the knowledge required to survive in rapidly changing and/or highly competitive markets. There was, however, only limited anecdotal evidence of the positive contribution that organizational learning can make to enhance the performance of firms. Results concerning organizational learning style appear to indicate the **firms who exhibit a customer relationship marketing style tend to adopt a double-loop learning style; whereas transactionally orientated firms appear to be single-loop learners.** When compared with transactional firms, relationship orientated respondents also reported higher competences for some areas of marketing, HRM and information management practices.

**Haythornthwaite & Wellman (1998),** criticized the individualistic perspective. They argued that learner’s learning behaviour was affected more by the kinds of social (organizational) networks in which they were involved than by individual attitudes and attributes (Davenport, 2001; Lave and Wenger, 1991; Rioux, 2000; Sonnenwald, 1995; Vakkari, 1997; Van, et al 1998; Walsh et al 2000).

**Ribbens (1997),** described a framework for investigating organizational learning style. In this study the theory of learning styles developed for individual applications
is extended to an organizational application. Learning styles of organizations may be best categorized by the preferences of both formal and informal systems of information handling. The link between organizational learning and strategy formulation is examined based on a learning style framework containing two dimensions: Abstract—Concrete and Random—Sequential. Study conducted on different types of organizations both public and private sectors and organizations tend to exhibit different learning styles. It was also established that predispositions toward general patterns of organizational strategy process and content are associated with each learning style.

Sonnenwald & Liewrouw (1997), found that communicated learning behaviour style and success in collaboration in the project teams correlate positively with perceived individual effectiveness and project performance. They introduced the social network perspective to study how learner's social ties and pattern of thinking exchanges in organizational networks affected their choice of the learning styles.

Lehtinen (1997), observed the significant relation of learning styles, patterns, types and its influence on the way learner search for knowledge. With a longitudinal study with 50 participants they concluded that over the years, many different models and categorizations had been used to describe an individual's preferred way to take on a learning task and learning style for learning organization which boils down to be cooperative learning.

Saddler-Smith (1997), explored learning style according to the approaches to studying model, (Tait et al, 1998; Saljo, 1975). In analyses of participants' own understanding on learning two polarities cooperative and competitive learning styles were found between which participants described their pattern for knowledge acquisition in respect to the level of learning organization.

Burdick (1996), found gender differences in task, task perception, and affective experience. Female employees were more likely to work together and more likely to ask for help. Male employees emphasized activity, where female evidenced more reflection.

Powell (1981), in order to identify factors which help or hinder learning during training, analyzed the participant's evaluations about the course. The responses were
classified in relation to learning in the areas of content, personal development and behavioural change. The major factors which emerged were expectations, learning style and personality. It was suggested that \textit{learning styles are strongly influenced by the interaction between participant characteristics and the parallel features of programme content and trainers.}

\textbf{Slavin (1980),} reviewed and summarized the results of 28 primary field projects lasting at least 2 weeks, in which cooperative learning methods were used. The pattern of research findings supports the utility of cooperative learning methods in general for increasing achievement, positive race relations, and mutual concern among participants, participants’ self-esteem, and other positive outcomes. They concluded that for high level cognitive learning outcomes, such as identifying concepts, analysis of problems, judgment, and evaluation, less structured cooperative techniques that involve high autonomy and participation in decision-making may be more effective than traditional individualistic techniques. There is some indication that \textit{cooperative learning techniques can improve self-esteem of an individual, as well as generally greater liking of the learning organization.}

Major factors identified through literature survey that effective variation of learning behavior styles are:

- \textbf{Age} - older learners prefer dependent and participatory learning styles (Hamidah et al, 2009);

- \textbf{Sex} - male are less likely to enjoy working in a socially connected environments, adopt more independent and competitive styles and female prefer social collaboration (O’Faithaigh, 2000; Kraft 1976; Kennedy et al 2003; Higgins et al, 2001; Burdick, 1996).)

- \textbf{Individual attitudes and attributes} (Davenport, 2001; Lave and Wenger, 1991; Rioux, 2000; Sonnenwald, 1995; Vakkari, 1997; Van, et al 1998; Walsh et al 2000; Lehtinen (1997); expectations and personality (Powell, 1981)}
2.4 Approaches of Measurement of Learning Organization

Different approaches have been offered to measure learning organization by various researchers from various fields and researches indicated much empirical evidence to support. These approaches provide a useful platform for understanding the characteristics of learning organization and its influencing variables.

In this regard it was found that learning organization measurement may be a cognitive approach (perception of the organizational members, development of attitude and knowledge) using survey research with structured questionnaire (Bhatnagar, 2006; Raper et al, 2006; Díez et al, 2005; James, 2002; Clarke, 2004), exploratory research (Virany et al, 1992).

Measurement of learning organization as goal directed behaviour (Badger et al, 2000) mainly collective / collaborative learning behaviour (Deng and Tsacle, 2006; Yazici, 2005; Lou et al., 2001, Slavin, 1980) and Social (organizational) networks (Haythornthwaite et al 1998) and Communication behaviour (Sonnenwald et al, 1997); medium for communication (Erdelez, 1996).
In thrust of research on cognitive and behaviour, other group of researchers tried to focus on the methodological issues regarding qualitative and case study method with typographic procedure. In this context while Shrivastava, 1983; Lars, 1998; Blackman & Henderson, 2005 used the case study method of qualitative analysis in their research on learning organization.

The most popular way of measurement of learning organization is the action research with the different Organization Development Intervention procedure, viz, Management audit (Rampersad, 2002), total quality Management (McAdam et al, 1998), training and development (McDougall & Beattie, 1996; Coulson Thomas and Coe. 1991).

A large number of studies have indicated the impact of situational and personal factors on development of learning organization. But very limited studies have focused on holistic and interactive effects, which are important theoretically and for those organization interested in the development of learning organization, proper climate for learning, working in a team with commitment, opening their innovative capacity and styles of learning. Besides previous empirical research on relevant facilitating and inhibiting factors of existence and development of learning organization were conducted mainly with international or multinational organization and or manufacturing company, very limited studies have been done in the Indian organization most specifically in financial service sectors in West Bengal.

Keeping in view of the importance of learning organization culture in the achievement and effectiveness of desired quality of working life and promotion of quality of work and lack of conclusive studies in relation to Indian situation it was thought worthwhile to undertake researches in this area. Accordingly a plan of research study on perception of learning organization (banking system) by the bank officers with respect to their situational and personal context in the banking system was framed and processed through the Ph D committite which has been present in the next chapter.