

The possibility of development of organizational learning in the light of intellectual capital

Sara Almasizadeh

M.A.Student Educational Management Urmia University
saraalmasi850@yahoo.com

Abstract: The present study has been done with the aim of prediction of factors of organizational learning based on intellectual capital dimensions among Faculty members of Razi University. 86 people of faculty members were accidentally chosen through (by) co relational research method. Data were gathered through two researcher made organizational learning questionnaire according to Nife model and intellectual capital dimensions questionnaire according to Bunits models. The reliability of questionnaires were measured by Cronbach coefficient on a sample of 30 people. The intellectual capital dimensions questionnaire $\alpha = 0.813$ and organizational learning questionnaire $\alpha = 0.828$. The gathered data were analyzed with MANOVA analysis and Multiple Regression. The attained results revealed that: there is a positive significant relationship between the whole dimensions of intellectual capital with the whole factors of organizational learning. There is also positive significant relationship among human capital, structural capital and customer capital with factors of organizational learning.

[Sara Almasizadeh. **The possibility of development of organizational learning in the light of intellectual capital.** *N Y Sci J* 2016;9(4):90-99]. ISSN 1554-0200 (print); ISSN 2375-723X (online). <http://www.sciencepub.net/newyork>. 14. doi:[10.7537/marsnys09041614](https://doi.org/10.7537/marsnys09041614).

Keywords: Organizational Learning, Intellectual Capital, Faculty Member.

1. Introduction

Today the organizations are experiencing dramatic changes; organizational development and the conversion of the closed fixed and predetermined patterns into living and changing entity organization and self-consistent models is dependent to the flexible structures and they are examples of changes that have occurred in organizations. According to the law of entropy that in a closed system, entropy increases in an organization also if it does not match itself with the environmental changes, it faces with Disorder, that eventually it will be stopped from the continuation of work. In fact the organizations for the purpose of survival of discipline and development attempt that by the use of their resources to achieve rapid growth in the global scope, improve continued effectiveness, profitability, flexibility, preparation for the future and enjoy a privileged position in benefiting from the excellent field of their activities (Hong & Kuo, 1999, Shuler & Jackson, 2001). The rapid environmental factors, the complexity and ambiguity level is increased and the organization's management faces with challenges In such circumstances the use of old paradigm of command and control expertise that emphasizes on the integration and efficiency, leading to a multi-sectoral organizations which are not remedial (James, 2003, Pablos, 2003, Uzumeri & Nembhard, 1995).

Today's knowledge is considered as one of the main and most important intangible assets of organizations, this type of attitude opposes the past which has introduced a big deal of organization capitals as intangible assets (Sullivan 2000). In the

definition of intangible assets, it can be stated that they are the non-physical and valuable sources which are created by innovation and exclusive plans of the organization or human sources (Alavi & ghorishi, 2007). In today's knowledge-oriented economy, the success of organizations is dependent to the ability of intangible assets management. By entering the knowledge-oriented economy we need to have access to new models of the organizational assets (Tayles et al, 2002).

Organizational learning is a dynamic process that enables organization to quickly adapt to the changes. This process involves the production of new knowledge, skills and behaviors. The organizational learning is the main way to create working knowledge and performance improvement of the organization. So a successful organization should be dynamic in learning (Jerez-Go'mez et al, 2005; Khanalizadeh et al, 2010, Skerlavaj et al., 2012).

Fevil and Liles (1985) in clearing the concept of organizational learning suggest that organizational learning changes the organization as an entity of cognitively which is able to observe their actions, to explore the effects of reform measures for the purpose of organizational development (Phang et al, 2008). In most of the definitions that have been mentioned regarding organizational learning, changes in behaviors is considered as the most essential principle of learning (Alavi, 2010, Peck, et al., 2013).

Intellectual capital is defined as "a package of useful and practical knowledge and knowledge assets, including talent, skill, questions, procedure and

relationships that can lead to the creation of value (Steward, 2001, 1997, 1994, 1991).

Organizational learning

Today, in organizations, learning has become the heart and essence of the activity, and we must confess that if the organizations are ignoring learning, this issue can be similar to accepting death for the organization. Organizational learning in recent years is among the organizational ability to respond changes in the external environment. Aragon (2003) stated that various changes in environment requires a realistic reaction that balances the interaction of organization with the environment Montes et al (2004). Brno Locke in explanation of the word of learning says, today the word of learning has a new understanding that is different with its concept in administrative theories and organizational context that existed in a few decades ago, because Of the complex nature of today's issues, technological advances, unstable environment and especially changes in individual and group values. Now the emphasis is on the modern process of distribution and dissemination of information and new knowledge of social and organizational issues, in a way that adopting practical solutions to review these issues and also recipient's participation in all stages of setting and performance of policy making could be effective (Javanmard & Sakhaei, 2009).

The organizations face with changes without delays during century 21st; In order to empower them in effective competence in a competitive market, the

key point is how they should learn and produce new knowledge. Survival and growth of organizations in today's world which is full of changes requires the ability to react on time and appropriately against the rapid environmental changes. Only those Organizations can predict the needs and environmental changes timely and continue their survival in the constantly changing environment that emphasize and concentrate on organizational learning. Learning requires that the people to deploy the knowledge that they learn in their organizations. The terms of organizational learning apparently refers to the individual learning in organization, but organizational learning in fact in its real meaning mostly refers to a group or the organizational level learning. The individual learning is obtained through studying, research, interviewing, cognitive, experience, training and development of mental models which take place in the mind, but the organizational learning occurs when the group learns to interact, share knowledge and to act collectively; In a way that the combined capacity of group is increased and the ability of understanding and implementing effective action to be achieved (Bennet & Bennet, 2008; Hung et al, 2010; Yukl, 2008). By reviewing that were conducted on the organizational learning from 1963 till now, some of the selected definitions have been presented in the following table (Table A).

Table A. Some of the selected definitions

The authors	Definition of organizational learning	resources
Kern and March (1963)	Organization's efforts in response to changes in its external environment for compliance of goals with the new conditions	Allame & moghadami, 2009
Garjlosi and Dale (1965)	Set of interactions between individual and group conformity and compliance in the organizational level	Miresmaeli, 2007
R. Jeris and Shan (1987)	It is a process in which the members by identifying and correcting errors and recording the results of this process	Farhang et al, 2010
Senge (1990)	It is a balanced relationship with the environment in which the organization activities are done dynamically to obtain knowledge	Senge, 1990
Huber (1991)	Process that will result in the development of insight for the individuals to influence the potential of human behaviors	Cegarre-Navarro et al, 2007
Huber (1992)	A change in the range of potential behavior of the organization which may lead to the organization effectiveness	Robey et al, 2000
Gu (1992)	It is a long-term activity which leads to competitive advantage over time and it requires sustained management attention, commitment and efforts.	Alavi, 2010
Kim (1993)	Organizational learning means increased ability to perform the actions for the purpose of effective actions	Erabi & Fakhariyan, 2008
Dixon (1994)	Conscious use of learning processes in the individual and group levels which leads to the organization move towards a more satisfying level of shareholders	Erabi & Fakhariyan, 2008
Slater and Narro (1995)	The most basic level of knowledge and insight development which is the potential for influence on effective behavior	Hult et al, 2001
Menzer and	The behavior between minds, groups or individuals in special social	Hong et al, 2006

The authors	Definition of organizational learning	resources
Nikloni (1995)	adaptation and culture	
Mal Hatra (1996)	The ability for organizations to insight and understanding through experiencing, observing and analyzing and having desire to success and failure tests.	Fathi, 2010
Tsang (1997)	A concept used to describe certain types of activities that occur to secure the organization against the environment changes	Dawes 2002
Simon (1998)	Vision growth a renew structure and successful revision of the organizational problems by the persons who have reflected the results of that in structural factors and organization results.	Fathi, 2010
Garoein (1999)	It is a process that will be revealed over time and it is followed with acquiring knowledge, deeper understanding and performance improvement.	Yaghoobi et al, 2010
Robey (2000)	It is a group process that by presence of that, the organizational effectiveness will be increased.	Robey et al 2000
Jones (2000)	It is a process through which managers try to increase the capabilities of organizational members in order to better understand their conditions.	Skerlavajet al, 2006
Lane (2001)	Acquiring knowledge and its transmission in the organization levels for manifestation in the required behavior of the organization	Saka- Helmhout, 2009
Moravad Rigrez (2003)	It is a collective process to support organization behavior change	Sharifi & Eslamiye, 2008
Lopez (2005)	Dynamic process of creating, acquiring and collecting knowledge for the purpose of developing sources and capacity which leads to better performance	Allame & moghadami, 2009
Panayides (2005)	The organizational ability for the purpose of stabilizing itself according to the environmental changes.	Panayides, 2005
Hong (2006)	The process of social participation which leads to group solidarity	Hong et al, 2006
Algra and Chiva (2008)	Learning process to change the organizational model which leads to improvement or preservation of organization performance	Khanalizadeh et al, 2009
Huang (2011)	The process of knowledge production which is effective in improving human skills	Hung et al, 2011

Dimensions of organizational learning based on the perspective of Nif (2001) include:

A shared vision:

It states a desired future and to attract and retain the best and creative knowledge workers, which is provocative and challenging. The importance of shared vision to become the learner organization: First, a shared vision provides the focus and energy to learn. Second, the prospects are pushing people to act. Outlook expresses their aspirations and dreams and to give them meaning. Third, the aim of drawing up is towards a higher favorable objective by the ruling force on the current condition. The share vision creates the ultimate goal and it encourages risk taking and innovation. Fourth, the values and shared meanings in determining the type of a knowledge that the organization preserves and transfer is important.

Organizational Learning Culture:

The values are the driving force of the Organization which help the organization to to achieve its vision. When the members of an organization or group for compliance with external environment and problem solving are active uniquely,

unconsciously help to learning. Because of this, in accordance to theorist, learning and problem solving are not only different, but also it should be said that different perspectives have the same process. When members of any society or organization or department are trying for compliance with the external environment and internal problem solving they have helped for learning unconsciously.

Team working and learning:

They are a committed group which can look for a rapid movement to achieve the target of learning, one of the most important strategies for organizational learning is that for learning in the organization, a team should b created. In work and team learning the emphasis is on the importance of the forces and personnel parallel and personnel of the organization to avoid wasting energy. Collective learning is a process of that during that, the capacity of the team members are developed and to be aligned so that its results to be something that all really want it.

Knowledge Distribution:

It consists transmission and distribution of knowledge, organizational transfer and technological

data and information. The capacity of the organization to replace the knowledge states the capability of transferring and sharing the power which is needed for the success of the organization as well. Knowledge should be distributed on time and quickly in all around the organization or the areas of company.

System Thinking:

System Thinking means the use of systemic method in the analysis and administration of organization affairs and paying attention to the impact of organizational factors on each other. With a general retrospective thinking, business activities and generally all the other human endeavors are the overall system. They are limited by the activity associated with encapsulation, the activities which usually require years of time to fully affect each other. Where we are a part of this set, in order to understand the change model we face with additional difficulties (Marquardt, 1995; Khanalizadeh et al, 2010; Miresmaeli, 2007).

Intellectual Capital

At the same time of developing the market value of knowledge-based organizations, during decade 1990, a great interest was created towards the intellectual capital. So the researchers tried to define and measure intellectual capital categories that until that time was something non-measurable. In the field of intellectual capital many definitions have been presented, the intellectual capital is the competence and experience of the organization which are mainly associated with the experience and allocation of staff. In fact this is the knowledge and experience of the persons inside the organization which can create values. This issue is done through the process of knowledge interaction and creation of new knowledge. It should be under attention that these capabilities are not only created by the individuals and inside the organization, but also it is possible that they be created by the environment which in the organization (Hame and prahald, 1994, Kalkan et al, 2014).

The intellectual capital can be considered as intellectual items that have been obtained, official and to be used as an asset with more added values (Stewart, 1997). The intellectual capital is the existing knowledge in the organization and it is stated at two individual and organizational levels and the individual level includes knowledge, skill and talent and the structural level includes some items such as a database for each customer, technology, organizational methods and processes (Haanes and Lowendah, 2000). In fact the intellectual capital is a set of knowledge oriented assets which is special for an organization and it is considered from its features and by adding the value to the owners of interests of organization, it will lead to the considerable improvement and increase of

competitive advantages of the organization (Marr, 2004). Stewart (2001) defines the intellectual capital in accordance to organizational resources as something related to wealth making through investment of knowledge, information intellectual knowledge and experience. This concept includes the three components that are non-financial and they have mutual relationship as follows:

Human capital:

Human Capital (HC) can be defined as the health, knowledge, motivation and skills of human sources of the organization without considering the future potential values for that organization. The existence of these features in human capitals can lead to satisfaction. Continuous strengthening of intellectual capacity and resources should necessarily create a large collection of talent and professional skills in the organizations (Usoff et al, 2002). The essence of human capital is considered as the pure intelligence of the organization members. In fact The human capital includes preserving knowledge of the members of an organization which includes capabilities and thinking method of personnel. The human sources play a vital and crucial role inside an organization and as a result in this investment, the staff play the most important role. The knowledge of personnel specially their technical knowledge against the tangible assets has strategic importance for the organizations, because they are among those sources that any kind of copy or their transferring to the organization is really difficult (Pike et al, 2002).

Structural capital:

Structural capital (SC) points out to the structures and processes existing inside an organization that the personnel use them and by this method, they use their knowledge and skills ((Vergauwen & Van alem 2005). It can be said that structural capital includes all the non-human knowledge inside the organization which include databases, organizational charts, process instructions, guidelines and whatever grants a greater value than its tangible assets. This type of capital arising from products and systems that the organization has developed them over time and when the people leave the organization and remain in the organization, so the organizations that have very strong structures, they have a culture that by its background to allow employees to learn and practice (Bontis et al, 2000).

Customer Capital:

Customer capital or relational capital (RC) includes the total of all the assets which organize relations of the organization with the outside environment. This investment includes relationships, customers, shareholders, suppliers, competitors, government, and legal institutions of society. The most important part of capital is the customer capital

or relational capital. The relational capital indeed is a reflex of long term performance of companies. Relational capital is related to the conformity level of organization with its surrounding areas (Bozburu, 2004). In fact the relational capital includes the knowledge sourced in the marketing channels and customer relationships in an organization (Bontis et al, 2000). These three components are the interdependence of intellectual capital. Intellectual capital is evaluated through combination, deployment, engagement, integration and balance between its three components and also manage their knowledge flow between them which presents the best values for the organizations (Pike et al, 2002).

The research hypothesis

- 1- There is a relation between dimensions of intellectual capital and organizational learning components.
- 2- There is a relation between dimensions of intellectual capital with a shared vision.
- 3- There is a relation between dimensions of intellectual capital with the culture of organizational learning.
- 4- There is a relation between dimensions of intellectual capital and work and group learning.
- 5- There is a relation between dimensions of intellectual capital and knowledge sharing.
- 6- There is a relationship between dimensions of intellectual capital with System Thinking.

Methods

The method of current research is descriptive correlation method. Target population consisted of 350 persons of faculty members of Razi University. Using stratified random sampling, a proportional class appropriate to the capacity of each of the colleges, 86

persons were selected as statistical population for the purpose of studying. In order to determine the sampling population according to the statistical capacity of sampling population the formula Cochran was used.

Tools for data collection

Data required in this study were collected through two questionnaires is as follows: Intellectual capital questionnaire: the abovementioned questionnaire by using Bontis model (2001) and Piqué (2002) were designed in the form of 35 separate species, using a scale designed of Likert. Results of factor analysis (three components of human capital, structural capital and customer capital) were gained. The KMO = 0.93 and Bartlett (P < 0.001) showed that the sampling population is enough and these factors exist in the statistical society. The results of factor loads are higher than 0.3 with orthogonal rotation got the three required components.

Organizational learning questionnaire: the questionnaire is based on Nif model (2001) on the form of 15 buoy in a separation method and by using the five degree scale of Likert. The results of factor analysis, five components (shared vision, organizational culture, work and group learning, sharing knowledge and system thinking) to be obtained. The KMO = 0.94 and Bartlett (P < 0.001) showed that the sampling capacity is sufficient and this factor exists in the statistical population. The results of the factor loadings higher than 0.3 with orthogonal rotation god the five required components.

Findings

- 1- There is a relation between dimensions of intellectual capital and organizational learning components.

Table 1: Results of Manova analysis of the relationship between intellectual capitals with the total size of each component for organizational learning

Intellectual Capital Components	Vilchez Lambra	F	df	Sig	Sharing Level	Statistical Power
Human Capital	0.22	48.39	5	0.001	0.76	0.99
Structural Capital	0.13	94.81	5	0.001	0.87	0.99
Customer Capital	0.32	31.59	5	0.001	0.69	0.98

The F coefficients in table 1 shows that there is a positive and significant relationship between human capital and all the organizational learning components (P=0.0001) and the participation level is 0.76. There is a significant and positive relation between customer capital with the whole of

organizational learning (P= 0.0001) and the sharing level if 0.69 and the statistical power for all three cases is equal to 0.99 that exhibits the sufficiency of sample capacity for the test of hypotheses.

- 2- There is a relationship between intellectual capital dimensions and shared vision.

Table 2: Results of multiple regression analysis between intellectual capital dimensions with shared view

Prediction Variables	Standard Variable	F	P	R	R ²	β	t	P
Human Capital	Share vision	46.41	0.001	0.76	0.57	0.09	0.24	0.81
Structural Capital						-0.20	-1.28	0.20
Customer Capital						0.78	4.60	0.01

Results of table 2 shows that the results of the test statistic for examining the components of intellectual capital with shared vision is equal to 46.41 which in the level (P= 0.0001) is significant. The value R2 indicates that 0.57 is obtained from the shared vision variance by the intellectual capital

dimensions. Also a review on the regression coefficients indicates that that the customer capital ($\beta = 0.78$) and they can predict the shared vision positively and significantly.

3- There is a relationship between intellectual capital dimensions and organizational learning culture.

Table 3: Results of multiple regression analysis between intellectual capital dimensions with organizational learning culture

Prediction Variables	Standard Variable	F	P	R	R ²	β	t	P
Human Capital	Organizational Learning Culture	26.31	0.001	0.66	0.44	0.07	0.99	0.32
Structural Capital						0.11	0.62	0.53
Customer Capital						0.49	2.29	0.006

The results of table 3 indicates that the results of the test statistic for examining the relationship between intellectual capital dimensions and organizational learning culture is equal to 26.31 which is significant in the level (P= 0.0001). The amount of R2 indicates that 0.44 is obtained from the organizational learning culture by the intellectual

capital dimensions. Also a review to the regression coefficients indicate and the customer capital ($\beta = 0.49$) can be predicted by the organizational learning culture positively and significantly.

4- There is a relation between intellectual capital dimensions and group learning.

Table 4: Results of multiple regression analysis between intellectual capital dimensions with team working and learning

Prediction Variables	Standard Variable	F	P	R	R ²	β	t	P
Human Capital	Team working and learning	35.49	0.001	0.68	0.46	0.67	3.84	0.06
Structural Capital						-0.32	-1.89	0.15
Customer Capital						0.23	0.61	0.54

Results of table 4 exhibits that the results of the test statistic for examining the relationship between intellectual capital dimensions with work and team learning is equal to 35.49 which in the level (P= 0.0001) is significant. The value of R2 exhibits 0.46 is determined from team working and learning by the

intellectual capital dimensions. Also a review to the regression coefficients show that the human capital ($\beta = 0.67$) and they can predict team working and learning positively and significantly.

5- There is a relationship between the intellectual capital dimensions and sharing knowledge.

Table 5: Results of multiple regression analysis between intellectual capital dimensions with knowledge distribution

Prediction Variables	Standard Variable	F	P	R	R ²	β	t	P
Human Capital	Knowledge Distribution	61.15	0.001	0.79	0.69	0.73	4.48	0.001
Structural Capital						0.25	1.23	0.093
Customer Capital						-0.19	-1.05	0.11

Results of table 5 that the results of the test statistic F for examining the relationship between intellectual capital components by sharing knowledge is equal to 61.15 which in the level (P= 0.0001) is significant. The value R2 indicates that 0.62 is determined from the sharing knowledge variance by

the intellectual capital dimensions. Also a review on the regression coefficient indicates that human capital ($\beta = 0.73$) they can predict knowledge sharing positively and significantly.

6- There is a relationship between intellectual capital dimensions and systems thinking.

Table 6: Results of multiple regression analysis between intellectual capital dimensions with system thinking

Prediction Variables	Standard Variable	F	P	R	R ²	β	t	P
Human Capital	System Thinking	83.13	0.001	0.58	0.33	0.09	-0.84	0.32
Structural Capital						0.60	3.97	0.001
Customer Capital						-0.21	-1.66	0.12

The results of table 6 exhibit that the results of the test statistic for examining the relationship between the components of intellectual capital with system thinking is equal to 83.13 which at the level ($P = 0.0001$) is significant. The value R^2 exhibits that 0.33 is determined from the system thinking variance by the intellectual capital dimensions. Also a review on the regression coefficients indicates that Structural Capital ($\beta = 0.60$) which they can predict the system thinking positively and significantly.

Conclusion

The results of the first hypothesis showed that there is a positive and significant relation between total intellectual capital dimensions and the total of components of organizational learning. These results indicate that existence of intellectual capital dimensions can lead to the formation of a shared vision, organizational learning culture, team working and learning, sharing knowledge and system thinking, so it is good that great attentions to be paid to the intellectual capital in the organizations and the result of such attention will lead to the staff to become innovative and creative individuals in organizations and to have greater motivation and ability to solve internal and external problems of their organizations, the personnel will act with integrity and with the formation of groups and teams of business knowledge and information exchange between organizational members and they will have a comprehensive vision towards current and future issues and they will be so effective for organizational effectiveness. The results of this hypothesis are consistent with the results of Ghalich Li and Moshabeki (2006), Bontis et al (2000) and Bontis (2004) which indicates there is a positive and significant relation between the intellectual capital dimensions and the organizational learning components.

The results of the second hypothesis showed there is a positive relationship between dimensions of intellectual capital and shared vision. The customer capital represents the potential of an organization due to external evident factors. The importance of intellectual capital, as the key part of intellectual capital which plays the role of a mediator and bridge in the investment process and it in the external environment it causes that the customer capital to be preserved in the organization by a survey of clients, addressing their problems, increasing time with customers and providing better services and issues like this. The results of this hypothesis are consistent with the results of Alavi and Gharshi researches (2005), Jafar Nezhad and Ghasemi (2007) and Alameh Moghadami (2009) which exhibits the increasingly attention to the customer capital category should be done in the organizations.

The results of the third hypothesis of research indicated that there is a positive and significant relation between intellectual capital dimensions and organizational learning culture, and 0.44 is explained from the organizational learning culture variance by the intellectual capital dimensions and also the Human Capital and customer capital has a significant predictor relation with the organizational learning culture which exhibits the importance of intellectual capital dimensions in the organizations which states helping to the organizations to set up strategies, assess for implement of strategies to aid decisions, expansion and diversification of organization activities, which here the customer capital has an extraordinary importance which is the main factor determining the of intellectual capital to value and thus, the organizational performance. The results of this hypothesis are consistent with the study results of Alavi and Gharshi (2005), Jafar Nezhad and Ghasemi (2007) and Alameh and Moghadami (2009) which indicates in order to match with the external environment and attempting to solve its problems it is good that much attentions to be paid to the intellectual capital dimensions including the customer capital.

The results of the fourth hypothesis of the research indicated that there is a positive and significant relation between dimensions of intellectual capital and the team working and learning and 0.46 is explained from the team working and learning variance by the intellectual capital dimensions and also the human capital has a predictor relations with team working and learning. The human capital is considered as the standard of intellectual capital and it is dependent to some factors such as knowledge, skills, capabilities and staff attitudes and human capital has caused that the organizations to be dependent to the knowledge and skills of staff to create revenue and growth and also improvement of efficiency and productivity. Results of this hypothesis are consistent with the research results of Bontis (2004), Bord (2006) and Buzbora (2000), which shows that the team working and learning causes sharing in information and thoughts and the existence of human capital and paying attention to that causes the organization to prevent wasting energy and to reach the target earlier.

The results of the fifth hypothesis showed that there is a positive and significant relation between intellectual capital dimensions and sharing knowledge and 0.69 is explained from the sharing knowledge variance by the intellectual capital dimensions and also the human capital and Structural Capital has a predictor and significant relation with knowledge sharing. The staff create the intellectual capital through competence, attitude and intellectual agility and the human capitals of an organization includes the

skills, expertise, problem-solving ability and leadership styles. The organizations by creating an environment in which the personnel be able to continuously present new ideas, holding training workshops and providing the required training for their staff should act in order to empower their staff. The results of this hypothesis are consistent with research results of Bontis (2004) and Buzbora (2000) which indicates paying attention to the human capital and surveying their comments about the working programs or activities will lead to success.

The results of the sixth hypothesis showed there is a positive and significant relation between intellectual capital dimensions with system thinking and 0.33 is explained from the system thinking variance by the intellectual capital dimensions and also the structural capital has a predictor and significant relation with system thinking. The structural capital includes all the non-human sources of knowledge of the organization which consists of databases, organizational charts to administrative instruction for implementation of processes, procedures, strategies, executive plans, and executive programs and entirely up all the things which have higher values for the organization. The results of this hypothesis are consistent with the research results of Bontis et al (2004) and Lucy (2005) which indicates by creating reasonable structures and by presenting reasonable solutions, a comprehensive vision could exist for the problems for the purpose of solving them and it considers all the dimensions systematically.

References

1. Alavi, S.E., Ghoreishi, S.R., (2007), Model for measuring intellectual capital in the Persian, *Management Thought*, Vol, 1, No, 2, Pp. 127-150.
2. Alavi,S., (2010), Organizational learning and the factors influencing, *Private technical and administrative managers*, No, 24, Pp. 66-75.
3. Allame, S.M., Moghadami, M., (2009), Relationship between organizational learning and organizational performance, the propulsion unit case study of Iran Khodro, *Journal of Management Executive*, Vol, 10, No, 1, Pp.75-99.
4. Beard, R. (2006). *accreditation processes and organizational learning capabilities in institutions higher education* "dissertation abstract Ph.D.". capella university, 103b pages; AAT3205707. [Http://proquest.umi.com](http://proquest.umi.com).
5. Bennet, A. and Bennet, D. (2008). *The partnership between organizational learning based on knowledge management*.
6. Bontis, N. (2004), National intellectual capital index a united nations initiative for the Arabic region, *journal of intellectual capital*, 5, pp 13-39.
7. Bontis, N., Keow, W.C.C. and Richardson, S. (2000), Intellectual capital and Business performance in Malaysian Industries, *Journal of Intellectual capital*, Vol1 No. 1, pp. 58-100.
8. Bozbura, F.T. (2004), Measurement and application of Intellectual capital in turkey, *The Learning Organization*, Vol.11, No, 4/5, pp. 375-367.
9. Cegarra-Navarro, J.G., Jimenez, J. D., Martinez-Conesa, E.A., (2007), Implementing e-busines through Organizational learning: An empirical investigation in SMEs, *International Journal of Information*, 27, pp. 137-186.
10. Dawes, P.H., (2002), A model of the effects of technical consultants on Organizational learning in high-technology purchase situations, *journal of High Technology Management Research* 14, pp. 1-20.
11. Erabi, S.M., Fakhariyan, M. (2008), Measure the level of organizational learning, and Iran Milk Company Subsidiaries, *Research Management*, Vol. 1, No 1, Pp 109-121.
12. Farhang, A., siyadat, S.A., Molavi, H., Hovida, R., (2010), Factor structure and reliability of its components with respect to organizational learning in public universities in the South East, *Quarterly Journal of Research and Planning in Higher Education*, No, 55, Pp. 111-130.
13. Fathi, R., (2010), Organizational learning and learning organization, *Monthly business and community*, Vol, 126, Pp. 38-48.
14. Ghelichli, B., Moshabaki, A., (2006), The role of social capital in the creation of intellectual capital. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Pp. 147-175.
15. Haanes, K. and Lowendahl, B.(2000), The unit of activity: towards an alternative to the theories of firm, in Tbomas, H. et al, strategy, *Structure and style*, John wiley & Sons, New York, NY.
16. Hamel, G. and Parhalad, C.K. (1994), *Competing for the Future*, Harvard Business School press, Boston, M.A.
17. Hong, J.C., Kuo, C.L. (1999), Knowledge management in the learning organization, *The learning and Organization Development Journal*; 20(4), pp 207-215.
18. Hong. J.F.L. Stanley snell, R., Easterby-Smith, M. (2006), Cross-cultural influences on organizational learning in MNCS: the case of Japanese companies China, *Journal off international Management*, 12, pp. 408- 429.
19. Hult, G.T. M., Ferrell, O.C, Hurley, Robert F,H. (2001), Global Organizational learning effects on

- cycle time performance, *JOURNAL OF BUSINESS RESEARCH*, 55, pp. 377-378.
20. Hung, R. Y. Y., Lien, B.Y.H., Yang, B., Wu, C.-M., Kuo, Y., (2011), Impact of TQM and Organizational learning on innovation performance in the high-tech industry, *Journal of the World Business*, 20, pp. 213-225.
 21. Hung, R.Y. Y., Yang, B, Lien, B. Y, McLean, G. N. Kuo, Y. (2010). Dynamic capability: Impact of process alignment and Organizational learning culture on performance, *Journal of the World Business*, 45, pp 258-294.
 22. Jafarnezhad, A.H., ghasemi, A., (2008), Model with respect to technology acquisition strategy, intellectual capital, *Journal of Information Technology Management*, Pp.1-36.
 23. Jamalzadeh, M., gholami, Y., saif, M.P., (2009), The relationship between intelligence organizational learning among staff and faculty at the University and provide a model for promoting organizational learning, *Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*, Vol 3, No 2, Pp63-86.
 24. James, C.D, (2003), Designing learning organizations, *Organization Dynamics*, 32(1), pp46-61.
 25. Javanmard, H., sakhaei, F., (2009), Relationship between interpersonal skills, organizational learning, innovation and organizational performance in small and medium industries in Markazi Province, Vol.16, No, 44, Pp. 81-96.
 26. Jerez-Gomez, P, Cespedes-Lorentc, J., Valle-Cabrera, R. (2003), Organizational learning capability: a proposal of measurement. *journal of Business Research*, 58, pp 715-725.
 27. Kalkan, A., Bozkurt, O.C., and Arman, M., (2014). The Impacts of Intellectual Capital, Innovation and Organizational Strategy on Firm Performance, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 150(15): 700-707.
 28. Khanalizadeh, R., Kornaej, A., Fani, A.A., Moshabaki, A., (2010), The relationship between empowerment and organizational learning, University of Tarbiyat Modares, *Study of the evolution of management*, Vol. 2, No, 3, Pp.21-45.
 29. Leuci, M. S. (2005). *The role of middle leaders in fostering organizational learning in a state cooperative extension service.*" dissertation abstract ED.D". University of Missouri-columbia.
 30. Marquardt. M., (1995). Building the global learning organization in best practices in learning organizations: *Measuring the Reality*.
 31. Marr, B. (2004), Measuring and Benchmarking Intellectual, *Benchmarking: an international Journal*, Vol. 11, No.6, pp. 559-570.
 32. Miresmaeili, A., (2007), The role of knowledge management and organizational learning in smart schools and normal schools in Tehran, *New ideas in the Journal of Educational Sciences*, Vol, 2, No, 2, Pp. 150-169.
 33. Montes, F. J. L, Moreno, A. R., Morales, V. G. (2004), Influence of support Leadership and teamwork cohesion on Organizational learning, innovation and performance: an empirical examination, *Tecnovation*, 25, pp 1159-1172.
 34. Pablos, P. O., (2003). Measuring and Reporting Structural Capital, *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, Vol. 5, No.4 Pp:629-647.
 35. Panayides, P. M, (2005), The impact of Organizational learning on relationship orientation Logistics service effectiveness and performance, *Industrial Marketing Management*, 36, pp. 68-80.
 36. Peck, C. A., Gallucci, C., Sloan, T., and Lippincott, A. (2013). Organizational learning and program renewal in teacher education: A socio-cultural theory of learning, innovation and change, *Educational Research Review*, 4, (1), 16-25.
 37. Phang, C.W. Kankanhalli, A. Caizuan, A. (2008), Investigating Organizational learning in Government projects: A multi-theoretic approach. *Journal of Strategic Information systems*, 17), pp 33-123.
 38. Pike, S., Rylander, A., Roos, G.(2002) Intellectual capital: management and disclosure, In C.W. Choo, and N. Bontis (Eds). *The Strategic Management of Intellectual Capital and Organizational Knowledge*, NY: Oxford University Press.
 39. Robry, D., Boudreau, Marie-Claude, B., Rose, G. (2000) Information technology Organizational learning: review and assessment of research, *Acting. Mgmt. & Info. Tech.* 10, pp. 125-155.
 40. Saka-Helmhout, A., (2009), Organizational learning as a situated routine-based activity in international settings, *Journal of the World Business* 45, pp. 41-48.
 41. Senge, P. (1990). *The Fifth Discipline: The art and practice of learning organization*. Doubleday Dell; New York.
 42. Sharifi,A., Eslamiye, F., (2008), Relationship between organizational learning and applying information and communication technologies in the University in academic year 87-86 Garmsar, *New approach in the Journal of Educational Management*, Vol, 1, No, 2, Pp. 1-22.

43. Shuler, R. and Jackson, S. (2001). HR Issues and activities integers and acquisitions, *European Management Journal*, 239-253.
44. Skerlavaj, M., Stembergar, M. I., Skrinjar, R., Dimovski, V.(2006), Organizational learning culture-the missing link between business process change and Organizational performance, *Into J. Production Economics* 106, pp. 346 -367.
45. Skerlavaj M. Song, J.H. and Lee, Y.(2012). Organizational learning culture, innovative culture and innovations in South Korean firms, *Expert Systems with Applications*, 37(9), 6390-6403.
46. Steward, T. A. (1991). Brainpower: Intellectual Capital is becoming corporate Americans most valuable asset and can be its sharpest competitive weapon, *the challenge is to find what you have – and it. Fortun*, 123 (11): 44.
47. Steward, T. A. (1994). Your company's most valuable asset: *Intellectual capital. Fortune*, 130(7):68.
48. Steward, T. A. (1997). *Intellectual capital: The new wealth of organizations*. New York, London: Doubleday/Currency.
49. Steward, T. A. (2001). *The wealth of knowledge: Intellectual capital and the twenty first century organization*. New York: Doubleday/Currency.
50. Sullivan, P.H. (2000), *Value-driven Intellectual capital. How to Convert Intangible Corporate Assets into Market Value*, John Wiley and Sons, London.
51. Tayles, M., Bramley, A., Adshead, N. and Farr, J. (2002), Dealing with the management of Intellectual capital: The potential role of strategic management accounting, *Accounting, Auditing& Accountability Journal*, Vol.15 No.2, pp. 251-267.
52. Usoff C.A. Thibodeau J.C., and Burnaby, P., (2002). The importance of intellectual capital and its effect on performance measurement systems. *Managerial Auditing Journal*, 17, 9-15.
53. Uzumeri, M. and Nembhard, D. (1995), A population of learners: *A new way to measure organizational*.
54. Vergauwen, P. Van Alem, F (2005), Annual report IC disclosures in the Netherlands, France and Germany, *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, Vol.6 No.1, pp.89-104.
55. Yaghobi, M., Karimi, S., Javadi, m., Nikbakhat, A., (2010), The relationship between organizational learning and knowledge management component of the hospital staff selected, *Health Management*, 13(43), Pp. 64-74 (in Persian).
56. Yukl, G. (2008), Leading Organizational learning: Reflections on theory and research, *The Leadership Quarterly* 20, pp 49-53.

4/23/2016