

Analysis of Implementation of Organizational Learning Process in Toward Increasing Willingness to Learn in Institution Health Education in Surabaya

Eppy Setiyowati

Address Respondents:

UNUSA Jalan SMEA no. 57 Surabaya Tel. (031) 8284508. 8291920, 8298631, fax (031) 8298582
Hp 081355718202 Email: eppy@unusa.ac.id. Website <http://unusa.ac.id>

I. Background

University management can not be separated from components like input, process and output. Input include: student, faculty, librarians, staff (administration) and physical infrastructure. Process include: teaching and learning process. The other part of process are management and administration of education management. Output include: graduates number and graduates quality. Profile of lecturer at Faculty of Public Health, appears in Table 1.2 below:

Table 1.2 Profile of lecturer at Faculty of Public Health Based on Position in Last Three Years 2008, 2009, and 2010.

Position	Total of Lecturers					
	2008		2009		2010	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
No functional position	11	14,66	8	10,1	8	10,1
Instructor (<i>Asisten Ahli</i>)	17	22,1	21	26,58	23	29,1
Assistant Professor (<i>Lektor</i>)	24	32,0	26	32,9	26	31,6
Associate Professor (<i>Lektor Kepala</i>)	14	18,7	15	18,98	15	18,98
Professor (<i>Guru Besar</i>)	7	9,3	8	10,1	8	10,1
Total	75	100	79	100	81	100

Source : Self Evaluation of Faculty of Public Health-2010

Table 1.2 showed the academic functional position of lecturers at Faculty of Public Health in 2008 to 2010. It showed that instructor number has increased. Although there weren't lecturers who had their position down, with the addition of 6 new faculty lecturers, then there were *amapi* lecturers from 2008 to 2009 who had inadequate jobs.

The definition of performance on this study were lecturers performance in Three Principles of Higher Education which were teaching, researching and doing community service as mentioned in format of faculty lecturer workforce.

This study aims to see the issues of lecturer performance in Three Principles of Higher Education at Faculty of Public Health. This study used managerial analysis with organizational learning approaches.

The objective of this study is to analyze implementation of organizational learning process to willingness to learn, personal goals, organizational appreciation, and performance of Three Principles of Higher Education.

III. Study Method

a. Study Design:

This study was a behavioral research with quantitative design. Lecturers from two faculties were taken as sample. There were 55 lecturers from one faculty called FPKM which was used as treatment group. Another faculty called FNPKM was used as control group with 51 lecturers were taken as sample.

b. Data Collecting

1) Pre-test and post-test were used to measure the willingness to learn, personal goals, perception of organizational appreciation, and the performance of Principles of Higher Education before and after implementation of organizational learning process.

2) Conducted observations using observation sheets to see the implementation of the organizational learning process.

c. Intervention stage of the implementation of the organizational learning process for treatment group:

1) Stage 1: workshop for faculty management included: *Dekanat*, Head of Department, and Head of Education Department.

Workshop materials:

- a) Knowledge management process
- b) Organizational learning process
- c) Establishing performance framework of Three Principles of Higher Education

2) Stage II: workshop for lecturer from each department.

Workshop materials:

- a) Strategic Plan of Faculty of Public Health
- b) Resource development plan of lecturers in Faculty of Public Health

c) Establishing performance framework of Three Principles of Higher Education

3) Stage III: Implementation of the organizational learning process:

a) Innovation process

The innovation process is a process to improve the existing knowledge of public health. Renewal stage use knowledge creation method. Knowledge creation is a method to create knowledge of Public Health that has difference compare to the existing Public Health knowledge.

b) Individual learning process

Individual learning process is a process in which every lecture in each department uses knowledge management methods, include knowledge acquisition, knowledge storage, and knowledge refinement to formulate public health knowledge in accordance with the area of knowledge of each department.

c) Collective learning process

Collective learning process is a group meeting process. This process aim is to do the learning process together. Collective learning process uses knowledge transfer and knowledge sharing methods. In these methods, the Head of Department transfer and share their knowledge about Public Health concept in accordance with the area of knowledge of each department. The Public Health concept of each Department is given for being developed by the developing team.

d) The process of collaborative decision making

Collaborative decision making is a process in which Head of Faculty collaborate with all department lecturers in order to get feedback about the Public Health concept. Decision-making process method is knowledge re-use. Head of faculty collaborate with each department in order to get an agreement about Public Health concept. This concept is a foundation for Three Principles of Higher Education work plan.

IV. Study Hypothesis

H1 Willingness to learn in intervention group of implementation of the organizational learning process would be greater than the control group.

Descriptive statistical table of willingness to learn in FNPKM and FPKM as follows:

Table 5.1 Distribution of Willingness to Learn in FPKM and FNPKM

No	Variable	FPKM				FNPKM			
		Min	Max	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Mean	SD
1.	Willingness to learn (Pre)	400	420	6,6200	1,0189	430	830	6,3843	9,9466
2.	Willingness to learn (Post)	490	840	698,3636	88,2497	430	810	639,0196	99,98510
3.	Difference of willingness to learn	-130	200	36,3636	6,8755	-160	210	0,5882	8,6288

Table 5.1 showed the difference of mean of willingness to learn in FPKM was greater than of FNPKM group with a value of 36.3636, while in FNPKM was 0.5882. Standard deviation difference in FNPKM (6.8755) was lower than in FPKM (8.6288).

H2 Personal goals of intervention group of the organizational learning process implementation would be greater than in the control group. Descriptive statistical table of Personal Goals in FNPKM and FPKM as follows:

Table 5.1 Distribution of Willingness to Learn in FPKM and FNPKM

No	Variable	FPKM				FNPKM			
		Min	Max	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Mean	SD
1.	Personal Goals (Pre)	460	950	6,8782	1,0363	520	830	6,5824	8,6132
2.	Personal Goals (Post)	470	860	657,4545	91,5952	510	790	662,549	75,17561
3.	Difference of Personal Goal	-90	70	-30,3636	3,3745	-60	70	4,3137	2,9137

The mean difference of perception to organizational appreciation showed on table 5.2 Personal goals in FPKM was -30.3636 and in FNPKM was 4.3137. The standard deviation difference of FNPKM (3.3745) was higher than in FPKM (3.375).

H3 Perception to organizational appreciation of intervention group of the organizational learning process implementation be greater than in the control

group. Descriptive statistical table perception to organizational appreciation FPKM and FNPKM as follows:

Table 5.3 Distribution of Perception to Organizational Appreciation in FPKM and FNPKM

No	Variable	FPKM				FNPKM			
		Min	Max	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Mean	SD
1.	Perception to Organizational Appreciation (Pre)	30	270	1.8564	5.4862	30	270	1.800	5.0279
2.	Perception to Organizational Appreciation (Post)	60	280	188.90	53.3566	30	270	175.098	50.6901
3.	Difference of Perception to Organizational Appreciation	-180	210	3.2727	8.2440	-120	190	-4.9020	5.8150

The results showed that the mean difference of perception to organizational appreciation in FPKM was 3.2727, while in FNPKM was -4.9020. The standard deviation difference in FPKM (8.2440) was higher than FPKM (5.8150). In conclusion, the difference of mean and standard deviation of perception to organizational appreciation in FPKM was higher than FNPKM.

H4 Performance of intervention group of the organizational learning process implementation would be greater than in control group. Descriptive statistical table performance FPKM and FNPKM as follows:

Table 5.4 Performance Distribution in FPKM and FNPKM

No	Variable	FPKM				FNPKM			
		Min	Max	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Mean	SD
1.	Performance (Pre)	9	25	14,0702	3,99469	9	18	11,3725	2,09724
2.	Performance (Post)	9	23	12,9818	2,6140	9	17	11,5294	2,05283
3.	Difference of Performance	-12	6	-1,0909	3,76274	-8	6	0,1569	2,94192

As shown for performance distribution in table 5.4, the mean difference of performance in FPKM was -1,0909 and in FNPKM was 0,1569. The results have also revealed that standard deviation difference in FPKM (3.76274) was higher than in FNPKM (2.94192).

MANCOVA analysis results: The effects of the implementation of the organizational learning process to willingness to learn, personal goals, organizational appreciation and performance are shown in table 5.5 below:

Table 5.5 MANCOVA test results: The effects implementation of organizational learning process

No	Independent variable	Covariate variable	Dependent variable	Results (Sig P)	Explanation
1.	Willingness to learn (pre)		Willingness to learn (post)	0,001	Significant
2.	Personal goals (pre)		Personal goals (post)	0,805	Not significant
3.	Perception to Organizational Appreciation (pre)		Perception to Organizational Appreciation (post)	0,349	Not significant
4		Performance (pre)	Performance (post)	0,004	Significant

Table 5.5 showed that the implementation of the organizational learning process did not significantly affect the personal goals and perception to organizational appreciation ($p = 0.805$, $p = 0.349$) while the willingness to learn and the performance showed a significant effect ($p = 0.001$, $p = 0.004$). It could be concluded that hypothesis 1 and hypothesis 4 were accepted while hypothesis 2 and hypothesis 3 were rejected.

IV. Observation Result

There was no organizational learning process happened in FNPKM faculty. However, some processes such as knowledge creation, knowledge acquisition, knowledge storage, knowledge refinement, knowledge sharing, knowledge transfer, and knowledge re-use, had occurred in observed department. Knowledge re-use process could not be observed completely because of time limit. Decision results between Dean and Head of Department would be informed to author..

Author could participate and did an observation in every department in FPKM. Many variations found in the implementation of the organizational learning process. Although occurred not in sequence, the organizational learning process was occurred in accordance with the agenda that had been planned.

V. Conclusion

The main objective of this study is to increase the willingness to learn, personal goals, perception to appreciation and lecturers performance at Faculty of Public Health through the implementation of the organizational learning process.

The pre and post measurements of difference of the willingness to learn in FPKM and FNPKM faculty as shown in table 5.1 revealed that the implementation of the organizational learning process has showed improvements. However, initiation for the implementation of the organizational learning process in FPKM and FPKM faculty is needed to maintain its continuity.

Mean difference of pre and post measurements of personal goals in FNPKM and FPKM faculty showed improvements, as shown in Table 5.2. Initiation for the implementation of the organizational learning process in FPKM and FNPKM faculty is needed to make it occurs continuously.

Table 5.3 showed a good change of mean difference of pre and post measurements of organizational appreciation perception in FPKM and FNPKM faculty. However, initiation for the implementation of the organizational learning process in FPKM and FPKM faculty is needed to maintain its continuity

Mean difference of performance measurement in FPKM and FNPKM faculty showed a good change, as shown in Table 5. 4. In order to keep the organizational learning process occurs continuously, then an initiation is needed.

Mancova analysis obtained results as shown in Table 5.5 showed that the independent variables are the willingness to learn (Pre), personal goals (pre), perception of organizational appreciation (pre). The covariate variable is the performance (pre). The dependent variables are the willingness to learn (post), personal goals (post), perception of the appreciation organizations (post) and performance (post). From the Mancova test results showed that the implementation of the organizational learning process significantly affected the willingness to learn and performance. The implementation of the organizational learning process did not significantly affect the perception of personal goals and the organizational appreciation.

Reference

- Albescu,F., Pugna,I, Paraschiv,D., 2009. *Cross culture knowledge Management*, Academy of economic studies, Bucharest. Informatica Economica Vol.13,No. 4/2009.
- Aggestam, L.2006. *Learning organization or pengelolaan pengetahuan which came first, the chicken or the egg?*. Information teknologi and control, 2006, vol.35.No.3A.ISSN 1392-124X
- Buschor, C.Bieri., Forrer Esther., Merki, K, Maag., 2002. *The Willingness of young Swiss to learn in continuing education and training : initial finding from a survey og young adults*. Journal Education & Training, vol. 44. No 4/5 pp 224-232 ISSN: 0040-0912.
- Bowo Dwinantyo,2009. *Manajemen Perguruan Tinggi*.
<http://manajemenpendidikantinggi.blogspot.com>
- Castaneda, D. I. and Rios, M. F 2007 . “*From Individual Learning to Pembelajaran organisasi.*” The Electronic Journal of Pengelolaan pengetahuan Volume 5 Issue 4, pp. 363 - 372, available online at www.ejkm.com
- Cliff Figalo & Nancy Rhine, 2002. *Building the Pengelolaan pengetahuan Network*. Printed in the United States of America. ISBN : 0-471-21549-X
- Dalkir, K. 2005. *Pengelolaan pengetahuan in Theory and Practice*, Elsevier Inc.All right reserved. McGill University
- Figuroa, A.H et.al, 2006. *Management of knowledge, information and pembelajaran organisasi* in University Libraries. Libri, 2006, vol.56,pp.180-190. ISSN 0024-2667
- Gaspersz.V (1997) *Manajemen Kualitas Dalam Industri Jasa* .Gramedia Pustaka Utama Jakarta
- Gardner and Lambert (2001): “ *Attitudes,motivation and willingness to communicate in their second language: students’ experiences in intensive French and Intensive English*”. (Yuki Hashimoto, University of Hawai’I, Journal Second Language Studies, 20 (2) Spring 2002, pp29-70).
- Gibbons, F.X., Gerrard,M., Blanton,H., & Russel,D.W (1998). *Reasoned action & social reaction: willingness and intention as independent predictors of health risk*. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74, 1164-1181.
- Gibbons, F.X., 2005. *Intention, Expectation, and Willingness*. Iowa State University
<http://www.cancercontrol.cancer.gov/brp/constructt/intent.expect.willingness/iew/html>

- Hasibuan, Malayu S.P. 2003 *Manajemen: Dasar Pengertian dan Masalah*, Bumi Aksara, Jakarta
- Jenny Darroch, 2005, *Knowledge Management, Innovation and Performance*, Journal of knowledge management, Vol.9 N0.3, pp. 101-105. Emerald Group Publishing Limited, ISSN 1367-3270
- [Jose A. Fadul](#). 2006 Collective Learning: Applying Distributed Cognition for Collective Intelligence, *The International Journal of Learning*, [Volume 16, Issue 4](#), pp.211-220.
- Julia Braham, Carol Elston, 2010. *Listening and Interpersonal Skills Review*. Learning Area Coordinator, University of Leeds.
- Harpe, B de la., David, Chritina, Dalton Helen, Thomas, Jan. 2009. *Are confidence and willingness the key to the assessment of graduate attributes?*. ATN Assessment Conference 2009, RMIT University.
- Indone, I.I. Alexandru, 2009. *Measuring the Performance of Corporate Knowledge Management Systems; Ioan Cuza University of Iasi, Faculty of Economic and Business Administration*. Informatica Economic Vol.13, no. 4/2009.
- Jones, P.M. *Collaborative Knowledge Management, Social Networks, and Pembelajaran organisasi*. NASA Ames Research Center. Human Factors Research and Tachnology Division Mail Stop 262-11 Moffett Field CA 94035. pmjones@mail.arc.nasa.gov
- Khaty L. 2008. *Step Six and the Principle of Willingness*. <http://www.bellaonline.com/article/art44832.asp>
- Kim Smith, 2009. **Innovation in Public Education: Problems and Opportunities**. Newschools Venture Fund
- King, R William, 2009. *Pengelolaan pengetahuan and Pembelajaran organisasi*, Springer Dordrecht Heidelberg London New York
- Kuntoro, 2009. *Dasar Filosofis Metodologis Penelitian*, Pustaka Melati, Surabaya
- Kwan , A (2006) *Helping University Student Improve Learning Motivation*. City University of Hong Kong Kowloon, Hong Kong.
- Leebov W. & Scott G. (1994) *Service Quality Improvement. The Customer Satisfaction Strategy for Health Care*. American Hospital Publishing, Inc. an American Hospital Association Company.
- Mark Youman, 2009. Collaborative Decision-Making. ICF International 9300 Lee Highway Fairfax, Virginia 22031 myouman@icfi.com

- Madelon L. Finkel, 2011. *Public health in the 21st century*. Praeger An Imprint of ABC-CLIO, LLC Santa Barbara, California, Oxford, England. ISBN 978-0-313-37553-8 (ebook : vol. 3)
- McElroy, MW, 2000. *Integrating complexity theory, pengelolaan pengetahuan and pembelajaran organisasi*. Journal of knowledge management, vol.4. 3.2000.pp 195-203 MCB University Press.ISSN 1367-3270.
- Moleong L.J, 2012 . *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. PT Remaja Rosdakarya Offset Bandung
- Murray E.Jennex. 2008. *Current Issue in Knowledge Management*. San Diego State University, USA
- Nonaka I & Takeuchi H, 1995. *The knowledge Creating Company*. New York Oxford. Oxford University Press.
- Omachonu, V.K (2000) *Quality of Care and the Patient: New Criteria for Evaluation*. Health Care Management Review. Vol 15 (4)
- Pawitra,T (1993). *Pemasaran: Dimensi Falsafah, Disiplin dan Keahlian*. Jakarta. Penerbit Sekolah Tinggi Manajemen Prasetya Mulya.
- Polito,T., Waston, K., 2008. *Toward an interdisciplinary Pembelajaran organisasi Framework*, East Carolina University, Greenville ,NC., Marist College, Poughkeepsie,NY
- Robbin,S,P. and Coulter,M. 1999. *Management*. Prentice Hall, Inc. Englewood Cliffs.
- Robbin, S,P and Judge T,A . 2005 *Organizational Behavior*, Twelfth Edition, Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Ruth A., 2008., *Employees' Willingness to Participate in Implementation of organizational Change* ., Organizational Vadyba , , 46. ISSN 1392-1142
- Saade, R George, Faail Nebeba, Tak Mak. 2009. *The Role of Instrinc Motivation in System Adoption: A cross – Cultural Perspective*. Journal of Information, Information Technology and Organizations. Vol.4
- SK-DirjenDiktiN048-EWMP, 1983. *Beban Tugas Tenaga Pengajar Pada Perguruan Tinggi Negeri Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Tinggi*
- Senge,P.M 1990. *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York,New York Doubleday.
- Smith, H.A., 2009. *Exploring strategies for deploying pengelolaan pengetahuan tools and technologies*. *Queen's school of business*, Queen's University

- Kingston.Ontorio, Canada K7L 3N6. *Journal of information science and technology*, 6 (3) 2009.
- Sonnentag, S. 2002. *Psychological Management of Individual Performance*. Technical University of Braunschweig, Germany. ISBN: 0-471-87726-3
- Siu Loon Hoe. 2007. *Is interpersonal trust a necessary condition for pembelajaran organisasi? Journal of Organizational Transformation and Sosial Change* , The University of Western Australia. Vol.4 No.2. 2007.
- Sutarto, 2002. *Dasar-Dasar Organisasi*. Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Sugiono, 2007. *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung; Alfabeta
- Suharsimi, Arikunto. 2010. *Manajemen Penelitian*. PT Rineka Cipta Jakarta
- Setiarso Bambang. 2003. Teori, Pengembangan dan Model“ *Organizational Pengelolaan pengetahuan Systems (OKMS)*” Email: setiarso@pdii.lipi.go.id
- Tjiptono, F (1997). *Strategi Pemasaran*. Edisi II. Penerbit Andi Yogyakarta.
- Van Winkelen,C and McKenzie,J. *Integrating individual and pembelajaran organisasi initiatives: working across pengelolaan pengetahuan and human resource management functional boundaries*. The electric journal of pengelolaan pengetahuan Vol.5 Issue 4, pp 527-538.