

# The Development of Learning Organization Model for Cooperate University in Thailand

Pakorn Akkakanjanasupar<sup>1</sup>,  
David B. Hopkins<sup>2</sup>,  
Hemanta Raj Dahal<sup>3</sup>,  
and Neha Khetrapal<sup>4</sup>

Siam Technology College, Thailand  
<sup>1</sup>pakorna@siamtechno.ac.th

**Abstract** - In Thailand, there are three institutions where they are cooperate universities managed by the companies underlying the teaching and learning to design the employees for particular tasks that the companies actually need to have for the coming future. This indicates the quality levels of learning organization in the Thailand cooperate universities have applied, that they are becoming strong in educational management and adjusting themselves toward the globalization era. When it comes to the rapid changes in the educational field, it might be unclear in the concept of the learning organization, (Senge, 1990), however these companies will be able to give the better understanding of the learning organization for the higher educational institutions in another context. In this study, the researcher will focus on the development of learning organization model for cooperate universities in Thailand. Indeed, its research methodology is designed as mixed methods which are assigned into 3 phases; 1) qualitative, 2) quantitative, and 3) qualitative, and these three phases are appropriately and particularly designed based on the different population, sample, instrumentation, data collection and analysis. In each phase will give better and clearer understandings on the development of learning organization model for this research.

**Keywords** - Learning Organization, Cooperate Universities, Educational Management

## I. INTRODUCTION

Among rapidly changing world, the era of globalization has played an important role in many dimensions of countries; societies, economics, politics, and sciences as the whole world. Consequently, it causes very high competitions in many of individuals and organizations, and defiantly no one wants to get out of the line. Of course, for all, this time has been concerned very importantly as an agenda of strategies to approve the changing underlying development plans and policies. Taking benefits or advantages from the globalized situation depends on a capacity to access suitable adaptations particularly and appropriately. In many countries, they have considered standard education as a tool taking advantage among the competitions of them all. When they want to develop the performances on the competitions, they absolutely consider the educational organizations where they actually generate quality human resource of nations. Similarly, the schools approve the changing as a responsiveness to improve and develop themselves within limited skills and resources.

With this particular dilemma, it was directly introduced to human resource development. The human resource development has been applied to develop individuals' abilities in organizations by providing them activities, educating, and training. Nadler (1970) defined it as a series of organized activities to produce behavioral change with intended purposes to develop competencies, and to engage the employee move with the organization.

According to a study conducted by Kumpikaite (2008), the human resource development (HRD) is a process to reach the best possible organizational result. The HRD does not engage only employees, but it also bounds the educational organizations that lead the employees whom are trained in the direction of organizational goals.

Nowadays, in the 21<sup>st</sup> century as the informative technology world; there are much and more expanded information and knowledge increasing continuously. Knowledge management (KM) has been considered to facilitate and share knowledge among the employees and organizations particularly to HRD. Davenport (1994) defined knowledge management as a process of capturing, distributing, and effectively using knowledge.

## **II. RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

1. What are conditions of the learning organization in the corporate universities in Thailand?

2. What are the components of learning organization found the current status of the corporate universities in Thailand?

3. How the model of learning organization of the corporate universities in Thailand should be?

## **III. RESEARCH OBJECTIVE**

1. To study the conditions of learning organization in the corporate universities in Thailand.

2. To analyze the components of learning organization found in the corporate universities in Thailand.

3. To develop the model of learning organization for the corporate universities in Thailand.

## **IV. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

This study aims to study the conditions of learning organization and the components of

learning organization found of the three corporate universities in Thailand: 1) Panyapiwat Institute of Management, 2) Nation University, and 3) Shinawatra University, and to develop the model of learning organization of the corporate universities in Thailand. The researcher sets up theoretical framework based the related concepts in documents from the experts in learning organization as follows.

The learning organization is for learning company as the strategy for sustainable development by Peddler and his faculties (1991), there are five components: 1) strategy, 2) looking in, 3) structure, 4) looking out, and 5) learning opportunities.

David Garvin (1993) introduced the learning organization as the organization where there are creatively transferring knowledge and able to change behavioral approach regardless to new knowledge and intuition. They are five components comprising; 1) systematic problem solving, 2) experiment with new approach, 3) learning from their own experience and history, 4) learning from the experiences and best practices of others, and 5) transferring knowledge quickly and efficiently.

The concept of learning organization by Michele J. Marquardt (1996) with the principal that tends to take advantages over the high competitions and develop to be sustainable organization with its environments. This concept is consisted of five components: 1) learning dynamic, 2) organization transformation, 3) people empowerment, 4) knowledge management, and 5) technology application.

As for the leadership theory and practice literature by Richard L. Daft (1999), his learning organization practice is created to focus on designing continuously learning. This concept is considered into five elements: 1) structure, 2) empowerment, 3) network, 4) strategy, and 5) adaptive culture.

Kaiser (2000) proposed eight components that influence the being of learning organization: 1) leadership, 2) organization culture, 3) mission and strategy, 4) management

practices, 5) organizational structure, 6) organizational systems, 7) working climate, and 8) motivation.

Furthermore, Karen Watkins and Victoria Marsick (2003) developed the dimensions of the learning organization for assessing learning activities within the organization. They have described that there are total seven dimensions required in order to become the learning organization as follows: 1) create continuous learning opportunities, 2) promote inquiry and dialogue, 3) encourage collaboration and team learning, 4) create systems to capture and share learning, 5) empower people toward a collective vision, 6) connect the enterprise to its environment, and 7) provide strategic leadership for learning.

The fifth discipline of learning organization by Peter M. Senge (2006) has introduced five components: 1) personal mastery, 2) mental model, 3) shared vision, 4) team learning, and 5) system thinking.

According to David Garvin, Amy Edmondson, and Francesco Gino's discipline on learning organization (2008), This concept of learning organization is constructed with three building blocks: 1) supportive learning environment, 2) concrete learning processes and practices, and 3) leadership that reinforces learning.

Additionally, the researcher will also recruit key supervisors (principal or exclusive management level) in the corporate universities in Thailand in order to include their perspectives and comments on learning organization in this study.

Therefore, all of these concepts and theories found in the study and related components on the learning organization found from the key supervisors and the experts, specifically included the results from qualitative data analysis from the key informants in the institution.

## **V. BACKGROUND INFORMATION OF CORPORATE UNIVERSITIES IN THAILAND**

Corporate university is a university that is set up by a private company and particularly designed to develop and train workers in skills that match the requirements of a job. The emergence of corporate university concept stems from the need of corporations to build capacity and improve performance of their human resources. As a result, the teaching methods and learning processes are created with a specific goal of ensuring that their staff members gain necessary professional exposure.

The establishment of corporate universities serves as a crucial link that connects industries and sectors as knowledge, among other things, is transferred from businesses to individuals, shaping and creating a new workforce that is better aligned with private sector labor market needs.

With the most extensive network of partnerships, ranging from suppliers and financial institutions to private companies and educational institutions, this cross-sector collaboration is the cornerstone of our Institute that enriches and provides a rare opportunity for students to gain a fuller and broader learning experience that extends beyond.

Today, the concept of corporate university is undoubtedly a growing trend that is quickly gaining traction among the world's leading companies wishing to elevate their organizational capability and performance. There are three corporate universities in Thailand; Panyapiwat Institute of Management, Nation University, and Shinawatra University.

With the support from the private sector, the corporate universities focus on improvement of the educational quality, human capital development, and creation of new bodies of knowledge to effectively meet the country's needs. For example, there is a pressing issue of competitiveness and labor force capacity that will need to be properly addressed to adequately prepare for Thailand's shift to a

service-based economy which will lead to rapid urbanization driven by infrastructure investments and improvements in farming. In this respect, the application of the body of knowledge and local wisdom will hold the key to boosting the value of Thai economy.

“In any private organizations there are vast archives of bodies of knowledge, which is something that universities lack. When developing their curricular most universities have to turn to professionals and learn from their work experiences. However, In Thailand there already are three wealth of knowledge corporate universities and they are experts in their fields, management, innovative technology communication, and journalism.

The knowledge they impart to students in the classroom are practical know-how based on real-work situations. And when the students’ degrees are tailored to match their career aspirations, during their studies they will not be wondering why they are taking this or that class, or whether the knowledge is useful or applicable. Likewise, employers can rest assure that our job-ready graduates will be up to the job and able to execute work efficiently. This is what sets these corporate universities apart from conventional universities.

## REFERENCES

**(Arranged in the order of citation in the same fashion as the case of Footnotes.)**

- [1] Basim, H., Sesen, H., and Korkmazyurek, H. (2007). “A Turkish Translation, Validity and Reliability Study of the Dimensions of the Learning Organization Questionnaire”. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, Vol. 2(4), p. 368-374.
- [2] Berson, Y., Nemanich, L., Waldman, D., Galvin, B., and Keller, R. (2006). “Leadership and organizational learning: A multiple levels perspective”. *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 17(6), p. 577-594.
- [3] Best, J.W. (1997). “Research in Education (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.)”. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- [4] Bowen, G., Ware, W., Rose, R., and Powers, J. (2007). “Assessing the Functioning of Schools as Learning Organizations”. *Children & Schools*, Vol. 29(4), p. 199-208.
- [5] Brown, R.B. (1996). “Organizational Commitment: Clarifying the Concept and Simplifying the Existing Construct Typology”. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 49(3), p. 230-251.
- [6] Carson, K.D. and Carson, P.P. (2002). “Differential Relationships Associated With Two Distinct Dimensions of Continuance Commitment”. *International Journal Organization Theory and Behavior*, Vol. 5(3-4), p. 359-381.
- [7] Chang, S. and Lee, M. (2007). “A study on relationship among leadership, organizational culture, the operation of learning organization and employees' job satisfaction”. *The Learning Organization*, Vol. 14(2), p. 155-185.
- [8] Creating a world-class education system in Ohio. (2007). Washington: Achieve, Inc.
- [9] Cronbrach, L.J. (1970). “Essentials of Psychological Test (5<sup>th</sup> Ed.)”. New York: Harper Collins.
- [10] Davenport, T. (1994). “Saving IT's Soul: Human Centered Information Management”. *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 72(2), p. 119-131.
- [11] Finegan, J.E. (2000). “The impact of person and organizational values on organizational commitment”. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 73(2), p. 149-169.
- [12] Fletcher, C. (1997). “Appraisal: Routes to improved performance”. London: Institute of Personnel and Development.
- [13] Garvin, D.A. (1993). “Building a learning organization”. *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 71(4), p. 78-91.
- [14] Garvin, D., Edmondson, A., and Gino, F. (2008). “Is Yours a Learning Organization?”. *Harvard Business Review*, p. 3-3.
- [15] Gelade, G.A., Dobson, P., and Gilbert, P. (2006). “National Differences In Organizational Commitment: Effect of Economy, Product of Personality, or Consequence of Culture?”. *Journal of*

- Cross-Cultural Psychology, Vol. 37(5), p. 542-556.
- [16] Gilbert, J.A. and Ivancevich, J.M. (1999). "Organizational diplomacy: The bridge for managing diversity". *Human Resource Planning*, Vol. 22(3), p. 29-39.
- [17] Hackett, R.D., Bycio, P., and Hausdorf, P.A. (1994). "Further assessments of Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model of organizational commitment". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 79(1), p. 15-23.
- [18] Herscovitch, L. and Meyer, J.P. (2002). "Commitment to organizational change: Extension of a three-component model". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 87(3), p. 474-487.
- [19] Huber, G. (1991). "Organizational Learning: The Contributing Processes and the Literatures". *Organization Science*, Vol. 2(1), p. 88-115.
- [20] Kadir, M.B., Salim, M., and Kamarudin, H. (2012). "The Relationship Between Educational Support and Entrepreneurial Intentions in Malaysian Higher Learning Institution". *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 69, p. 2164 - 2173.
- [21] Kanter, R.M. (1968). "Commitment and Social Organization: A Study of Commitment Mechanisms in Utopian Communities". *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 33(4), p. 499.
- [22] Krejcie, R.V. and Morgan, D.W. (1970). "Determining sample size for research activities". *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, Vol. 30, p. 607-610.
- [23] Kaiser, S.M. (2000). "Mapping the Learning Organization: Exploring A Model of Organizational Learning (Doctoral Dissertation)".