

The Relationship between Organizational Trust and Organizational Learning among Faculty Members

Maryam Rahmanimanesh¹, Badri Shahtalebi² and Mohsen Zamani Cheryani³

¹Department of Educational Sciences, Khorasgan (Isfahan) Branch, Islamic Azad University Isfahan, Iran

²Department of Educational Sciences, Khorasgan (Isfahan) Branch, Islamic Azad University Isfahan, Iran

³Department of Educational Sciences, Khorasgan (Isfahan) Branch, Islamic Azad University Isfahan, Iran

Abstract: The present study was conducted to examine the relationship between the organizational trust and the organizational learning among faculty members at Azad University of Khorasgan (Esfahan) in 2011-2012 in a descriptive-correlational way. The statistical population of the current study was all 310 faculty members at Azad University of Khorasgan (Esfahan) from whom 172 were selected through Kokran (1994) sampling formula and clustered random sampling suitable for the sample size to take part in the study. The research instrument were Mayer and Davis (1999) and Macknight et.al (2002) standard questionnaire of organizational trust which was confirmed by Ellonen et.al (2008) as well as Gomez et.al (2005) standard questionnaire of organizational learning. The questionnaires' face validity and reliability was proved. Their reliability, too, was calculated 0.91 for organizational learning questionnaire and 0.98 for organizational trust through Cronbach alpha coefficient. In order to analyze the research data, the descriptive statistics including the average, percentage, standard deviation and frequency and also the inferential statistics involving correlation coefficient and step-by-step regression were applied. The results of analysis indicated that there is a significant relationship between all aspects of organizational trust including lateral trust, vertical trust, institutional trust, and organizational learning ($P < 0/05$). According to determination coefficient 47.7%, 63.2%, and 61.5 % of the variance has been common between lateral trust, vertical trust and institutional trust with organizational learning. Moreover, there has been a significant relationship among the aspects of organizational trust with the aspects of organizational learning; i.e. managerial commitment, systematic view, openness and experimentation, knowledge transfer and integration. The results of step-by-step regression showed that the best predictor of organizational learning at first step was vertical trust, at second step, lateral trust and at third step institutional trust.

[Maryam Rahmanimanesh, Badri Shahtalebi and Mohsen Zamani Cheryani. **The Relationship between Organizational Trust and Organizational Learning among Faculty Members.** *Life Sci J* 2012;9(4):4926-4935] (ISSN:1097-8135). <http://www.lifesciencesite.com>. 739

Keywords: organizational trust, lateral trust, vertical trust, institutional trust, organizational learning, faculty members

Introduction

As new organizational behavior faces increasingly complexities; it is necessary for managers and staff of organizations to know these complexities and suitable strategies to deal with them. Trust-based management is a new expression of an old thought whose place in today relationships is well defined and utilizing its mechanisms can be effective in obtaining organizational and individual effectiveness. There is a fact in management world which is called "environmental selection". On this basis, environment usually and with absolute atrophy selects among existing competitors in a special working area, and the organizations which are able to respond better to environmental requests and attract their staff's trust and try to keep it, will emit their competitors from competition field (Zarei Matin & Hassanzadeh, 2004, p 80). Therefore, desired performance depends on various variables including trust and learning. Trust is undeniable as an important

factor in planning and making required atmosphere to rear and train human capital and more importantly to keep human legacy (Mohseni Tabrizi & Shirali, 2009). In addition, Driks & Ferrin's overview of the history of role of trust in organizational environments indicates that trust has direct or modulatory effects on desired performance and behavioral consequences variables. In their overview, trust facilitates other determinants on performance and behavioral consequences, as trust provide conditions in which certain consequences including organizational learning more possibly occur (Driks & Ferrin, 2001). In his research, Dodgson (1993) has stated three reasons for increasing organizations' interests in organizational learning issue; he believes learning of organization has found a great deal of popularity among organizations which look for adjustment and accountability to environmental changes. He also believes that technological changes and broad analytical value of organizational learning are reasons

of increasing organizations' interests in learning and desired performance (Templeton, Morris, Synder & Lewis, 2004). As punditshave emphasized, learning should be the focus of duties of university. In dimension of education, these institutes should provide possible learning opportunities on one hand, and help students, faculties and other staff to gain skills, attitudes and knowledge which increase the zeal to continue learning and the ability to do it, on the other hand. Achieving this goal seems to be possible in the light of organizational trust (Karimi, Nasr & Boghratian, 2009, p 164). Blomqvist & Sthale (2000) believe that trust has a significant role in increasing organizational partnership. Trust between individuals and organizations leads to form regular and logical relationships and interactions and be an opportunity to cooperate organizations, thereby increase organizational investments (Farhang, 2010). The level of trust on individuals relates to the level of their ability. Also, different duties can be given to staff according to the level of trust. The concept of trust in human relationships has attracted a lot of attention. Most of the literature about human relations has focused on defining to develop and maintain trust (Franklin, 2004). Organizational trust is considered as individuals' positive expectations. This kind of trust refers to individuals' expectations of qualification, reliability and benevolence of organizational member and also institutional trust between individual and organization (Mayer et al, 1995; Macknight et al, 1998). Organizational trust includes both impersonal and interpersonal trust. Interpersonal trust can be categorized into two dimensions:

- A) Horizontal trust which refers to trust among staff.
- B) Vertical trust which refers to trust between employees and employers (Costigan et al, 1998)

This trust might be on basis of qualification, reliability and benevolence (Mayer & Davis, 1999). Institutional trust is on basis of roles, systems and expressions which are perceived interpretations about a person's reliability. In most cases, institutional trust is determined by efficiencyand adequacy of broad organizational systems such as human recourse policy (Costigan et al, 1998).

Table 1: indicators of trust in other studies

Authors	Used indicators in other studies
Salmons (1960)	Benevolence
Jones, James & Brone (1975)	Ability, behaviors related to individual needs and desires
Gabaro (1978)	clearness, previous results and achievements
Larseler & Hoston (1980)	Benevolence, honesty
Lieberman (1981)	Qualification, honesty
Batlor (1991)	Availability, qualification, compatibility, caution, justice, honesty, loyalty, clearness
Ring, Van di Van (1992)	Honesty, morality and goodwill

(Reference: Mohammad JavadGhorbani, 2007, p 11)

Mayer et al (1995) consider ability, benevolence and honesty (reliability) as three elements of trust.

- 1) Ability has been defined as a set of skills, eligibility and characteristics of a department which can affect others. This is why trusted person may have high abilities in some skills which increase the possibility of being trust by others.
- 2) Benevolence is a range in which trusted person believes that he wants to do a good job for truster and there is no motivation of gaining benefit for trusted person within this range, benevolence represents that trusted person has certain achievements for truster. An example of these achievementsis communicating between trusted person and truster. Trusted person wants to help truster, however he is not required to help and there is no external reward for him.
- 3) Honesty (reliability) includes perception of truster about this fact that trusted person is committed to a set of principles which is also acceptable for truster.

Each of above dimensions is important in trust process and yet is different from each other but it does not mean that they are independent from each other. They have an inextricablelink (Mayer et al, 1995). Trust dimensions in Simons's studies (2002) are similar to those presented by Mayer et al which include ability-based trust, honesty-based trust and benevolence-based trust. Ability-based trust states that individual (member) believes that other members of the team have required knowledge, skill, experience and intelligence. Honesty-based trust is an extent in which a member believes that members of team are reliable and honest and benevolence-based trust refers to the extent in which individual believes other members of team act in the direction of his benefits and interest (Simons, 2002). So, according to previous reviewed studies and researches, it can be found that three factors, ability, benevolence, honesty, have been used as the main effective factors on trust, in most conducted researched on trust.

Dimensions which constitute organizational trust include two dimensions which the first one is interpersonal trust and many dimensions have been given and used to measure interpersonal trust in the literature by different researches and pundits. Ability, honesty, reliability, qualification, hopefulness, tendency, veracity, dependence and . . . are some constitutive dimensions of interpersonal trust (Chathote et al, 2011, 2007). The next dimension is impersonal trust which includes two dimensions: normative trust and structural trust.

Normative trust, in fact, is trust of situational norms which roots in appearance. This imagine that people and objects are ordinary and natural and everything is in its right place, comes from this approach. With respect to this definition, when an organization places in a normal situation, normative trust means that the possibility of organization is high. ellonen et al believe that normative trust includes three main indicators as below:

A) Benevolence and trust:

Include individual's belief on this issue that organization meets its commitments and there is coordination between organization's action and speech. On the other hand, individuals consider the organization as a benevolentone, as pays attentions to staff equally and pays a special attention to their well being and future and always considers benefits of all members.

B) Vision, Strategy and Communication:

Include individual's belief on this fact that organization director has a strong strategic vision to face to future challenges and can direct the organization well; this trust requires that individual be aware of how to do actions in the organization.

C) qualification:

Involves interpersonal technical skills and knowledge and refers to individual's trust about this fact that organization has update, advanced technologies, and high quality working processes are to ongoing improve. On the other hand, the individual believes that organization director has enough managerial skills and ability (ellonen et al, 2008).

The next dimension which constitutes impersonal trust is structural trust. Structural trust represents required underlying conditions such as information systems, human resource management approaches, and . . . to achieve organizational trust (ellonen et al, 2008).

On the other hand, huge organizations with traditional structures do not have the required ability and flexibility to be aligned with changes of environmental surrounded especially with respect to globalization issues, so they have to either change structurally or be equipped with such tools to gain the ability to deal with universal

changes, for their survival. One of the most important tools is creating a learner organization and internalizing organizational learning (Khalili Araghi, 2003). Gomez et al have also defined organizational learning as gaining or creating knowledge, transfer it and integrating it. On this basis, they have considered these three organizational processes as the ability of organization to process knowledge. On the other word, they have defined organizational learning as the ability to create, gain, transfer and integrate knowledge and modify organization's behavior to reflect the new situation with an attitude to improve organization's performance. Gomez et al have noted that four conditions are essential to develop organizational learning ability: first, organization director should provide a strong support for organizational learning and support programs on it. Second, presence of a collective intelligence to see the organization systematically and presence of a common perspective among staff are necessary in the organization. i.e. staff should be consciously be able to see the entire organization and its problems, comprehensively. Third, organization needs to develop organizational knowledge by transferring and integrating individual obtained knowledge. Fourth, only compatibility and adaptation to changes of environment is not enough to make learning as a source of creating competitive advantage, but the organization should move beyond adaptive learning which is only adapting to changes of environment and should reach to generative learning so that the organization can make a change with its values and in the environment and this kind of learning requires an open mind and experimental behavior (Gomez et al, 2005).

In Gomez's point of view, dimensions of organizational learning include:

1. **Manager's commitment to organizational learning:** manager should understand the importance of learning and create a culture in which achieving, creating and transferring knowledge are considered as a core value in the organization. Manager should state clearly that learning is strategic, as organizational learning is a valuable tool to gain long run results (Sinckula, 1994; Stata, 1989; Garcia et al, 2007). Manager should also make sure that staff understands the importance of learning, since it is a fundamental factor in organization's achievement.
2. **Systemic vision:** systemic approach requires gathering organization's member around a public entity. Different individuals, departments and organizational atmospheres should have a clear attitude of organization goals and know that how to contribute to development (Gomez et al, 2005, p 717). Organization should be considered as a

system that although it constitutes of different parts with special functions, it works coordinately with each other (Stata, 1989; Leonard Barton, 1992).

3. **Open atmosphere and experimentation:** generative learning or learning of second loop needs an open atmosphere in which new ideas and opinions are valued inside or outside of the organization. This kind of learning also causes to improve, renew and expand individual knowledge all the time (Leonard Barton, 1992; Slocum et al, 1994; Sinkula, 1994). Creating an open area requires manager's commitment to create a variety of duties and cultures in the organizations, so that there is a readiness to accept all kinds of opinions, experiences and also learning from them. Also, it should be avoided from egocentricity-based approaches which consider individual values, opinions and experiences better than others'. Experience needs a cultural atmosphere to be a suitable bed for creation, the ability to do important actions and readiness to do controlled risks to support this idea of one can learn from others' errors (Gomez et al, 2005, p 717).
4. **Transferring and integrating knowledge:** fourth capability returns to two completely related processes, that is, transferring and integrating inter knowledge. Instead of being sequent, these two processes occur simultaneously. Efficiency of these two processes depends on the presence of previous capacity in capturing knowledge. The absorbing capacity is the ability to recognize, achieve, understand and utilizing knowledge and it can remove internal obstacles in the organization (Yaghoubi et al, 2010; Farhang, 2010). Transferring refers to internally passing along the obtained knowledge on individual level, particularly through conversation and interaction between people (on the other word, through communication, conversations and mental debate). Easy communication is more based on presence of a quick information system which guarantees accuracy and availability of information. In regard to conversation and discussion, working teams and staff' meetings are ideal forms of freely sharing ideas. Team learning places on a higher level of individual learning which includes transferring, interpreting and combining achieved knowledge, individually. This combination of knowledge resulted in creating connected bodies of knowledge which are originated in organizational culture, working processes and other components which constitute organizational memory.

Therefore, knowledge can be recovered and used in different situations appropriately, so that guarantees ongoing learning of the organization despite to natural turnover of organization's members (Hajipour & Nazarpour Kashani, 2010, p 187).

Different studies try to explain the relationship between these two variables including the study of Taheri Lari et al (2012) which is called the relationship between organizational trust, organizational learning and entrepreneurship, they concluded that there is a relationship between horizontal, vertical, institutional trust and organizational learning. The general conclusion of this study is that increasing in organizational trust causes to increasing the level of organizational learning. And similarly, Farhang's study (2010) on the relationship between organizational learning, organizational trust and the expansion of staff in Medical and non-Medical governmental universities in east south of Iran showed that there is a significant relationship between horizontal, vertical, institutional trust and organizational learning. In foreign studies, in can be referred to Janowicz & Noorderhaven's study (2009) called understanding the role of organizational learning and trust which concluded that organizational trust influences sharing learning. The other conclusion is that paying attention to organizational trust can be stimuli for participants in learning process. Lobo & Dolke (2012) concluded that there is a relationship between the dimensions of trust, namely, organizational trust, managerial trust, trust among colleagues and organizational learning and all of its dimensions including achieving knowledge, sharing it and using it.

Study hypothesizes

- 1) There is a relationship between organizational trust, its dimensions and organizational learning in faculties.
- 2) There is a relationship between organizational trust, its dimensions and organizational learning in the dimension of management commitment among faculties.
- 3) There is a relationship between organizational trust, its dimensions and organizational learning in the dimension of systematic vision among faculties.
- 4) There is a relationship between organizational trust, its dimensions and organizational learning in the dimension of open atmosphere and experimentation among faculties.
- 5) There is a relationship between organizational trust, its dimensions and organizational learning in

the dimension of transferring and integrating knowledge among faculties.

- 6) Organizational trust and its dimensions have the capacity to anticipate organizational learning.

Methodology, community, sampling and analyzing data of study

Method of this study is descriptive-correlative. Statistical community of this study includes all faculties of Islamic Azad University of Khorasgan (Isfahan) in number of 310 who are working in academic year 2011-2012. Of this statistical community, 172 people were selected and increase statistical potential by using Cochran's sampling formula and were also used according to random sampling. In order to measure organizational belief variable, a standard 48-question questionnaire of Mayer & Davies (1999) was used which measures trust in three dimensions including horizontal trust, vertical trust and institutional trust. Perpetuity of the questionnaire were computed 0.98 by using

statistical package of social sciences software, ellonen et al (2008) reported this questionnaire's Cronbach's Alfa 0.89.

Also, a standard 14-question questionnaire of Gomez et al (2005) was used to measure organizational learning variable. This questionnaire measures dimension of management commitment, systematic vision, open atmosphere and experimentation, transferring and integrating knowledge. Its perpetuity was computed 0.91 by using statistical package of social sciences software.

The data from the questionnaires was analyzed by using Pierson's correlation coefficient, step by step regression and variance analysis. The analysis was done by using statistical package of social sciences software (spss).

Study findings

The main hypothesis: there is a relationship between organizational trust, its dimensions and organizational learning.

Table (1): correlation coefficient between organizational trust, its dimensions and organizational learning

Reference variable	Organizational learning		
Statistical indicator	Correlation coefficient	Square correlation coefficient	of The level of significance
Anticipating variable			
Organizational trust	0.829**	0.678	0.001
Trust among staff (horizontal trust)	0.691**	0.477	0.001
Staff's trust on manager (vertical trust)	0.795**	0.632	0.001
Institutional trust	0.784**	0.615	0.001

P<0.05

Findings shown in table (1) indicate that correlation coefficient between organizational trust, its dimensions and organizational learning is significant. According to coefficient of determination (r^2) there 68.7, 47.7, 63.2, 61.5 percent variance were common between organizational trust, trust among staff (horizontal trust), staff's trust on manager (vertical trust), institutional trust and organizational learning, respectively. So, the main hypothesis is confirmed which based on, there is a relationship between organizational trust, its dimensions and organizational learning.

Hypothesis 1:

there is a relationship between organizational trust, its dimension and organizational learning in the dimension of management commitment.

Table (2): correlation coefficient between organizational trust, its dimensions and organizational learning in the dimension of management commitment

Reference variable	Management commitment		
Statistical indicator	Correlation coefficient	Square of correlation coefficient	The level of significance
Anticipating variable			
Organizational trust	0.678**	0.460	0.001
Trust among staff (horizontal trust)	0.524**	0.274	0.001
Staff's trust on manager (vertical trust)	0.669**	0.448	0.001
Institutional trust	0.692**	0.479	0.001

P<0.05

Findings shown in table (2) indicate that correlation coefficient between organizational trust, its dimensions and management commitment is significant. i. e. there is a significant relationship between organizational trust, its dimensions and organizational learning in the dimension of management commitment. According to coefficient of determination (r^2) there 46.0, 27.4, 44.8, 47.9 percent variance were common between organizational trust, trust among staff (horizontal trust), staff's trust on manager (vertical trust), institutional trust

Table (3): correlation coefficient between organizational trust, its dimension and organizational learning in the dimension of systematic vision

Reference variable	Systematic vision		
Statistical indicator	Correlation coefficient	Square correlation coefficient	of The level of significance
Anticipating variable			
Organizational trust	0.664**	0.441	0.001
Trust among staff (horizontal trust)	0.552**	0.305	0.001
Staff's trust on manager (vertical trust)	0.630**	0.397	0.001
Institutional trust	0.637**	0.406	0.001

P<0.05

Findings shown in table (3) indicate that correlation coefficient between organizational trust, its dimensions and systematic vision is significant. i. e. there is a significant relationship between organizational trust, its dimensions and systematic vision. According to coefficient of determination (r^2) there 44.1, 30.5, 39.7, 40.6 percent variance were common between organizational trust, trust among staff (horizontal trust), staff's trust on manager (vertical trust), institutional trust

Table (4): correlation coefficient between organizational trust, its dimensions and organizational learning in the dimension of open atmosphere and experimentation

Reference variable	Open atmosphere and experimentation		
Statistical indicator	Correlation coefficient	Square correlation coefficient	of The level of significance
Anticipating variable			
Organizational trust	0.802**	0.643	0.001
Trust among staff (horizontal trust)	0.679**	0.461	0.001
Staff's trust on manager (vertical trust)	0.784**	0.615	0.001
Institutional trust	0.749**	0.561	0.001

P<0.05

Findings shown in table (4) indicate that correlation coefficient between organizational trust, its dimensions and organizational learning in the dimension of open atmosphere and experimentation is significant. i. e. there is a significant relationship between organizational trust, its dimensions and open atmosphere and experimentation. According to coefficient of determination (r^2) there 64.3, 46.1, 61.5, 56.1 percent

and management commitment, respectively. So, the hypothesis1 is confirmed which based on, there is a relationship between organizational trust, its dimensions and organizational learning in the dimension of management commitment.

Hypothesis 2: there is a relationship between organizational trust, its dimensions and organizational learning in the dimension of systematic vision.

and systematic vision, respectively. So, the hypothesis 2 is confirmed which based on, there is a relationship between organizational trust, its dimensions and organizational learning in the dimension of systematic vision.

Hypothesis 3: there is a significant relationship between organizational trust, its dimensions and organizational learning in the dimension of open atmosphere and experimentation.

variance were common between organizational trust, trust among staff (horizontal trust), staff's trust on manager (vertical trust), institutional trust and open atmosphere and experimentation, respectively. So, the hypothesis 3 is confirmed which based on, there is a relationship between organizational trust, its dimensions and organizational learning in the dimension of open atmosphere and experimentation.

Hypothesis 4: there is a significant relationship between organizational trust, its dimensions and organizational learning in the dimension of transferring and integrating knowledge.

Table (5): Correlation coefficient between organizational trust, its dimensions and organizational learning in the dimension of transferring and integrating knowledge

Reference variable Statistical indicator	Transferring and integrating knowledge		
Anticipating variable	Correlation coefficient	Square of correlation coefficient	of The level of significance
Organizational trust	0.661**	0.437	0.001
Trust among staff (horizontal trust)	0.569**	0.324	0.001
Staff's trust on manager (vertical trust)	0.616**	0.379	0.001
Institutional trust	0.604**	0.365	0.001

P<0.05

Findings shown in table (5) indicate that correlation coefficient between organizational trust, its dimensions and organizational learning in the dimension of transferring and integrating knowledge is significant. i. e. there is a significant relationship between organizational trust, its dimensions and transferring and integrating knowledge. According to coefficient of determination (r^2) there 43.7, 32.4, 37.9, 36.5 percent variance were common between organizational trust, trust among staff (horizontal trust), staff's trust on

manager (vertical trust), institutional trust and transferring and integrating knowledge, respectively. So, the hypothesis 4 is confirmed which based on, there is a relationship between organizational trust, its dimensions and organizational learning in the dimension of transferring and integrating knowledge.

Hypothesis 5: organizational trust and its dimensions have the capacity to anticipating organizational learning.

Table (6): multiple correlation coefficient between organizational trust and organizational learning abilities among faculties

Reference variable Statistical indicator	Anticipating variable	Multiple correlation coefficient	Square of multiple correlation coefficient	Square of adjusted multiple correlation coefficient	F coefficient	Level of significance
Organizational learning ability	Step 1 Staff's trust on each other	0.791	0.626	0.623	219.580	0.001
	Step 2 Staff's trust on manager Trust among staff	0.811	0.658	0.653	125.059	0.001
	Step 3 Staff's trust on manager Trust among staff Institutional trust	0.822	0.676	0.669	89.890	0.001

P<0.01

As findings in table (6) indicates, the best anticipator is organizational learning ability in step 1 which is staff's trust on manager (vertical trust), among studied variables in the regression. In step 2, in addition to staff's trust on manager (vertical trust), there is trust among staff (horizontal trust) and in step 3, in addition to staff's trust on manager (vertical trust) there is institutional trust. According to the results of step by step regression analysis, trust among staff (horizontal

trust) and institutional trust are significant. On this basis, coefficient of staff's trust on manager dimension explains 62.6 percent variance of organizational learning ability, in step 2 dimensions of staff's trust on manager and trust among staff 65.8 percent variance of organizational learning ability and in step 3, dimensions of staff's trust on manager, trust among staff and institutional trust 67.6 percent variance of organizational learning ability. The observed F on level

of $p < 0.01$ is significant, so this regression is generalizable to the statistical community.

Table (7): Beta coefficient in anticipating organizational learning ability of faculties

Statistical indicator	Anticipating variable	Multiple correlation coefficient	Square of multiple correlation coefficient	Standard Beta coefficient	T coefficient	Level of significance
Reference variable						
		Beta	Reference error			
Organizational learning ability	Step 1 Staff's trust on each other	0.612	0.041	0.791	14.818	0.001
	Step 2 Staff's trust on manager	0.466	0.058	0.603	8.089	0.001
	Trust among staff	0.221	0.064	0.259	3.470	0.001
	Step 3 Staff's trust on manager	0.224	0.099	0.316	2.461	0.015
	Trust among staff	0.210	0.062	0.246	3.370	0.001
	Institutional trust	0.222	0.082	0.326	2.710	0.008

$P < 0.01$

Findings in table (7) indicate that Beta coefficient increases organizational learning ability to 0.316 units per increasing 1 unit in the dimension of staff's trust on manager (vertical trust) and to 0.246 units per increasing 1 unit in the dimension of trust among staff (horizontal trust), and to 0.326 units per increasing 1 unit in the dimension institutional trust.

Anticipation equation of 5th question of the study is as follow:

Organizational learning ability = constant coefficient (9.96) + staff's trust on manager (0.244) + trust among staff (0.210) + institutional trust (0.222)

Discussion and Conclusion

During this study, some evidences were obtained from the relationship between organizational trust and organizational learning in regard to findings in table 1. Gomez et al (2005) proposed some significant evidence in which they suggested organizations need to expand knowledge according to management commitment, and in this condition, manager understands the importance of learning and emphasizes on creating and transferring knowledge as a core value. These findings are in a same direction as Lobo & Dolke (2012) and Farhang (2010)'s attitudes based on there is a relationship between dimensions of trust, organizational learning and all of its dimensions including achieving knowledge, sharing and using it. Presence of positive relationship between organizational trust and organizational learning means that the more organizational trust is in an organization, the easier to share knowledge. On the other hand, the higher organizational trust is, the more serious is using learning tools.

The findings of present study indicate that there is a relationship between organizational learning in the

dimension of management commitment (table 2). It seems that, if manager understands the importance of learning and creates an atmosphere of trust, achieving, creating and transferring knowledge as core values, will find a specific place in the organization. In an organization where staff trusts each other and also there is trust between manager and staff, trust on structures and policies finds a high place. This part of findings is in a same direction with Adler & kwon's attitudes (2002) based on there is a relationship between social capital and transferring knowledge in organizations and also is in a same directions with Farhang's attitude (2010) who concluded that there is a relationship between institutional, organizational and vertical trust and organizational learning which means organizational learning changes by decreasing and increasing trust in an organization.

In other part of these findings (table 3), it was shown that there is a relationship between organizational trust, its dimensions and organizational learning in the dimension of systematic vision. These findings are in a same direction with the study of Taheri Lari et al (2012) based on there is a relationship between organizational trust and organizational learning. These are the same as the study of Kazemi Jagnab(2002). Since, in organizational learning-based organization where staff is responsible for their learning, they consider the relationship between their responsibilities and organization's goals as a whole. In this condition, staff is expected to learn from their colleagues and also teaches them and in this situation working culture is coordinated and integrated with organizational learning (Hajipour & Nazarpour, 2010). Presence of trust in the triple vertical, horizontal and institutional dimensions increases the

interactions between organization employees and creates a secure atmosphere in the entire organization. It is obvious when all organizational resources trust each other and also manager, a holistic approach governs on the organization and holistic, systemic thinking will be some important areas in organizational learning. Therefore, the relationship between these variables will be explainable.

Findings in table 4 indicate that there is a relationship between organizational trust, its dimensions and organizational learning in the dimension of open atmosphere and experimentation. This finding is relatively in a same direction with Dovey's study (2009) called the role of trust in learning and innovation process and its results show that trust is a social capital and influences learning and innovation. Since, it can be cited that open atmosphere and experimentation are fields of organizational innovation. Presence of open atmosphere and experimentation are features of organizations with organizational learning. Learning as a kind of modification also needs open atmosphere and experimentation. It is obvious when staff did not experience organizational trust and afraid to do creative actions and concerns about their colleagues and leaders' responses, they will not enter into an open and experimentation atmosphere.

Results from table (5) indicate that there is a relationship between organizational trust, its dimensions and organizational learning in the dimension of transferring and integrating knowledge. this finding is compatible with Ribier & Tuggle's studies (2005) on the role of organizational trust and knowledge management based on organizations with high level of organizational trust are more successful in knowledge management projects especially transferring knowledge. This finding is also compatible with Lajavardi & Khan Babaei (2007) about emphasis on the presence of supplementary skills and atmosphere of trust as the most important factors in facilitating knowledge management in both creating and transferring knowledge components. In general concept, transferring, integrating and avoiding filtering information occur in a trust-based atmosphere. Presence of trust in organization among staff and managers provide information exchange. Organizational learning raises a mode in which learning is not a top to bottom process, but it is a process which flows throughout the organization, vertically, horizontally and diagonally.

However, the evidence of this study showed that organizational trust and its dimensions have the capacity to anticipate organizational learning (Table 6). This finding is compatible with ideas of some researches such as Lobo & Dolke (2012), Taheri Lari et al (2012) and Farhang (2010). On the other word, improving learning statue in the organization leads to improve organizational learning process. Trust as stimuli for

organizational learning is an essential growing framework to share knowledge along organizational and geographic boundaries.

References:

- Adler P, Kwon C. 2002. Social capital: Prospects for a new concept. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(1): 17-40. Available from: http://www.csee.wvu.edu/~xinl/library/papers/social/social_capital.pdf.
- Chathoth PK, Mak B, Jauhari V, Manaktola K. 2007. Employees perceptions of organizational trust and service climate: a structural model combining their effects on employee satisfaction. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 31(3): 338-357. Available from: <http://jht.sagepub.com/content/31/3/338.short>
- Chathoth PK, Mak B, Sim J, Jauhari V, Manaktola K. 2011. Assessing dimensions of organizational trust across cultures: a comparative analysis of u.s and indian full service hotels. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 30(2): 233-242.
- Costigan FD, Iher SE, Berman JJ. 1998. A multi-dimensioned study of trust in organisdtions. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, X(3): 303-317. Available from: <http://www.jstor.org>
- Dovey K. 2009. The role of trust in innovation, Learning organization. *Learning Organization The*, 16(4): 311-325. Available from: <http://www.emeraldinsight.com>.
- Driks KT, Ferrin DL. 2001. The role of trust in allinces organization settings. *Organization Science*, 12(4): 450-467. Available from: <http://www.citeulike.org>.
- Ellonen R, Blomqvist K, Puumalainen K. 2008. The role of trust in organizational innovativeness. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 11(2): 160-181. Available from: <http://www.emeraldinsight.com>.
- Franklin K M. 2004. An examination of organizational trust and psychological sense of community in a networked environment, 223P. Available from: <http://scholar.lib.vt.edu>.
- Farhang Abolghasem .2010. investigating the relationship between organizational learning, organizational trust and employee's progress in governmental universities in east – south of Iran, Doctoral thesis, faculty of educational sciences and management of Isfahan University. (in Persian)
- Garcia-Morales VJ, Liorens-Montes FJ, Verdu-Jover AJ. 2007. Influence of personal mastery on organizational performance through organizational learning and innovation in large firms and SMEs, *Technovation*. 27(9): 547-568. Available from: <http://www.sciencedirect.com>.
- Gomez PJ, Lorente JC, Cabrera RV. 2005. Organizational learning capability: A proposal of measurement. *Journal of Business Research*, 58(6): 715-725. Available from: <http://www.sciencedirect.com>.

- Ghorbani Mohammad Javad .2007. organizational trust, 5th international conference on management. (in Persian)
- Hajipour Bahman, Nazarpour Kashani Hamed .2010. Prioritizing of types of organizational cultures (according to Queens' model) based on the level of their influencing on organizational learning, thought of strategic management, 1: 181 – 208. (in Persian)
- Janowicz MP, Noorderhaven NG. 2009. Trust, Calculation, and Interorganizational learning of tacit knowledge: An organizational roles perspective. *Organization Studies*, 30(10): 1021-1044. Available from: <http://oss.sagepub.com>.
- Karimi Sediqeh, Nasr Ahmadrza, Boghratian Kazem. 2009. Forever learning: University approach in 21st century. First edition, Isfahan: University of Isfahan and organization of reading and editing of books on human sciences, 215 pages. (in Persian)
- Kazemi Jagnab Hojat .2002. the role of trust in scientific organizations and some factors influencing it, masters' thesis, faculty of social sciences of Tabriz University. (in Persian)
- Khalili Araghi Maryam .2003. learner organizations: a necessity to evolution and develop, *Tadbir Journal*, 137: 90 – 93. (in Persian)
- Lajevardi Jalil, Khanbabaie Ali. 2007. Investigating factors facilitate knowledge management in working teams. *Management knowledge Journal*, 76: 97 – 116 .(in Persian)
- Leonard-Barton D. 1992. The factory as a learning laboratory. *Sloan Management Review*, 34(1): 23-38. Available from: <http://www.cob.unt.edu>.
- Lobo AL, Dolke AM. 2012. Interpersonal trust and organizational learning capability. Available from: <http://www2.warwick.ac.uk>.
- Macknight DH, Cummings LI, Chervady NI. 1998. Initial trust formation in new organizational relationships. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(3): 473-490. Available from: <http://www.jstor.org>.
- Mayer RC, Davis JH, Schoorman D. 1995. An integration model of organization trust. *The Academy of Management Review*, 20(3): 709-734. Available from: <http://www.jstor.org>.
- Mayer RC, Davis JH. 1999. The effect of the performance appraisal system on trust for management: A field quasiexperiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(1): 123-136. Available from: <http://cognitiveloadresearch>.
- Mohseni Tabrizi Alireza, Shirali Ismaeil. 2009. Factors affected on social trust of Iranian students on abroad. *Research and planning in higher education Journal*, 52: 151 – 176. (in Persian)
- Ribier VM, Tuggle FD. 2005. The role of organizational trust in knowledge management: Tool & Technology Use & Success. *International Journal of Knowledge management*, 1(1): 1-19.
- Sackaran Oma .2002. research methodologies in management, translated by Mohammad Sabaei & Mahmoud Shirazi, first edition, Tehran: Agah publications, 560 pages. (in Persian)
- Simons T. 2002. Behavioural integrity: The perceived alignment between managers words and deeds as a research focus. *Organization Science*, 13(1): 18-35.
- Sinkula JM. 1994. Market information processing and organizational learning. *Journal of Marketing*, 58(1): 35-45. Available from: <http://www.jstor.org>.
- Slocum John W, McGill Michael E, Lei David T. 1994. The new learning strategy: Anytime, Anything, Any where organ dynamics. *American Psychological Association*, 23(2): 33-47. Available from: <http://serials.cib.unibo.it>.
- Stata R. 1989. Organizational learning: The key to management innovation. *Sloan Management Review* (Spring): pp: 63-74. Available from: <http://books.google.com>.
- Taheri Lari Masoud, Khayat Moghadam Saeid, Enayati Gholamreza, Zavari Mohammad Ebrahim .2012. investigation the relationship between organizational trust, organizational learning and entrepreneurship in small businesses, National conference on entrepreneurship, cooperation, economical jehad, 1 – 17. Reference website: <http://www.civilica.com>. (in Persian)
- Templeton GF, Morris SA, Synder CHA, Lewis B. 2004. Methodological and thematic prescriptions for defining and measuring the organizational learning concept. *Information Systems Frontiers*, 6(3): 263-276. Available from: <http://www.springerlink.Com>.
- Yaghoubi Maryam, Karimi Saeid, Javadi Marzieh, Nikbakht Akram .2010. the relationship between components of organizational learning and knowledge management in employees of selected hospitals in Isfahan city (2009), *health management*, 13 (42): 65 – 74. (in Persian)
- Zarei Matin Hassan, Hassanzadeh Hassan. 2004. Inter-organization trust and investigating current situations of executive organizations of Iran. *Management Culture Magazine*, 2nd year, 7: 79 – 126. (in Persian)