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ABSTRACT
The aim of this research was to study the influence of employees’ understanding of organizational mission on employees’ understanding of learning organizational dimensions. This study was practical due to its objectives, and was descriptive due to its methodology. The statistical society included 280 employees of Borujerd Communication Organization among whom the researchers selected 162 persons using Morgan Table. In order to collect the data needed, the researchers used, in addition to library researches, questionnaires. The alpha coefficient for the questionnaires was 0.865. Moreover, the researchers used SPSS and software to analyse the data. Finally, the result showed that employees’ understanding of organizational mission influenced their understanding of mental models, common ideals, team learning, and systematic thinking.
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1. INTRODUCTION
According to Peter Senge, “the problem that today’s organizations face is that they are not able to identify and determine threats and their effects and also they cannot provide new options and alternatives and on the whole organizations have problems when dealing with learning” (qtd. in Sobhani Nezhad and et al 2006, p. 97). Peter Drucker believed that “in the current economy, knowledge or wisdom (as the result of learning) is not a source like or along with other sources such as business, investment, and land, but it is the only significant and meaningful resource of the current era” (qtd. in Sobhani Nezhad and et al 2006, p. 98-99). The necessities of an organization including change in culture, and having creative learning procedure should be highly considered by top managers, because these ways cause organization to adapt itself with rapid technological changes, global competition and change in customers’ needs. Effective organizations make their members powerful and skilled, found their organization based upon group working, and expand their human resources in all levels. Organizational members are committed to their jobs and consider themselves as the main parts of the organizations. “Members in all levels feel that they have roles on decision makings and these influences are effective for their jobs and their jobs are directly related to organizational objectives” (Rahim Niya and Alizadeh 2009, p. 156).

1.1. LITERATURE REVIEW
Professor Daniel Denison (2000) studied the relationships between organizational culture and effectiveness. Then, he proposed his cultural model including these characteristics: (1) “Business Involvement, (2) Compatibility, and (3) Adaptation” (qtd. in Manouriyan and Bakhtaee 2005, p. 5).

Organizational Mission: It is said that the most important characteristic of an organization is its mission. Those organizations that do not know where they are and what they are supposed to do usually go devious. Successful organizations have clear understanding of their objectives and goals in a way that they define those objectives and plan organizational perspectives. The most challenging organizations are those which are forced to change their missions. “When an organization is forced to change its mission, it is necessary to change its strategy, structure, culture and behavior. In such a situation, a powerful leader identifies organizational perspectives and creates a culture to support such perspectives” (Rahim Niya and Alizadeh 2009, p. 156).

- Tendencies and Strategic Direction: Clear strategic tendencies shown the direction of organizational objectives and determine to what extent an individual can help to the organizational industry.
- Objectives and Goals: A clear set of goals and objectives can be related to organizational mission, perspective, and strategy and shows the proper and clear direction in each individual’s job.
- Perspective: Organizational perspective is a positive and common view of organizational situation in future that imagines fundamental values and captures the individuals’ mind and heart and guides them simultaneously.
Learning Organization: It refers to a kind of organization in which people continuously increase their abilities to reach the results they expect and by doing so, the new thinking pattern and collective thought are developed and expanded. These organizations are skillful in creating, gaining, knowledge transferring, and knowledge sharing in order to obtain new thoughts and ideas.

Learning Organization Dimensions: There are 4 dimensions for learning organizations including personal abilities, mental models, common ideal, and team learning.

Personal Abilities: Personal abilities adjust logical pictures or images that a person expects to obtain from the results. This picture or image is along with the real and current situation of life. “Learning” develops the relationship between “personal perspectives” and the current “reality” and also it expands the capacity of better choices and reaching expected “results” (Senge 1994, p. 59). These abilities are things more than obtainable skills and the power of competition, although they can be categorized based upon two principles. Some scholars believe that personal learning is not necessarily the insurance of learning, but without personal learning it is impossible to have organizational learning. In this regard, the most important role of a manager is to provide circumstances in which individuals can obtain the necessary skills to have a good and comfortable life.

Mental Models: These models refer to expectations and believes engraved in the mind or general believes or even general images which influence our understanding of the world. Mental models cause us to adjust our performance based upon them. For instance, “if we believe that we cannot trust in others; consequently, our behaviours shape according to distrust” (Zaree and et al 1999, p. 70).

Common Ideal: Common ideal is necessary to create pervasive learning and this is because of the reason that it provides the needed energy to learn. In fact, the idea of pervasive learning without an important objective or goal to move and act is completely meaningless and naïve. Ideals are common when individuals have a better image of future and feel a kind of commitment to reach it.

Team Learning: In pervasive organizations, “team learning” is very important, because it is “the foundation of learning in modern organizations” (Akhavan and Jafari 2006). Team learning starts with “discussing” and till the time that “teams do not learn”, “the organizations do not learn”, too (Gore Lick 2005, pp. 383-388).

Systematic Learning: It is the fifth level in shaping learning organizations that integrate other principles and combine them through an integrated structure in term of theory and practice. “Peter Drucker introduced this kind of organization as an orchestra in which each one plays his/her own song, but the important point is that all are subordinated or directed by the leader and the result is a rhythmic music” (qtd. in Zibaee 2007).

Scot and Harris in their study on 25 British road engineering companies concluded that thinking systems limit designers’ situations to gain their suitable feedbacks. They suggested “using more organized learning cultures in construction industry” (Scot and Harris, 1998, pp. 21-27). Mr. Reza Shafaee (2001) in his thesis studied the barriers for learning organizations creation and concluded that the barriers were in three categories including “barriers for starting the movement, barriers for keeping the movement, and barriers for establishment of results” (Shafaee 2001, p. 1). Brooks and his coworkers in 1992 showed that if personal efforts to change the organizational culture were not accompanied with common ideals would fail. Moreover, “the managers’ efforts to change to be adapted to
organizational culture would be useless. In addition, mental dimensions, learning ethics, and social characteristics should be developed” (Brooks and et al 1992, pp. 333-344).

2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study was practical due to its objectives, and was descriptive due to its methodology. The statistical society included 280 employees of Borujerd Communication Organization among whom the researchers selected 162 persons using Morgan Table. In order to collect the data needed, the researchers used, in addition to library researches, questionnaires. The alpha coefficient for the questionnaires was 0.865. Moreover, the researchers used SPSS and software to analyse the data.

3. FINDINGS

In this research we used SPSS software version 19. There are 5 alternative hypotheses. The hypotheses are as following:

The First Hypothesis: The relationship between employees’ understanding of organizational mission and employees’ understanding of personal abilities.

The null hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between employees’ understanding of organizational mission and employees’ understanding of personal abilities.

The Alternative hypothesis: There is a significant relationship between employees’ understanding of organizational mission and employees’ understanding of personal abilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees’ Understanding of Organizational Mission and Employees’ Understanding of Personal Abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to table 1 and the significance, the null hypothesis is accepted and the alternative hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, there is no significant relationship between employees’ understanding of organizational mission and employees’ understanding of personal abilities.

The Second Hypothesis: The relationship between employees’ understanding of organizational mission and employees’ understanding of mental models.

The null hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between employees’ understanding of organizational mission and employees’ understanding of mental models.

The Alternative hypothesis: There is a significant relationship between employees’ understanding of organizational mission and employees’ understanding of mental models.
Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employees’ Understanding of Organizational mission and Employees’ Understanding of Mental Model</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Error</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>7.825</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to table 2 and the significance, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, there is a significant relationship employees’ understanding of organizational mission and employees’ understanding of mental models.

The Third Hypothesis: The relationship between employees’ understanding of organizational mission and employees’ understanding of common ideals.

The null hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between employees’ understanding of organizational mission and employees’ understanding of common ideals.

The Alternative hypothesis: There is a significant relationship between employees’ understanding of organizational mission and employees’ understanding of common ideals.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employees’ Understanding of Organizational mission and Employees’ Understanding of Common Ideals</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Error</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>21.691</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to table 3 and the significance, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, there is a significant relationship between employees’ understanding of organizational mission and employees’ understanding of common ideals.

The Fourth Hypothesis: The relationship between employees’ understanding of organizational mission and employees’ understanding of team learning.

The null hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between employees’ understanding of organizational mission and employees’ understanding of team learning.

The Alternative hypothesis: There is a significant relationship between employees’ understanding of organizational mission and employees’ understanding of team learning.
Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employees’ Understanding of Organizational mission and Employees’ Understanding of Team Learning</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Error</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>31.869</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to table 4 and the significance, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, there is a significant relationship employees’ understanding of organizational mission and employees’ understanding of team learning.

The Fifth Hypothesis: The relationship between employees’ understanding of organizational mission and employees’ understanding of systematic thinking.

The null hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between employees’ understanding of organizational mission and employees’ understanding of systematic thinking.

The Alternative hypothesis: There is a significant relationship between employees’ understanding of organizational mission and employees’ understanding of systematic thinking.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employees’ Understanding of Organizational mission and Employees’ Understanding of Systematic Thinking</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Error</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>32.245</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to table 5 and the significance, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, there is a significant relationship between employees’ understanding of organizational mission and employees’ understanding of systematic thinking.

4. CONCLUSION

In this research we study influence of employees’ understanding of organizational mission on employees’ understanding of learning organizational dimensions. This study is practical due to its objectives, and is descriptive due to its methodology. The statistical society includes 280 employees of Borujerd Communication Organization among whom the researchers select 162 persons using Morgan Table. In order to collect the data needed, the researchers use, in addition to library researches, questionnaires. The alpha
coefficient for the questionnaires is 0.86. Moreover, the researchers use SPSS and software to analyse the data. Finally, the results show that employees’ understanding of organizational mission influenced their understanding of mental models, common ideals, team learning, and systematic thinking.
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