J. Appl. Environ. Biol. Sci., 5(8S)1-5, 2015

ISSN: 2090-4274
Journal of Applied Environmental and Biological Sciences
www.textroad.com

Investigating the Relationship of Systematic Thinking and Participative Leadership with Innovation in Jaam-E-Jam Channel in IRIB

Nadia Amirirad and Masoumeh Oladian

Islamic Azad University, Damavand Branch, Damavand, Iran

Received: March 8, 2015
Accepted: May 10, 2015

ABSTRACT

Innovation starts with the decision or determination of a creative person who tries to present or construct something new in this era by breaking conventional and existing ideas. The present study was applied with regard to purpose and the data collection was descriptive-correlational. The population of this study included all the 100 personnel of Jaam-E-Jam Channel in the Islamic Republic of Iran Broadcasting in 2014. The sample of this study was determined as 80 individuals according to Cohen and Morgan and Krejcie Table. Simple random sampling was used in this study. The data were collected through field and desk studies. There is a positive significant relationship between systematic thinking and organizational innovation. Leaders of organizations should participate employees in important decision-makings.

KEYWORDS: Systematic Thinking, Participative Leadership, Innovation

Change is considered a new transformation and method in any organization for working and being active, and refers to new and extensive structures of old and traditional structures. New activities that can be institutionalized in the form of creativity and innovation along with new ideas and provide the background for the future growth and development approaching organizations and institutions to the dimensions of growth and perfection and consequently lead to useful products and innovations that have fundamental phases in order to progress organizational issues in the 21st century. The general concepts of "change", "creativity" and "innovation" are never restricted to one sector, especially in business and commercial structures that have a shorter production period and more customer demand completely competitively. Thus, long-term commercial success is based on management capability in swinging affairs and institutionalizing and promoting innovation in any sector. This process is related to the performance of personnel and its vast dimensions should be practiced among different individuals with knowledge and various skills [1].

The growing process of technology and the intensive competition in various industries and organizations has made creativity and innovation necessary. Organizations that adapt to this process are successful; otherwise they are doomed to failure. Innovation is an infrastructural issue and need of human life. It is not problematic as some think. Very simple ideas are the bases of many valuable innovations. They often have very worthwhile results. Innovations play a significant role in the management and administration of companies. Innovation and inventions have a significant role in the history of mankind. Innovation starts with the decision or determination of a creative person who tries to present or construct something new in this era by breaking conventional and existing ideas. Thus, I have always emphasized that creativity is so much important for people because creative, innovative and productive people form the history and direct the world. Creativity starts with the exploration and investigation of the status quo: "Have I ever done my best?" "Is the status quo ideal?" "Can a better solution be found?" Such questions awake and stimulate your hidden and latent creativity and the more you explore, better results you will get. I strongly believe that the youth are responsible for the improvement of the status quo using creativity. When you look at something from a different perspective, you become aware of the issues involved, these issues should drive you in the direction of progress and construction because the youth are less confined to restrictions, and are more prepared and sensitive for innovation in comparison with older people [2, 3].

Organizational learning is known as a vital tool in developing creativity because effort towards overcoming environmental dynamics and correct, fast and on-time reaction is so vital for the survival and success of organizations with regard to increasing environmental change and increased competitiveness in various organizational and environmental fields. The proposition of organizations which are referred to as learner organizations was a very valuable step in this direction; organizations that are able to discover and revise the existing deviations in their past and current programs and learn. In other words, they can investigate, revise and improve the defined programs and goals. The learning occurring in learning organizations is called organizational learning [4].

Systematic thinking is a principle that combines, completes and proposes the afore-mentioned principles as a unit of theories and practices [5]. Systematic thinking is a perceptual framework in the analysis of issues helping us see the whole pattern clearer [6, 7]. On the other hand, participatory leadership is the application of organizational structure or intervening project teams in the conduction of organizational activities. The

***Corresponding Author:** Masoumeh Oladian. Islamic Azad University, Damavand Branch, Damavand, Iran; Email: Oladiain.M@gmail.com

participation of a larger number of related people in various organizational categories in the organizational decision-making process [8] refers to participatory leadership.

Systematic thinking is a system for observing the wholes. It is a framework for the comprehensive and integrated observation of the shared relations as separated from each other. Systematic thinking is the base of other principles of organizational learning. This thought is contrasted with the old principle we learnt in the past and early in life and we should divide them into the components in order to solve the problems. This seems to remove the complexity of the issue or problem and make it simple. Under these circumstances, the problem could not be seen as the primary. This is followed by an irreversible loss. Systematic thinking is a perceptual framework in the analysis of issues and helps us see the whole pattern clearer, or is a framework to specify the relationship between the components as a whole rather than as a causal relationship. Systematic dynamic shows that organizations are related to each other like a massive network. Using systematic thinking makes us ignore the signs of problems and issues but attend to their causes. Systematic thinking is based on the superiority of whole to component. It means that, instead of analytical or linear method including the analysis of issues to the intended components in each part and the whole conclusion, we should switch to non-linear and live thinking which is generally referred to as systematic thinking [6].

Many studies have addressed the relationship between the components of organizational learning and innovation in organizations. For example, Khani Tabasi [9] investigated the relationship between strategic human resource management practices and organizational innovation by considering organizational learning. The results showed that strategic human resource management practices are positively correlated with innovation performance. In addition, organizational learning positively helps organizational innovation performance.

Ghasemi Zarandini [10] also investigated the relationship between organizational learning and application of information and communication technologies. The results showed that there is a positive significant relationship between organizational learning and all its components, i.e., systematic thinking, mental models, shared perspectives, team learning, personal skills with application of information and communication technologies and its components, i.e., the use of computer hardware, computer software, the type and extent of using the Internet and Internet services at 95 percent confidence interval. Jafari [11] investigated the relationship between organizational learning and organizational intelligence in a study. The results of this study confirmed the relationship between organizational learning and all its components, i.e., systematic thinking, mental models, shared perspectives, team learning, personal skills with organizational intelligence. Based on the findings of previous studies, the relationship of systematic thinking and participative leadership with organizational innovation were investigated.

1. MATERIAL AND METHODS

The present study was applied with regard to purpose and the data collection was descriptive-correlational. The population of this study included all the 100 personnel of Jaam-E-Jam Channel in the Islamic Republic of Iran Broadcasting in 2014. The sample of this study was determined as 80 individuals according to Cohen and Morgan and Krejcie Table. Simple random sampling was used in this study. The data were collected through field and desk studies. The whole theoretical foundation of the relationship of organizational learning and innovation were investigated in the desk studies. (Include books, journals and electronic resources). In the field method, the Standard Questionnaire of Organizational Learning the Iranian Version including 21 items on a 7 point (strongly disagree, disagree, somewhat disagree, I have no idea, somewhat agree, agree, strongly agree respectively receiving 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 scores) was used. In addition, the Standard Questionnaire of Innovation was used in order to measure the dimensions of innovation which are participation, freedom, and trust, time of idea, recreation, conflicts, supporting ideas, discussions, and risk taking. This questionnaire includes 44 items on a 5 point Likert Scale continuum (disagree, somewhat disagree, I have no idea, agree, somewhat agree). These questionnaires were filled in by the personnel of Jaam-E-Jam Channel in IRIB. They were asked to specify the items to the extent they apply to the effect of the components of organizational learning in their working and innovation life. Since the two questionnaires are standard ones, the validity and reliability of them were confirmed in numerous foreign and local studies. In addition, the Cronbach's Alpha was calculated in this study using SPSS. It was 0.83 for the Questionnaire of Organizational Learning and 0.81 for the Questionnaire of Innovation. Descriptive statistics (frequency tables and graphs, measures of central tendency and measures of variability) and inferential statistics (Pearson Correlation, regression testing) were used in this study.

2. RESULTS

The below descriptive table1 is related to measures of central tendency. Variability of the components of organizational learning among the staff Measures of central tendency include mean and median, the measures of variability include standard deviation, variance, skewness and kurtosis. Regarding skewness and kurtosis that are between (-1.96) and (+1.96), it can be estimated that the information related to the variables have a normal distribution. The descriptive table2 is related to measures of central tendency. Variability of the components of organizational innovation among the staff Measures of central tendency include mean and median, the measures of variability include standard deviation, variance, skewness and kurtosis. Regarding skewness and kurtosis that

are between (-1.96) and (+1.96), it can be estimated that the information related to the variables have a normal distribution.

Hypothesis 1: There is a relationship between systematic thinking and organizational innovation.

The result of the correlation test shows that there is a positive significant relationship between systematic thinking and organizational innovation and the correlation coefficient was 0.221. This correlation coefficient is significant at 95 percent confidence interval with a 5 percent alpha. The relationship was also direct and positive, i.e., the more systematic thinking, the more organizational innovation. The results of the table shows that the regression coefficient of determination is R2=0.119. This shows that 11.9 percent of the changes caused by organizational innovation are related to systematic thinking component.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics related to organizational learning

Variables	**Measures of central tendency**		**Measures of Variability**			
	Mean	Median	Standard deviation	Variance	Skewness	Kurtosis
Systematic thinking	10.37	10	4.30	18.51	.622	-.165
Participative leadership	8.72	7	5.04	25.46	.941	.326

Table 2. Descriptive statistics related to organizational innovation

Variables	Measures of central tendency		Measures of Variability			
	Mean	Median	Standard deviation	Variance	Skewness	Kurtosis
Participation	11.51	11.50	3.41	11.59	-.120	-.008
Freedom	13.70	13	3.41	11.61	-.351	1.48
Trust	14.18	14	5.07	25.74	.110	-.259
Time of idea	12.75	12.50	3.45	11.91	.039	.486
Recreation	13.06	13.06	3.47	12.06	-.370	.268
Conflicts	10.26	10	2.44	5.96	-.388	.488
Idea support	12.43	13	4.57	20.91	.054	.084
Discussions	13.06	13	3.64	13.22	-.311	.310
Risk-taking	11.01	11	3.38	11.43	.-473	-.215

Table 3. Correlation test of the relationship between systematic thinking and organizational innovation

	Organizational innovation	Systematic thinking
Pearson's correlation coefficient (r)	1	0.221
Significance level	0.024	1

Table 4. The regression coefficient of determination

Deviation of the estimation error	Adjustment coefficient	Coefficient of determination	Correlation coefficient	Model
21.79	0.108	0.119	0.345	1

Table 5. Analysis of variance

Significance level	F	Mean of squares	Grading	Sum of squares	Model
0.049	4	2051.11	1	2051.11	Regression
		512.79	78	39997.78	The remaining
			79	42048.89	Total

Table 6. Equation of the regression line

Significance level	T	Standard beta	Non-standard beta		Regression model
		Beta	Standard error	B	
0.000	17.14		6.64	113.88	Intercept (a)
0.049	2	0.221	0.592	1.184	Systematic thinking

Table 7. Correlation test of the relationship between participative leadership and organizational innovation

Participative leadership	Organizational innovation	
0.317	1	Pearson's correlation coefficient (r)
1	0.002	Significance level

Table 8. The regression coefficient of determination

Deviation of the estimation error	Adjustment coefficient	Coefficient of determination	Correlation coefficient	Model
22.02	0.089	0.101	0.317	1

Table 9. Analysis of variance

Significance level	F	Mean of squares	Grading	Sum of squares	Model
0.004	8.73	4230.84	1	4230.84	Regression
		484.85	78	3782.04	The remaining
			79	42048.89	Total

Table 10. The equation of the regression line

Significance level	T	Standard beta	Non-standard beta		Regression model
		Beta	Standard error	B	
0.000	22.98		4.94	113.51	Intercept (a)
0.004	2.95	0.317	0.491	1.45	Participative leadership

Dependent variable: Organizational innovation

The table of analysis of variance confirms the regression coefficient of determination and that the observed F (F=4) is significant with a 5 percent alpha and the null hypothesis is rejected. Thus, the regression coefficients of determination can be confirmed.

The above beta table shows the final results of regression and the equation of the regression line can be given as follows with regard to this table: Organizational innovation=113.51+1.45 (Participative leadership).

The above beta table shows the final results of regression and the equation of the regression line can be given as follows with regard to this table: Organizational innovation=113.88+1.18 (Systematic thinking).

The results of the above table showed that systematic thinking has a significant effect on predicting organizational innovation. In addition, regarding the beta value, it can be said that a one-unit increase in systematic thinking increases the organizational innovation as 0.221 and this prediction is significant with regard to t (2) statistic at 5 percent alpha.

Hypothesis 2: There is a relationship between participative leadership and organizational innovation. The results of correlation test above shows that there is a positive significant relationship between participative leadership and organizational innovation and the correlation coefficient was 0.317. This correlation coefficient is significant at 95 percent confidence interval with a 5 percent alpha. The relationship was also direct and positive, i.e., the more participative leadership, the more organizational innovation. The results of the above table shows that the regression coefficient of determination is R2=0.101. This shows that 10.1 percent of the changes caused by organizational innovation are related to participative leadership component. The table of analysis of variance confirms the regression coefficient of determination and that the observed F (F=8.73) is significant with a 5 percent alpha and the null hypothesis is rejected. Thus, the regression coefficients of determination can be confirmed.

The results of the above table showed that participative leadership has a significant effect on predicting organizational innovation. In addition, regarding the beta value, it can be said that a one-unit increase in participative leadership increases the organizational innovation as 0.317 and this prediction is significant with regard to t (2.95) statistic at 5 percent alpha.

3. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

There is a relationship between systematic thinking and organizational innovation. The results of statistical analyses, i.e., Pearson and Regression Correlation Coefficient, showed that there is a positive significant relationship between systematic thinking and organizational innovation. This hypothesis is in line with many previous studies in recent years, all of these studies confirm the positive relationship between shared perspectives and innovation. For example, the studies done by Haj Manochehri [12]; Mortezaei [13]; Reshmeh [14]; and Jafar Abadi [15] confirm these findings.

There is a relationship between participative leadership and organizational innovation. The results of statistical analyses, i.e., Pearson and Regression Correlation Coefficient, showed that there is a positive significant relationship between systematic thinking and organizational innovation. This hypothesis is in line with many previous studies in recent years, all of these studies confirm the positive relationship between shared perspectives and innovation. For example, the studies done by by Haj Manochehri [12]; Mortezaei [13]; Reshmeh [14]; and Jafar Abadi [15] confirm these findings.

Suggestions

-Leaders of organizations should be participate employees in important decision-makings.

-Encouraging by considering rewards for individuals and groups in order to evaluate measures that have led to success or failure.

-Establishing a system that allows for learning from successful practices of other organizations.

-Studying is effective factors in organizational learning and innovation in other research studies .

-Investigate the effect of innovation on organizational learning in other research studies.

-Investigate components of innovation in other research studies.

REFERENCES

1. Andropolos, K., & Davidson, P. 2011. Development, Creativity and Innovation Management, Translated by Taleghani, Gh.
2. Fishani, A., & Teimor, A. 1998. Creativity and Innovation in Humans and Organizations, Termeh Publications, First Edition, Tehran, 191-195.
3. Kim, D.H. 1995.Managerial practice fields: infrastructures Of Learning Organizations: developing cultures for tomorrow's workplace.
4. Peyman, A., & Jafari, M. 2007. Designing the Conceptual Model of Knowledge Management emphasizing on the Key Factors in Success, Tomorrow Management Quarterly, 3 (13 & 14).
5. Senge,P. 1990 . "The fifth Discipline", New Yourk, Mc Grow Hill, 42.
6. Amirkhani, A. 2008. Learning Organizations of the Knowledge Era Organizations. Danesh (Resaneh Saz) Publications, Tehran.
7. Lee, Sh. 2009. 'Developing hierarchical structure for assessing the impact of innovation factors, 200.
8. Robbins, S.P. 1998. Organizational behavior: concepts, controversies applications, 8th ed, Upper saddle River, NJ: Prantice – Hall: 258-61
9. Khani Tabasi, M. 2013. The Relationship between Strategic Human Resource Management Practices and Organizational Innovation by considering Organizational Learning, MA Thesis.
10. Ghasemi Zarandini, O.2013. Investigating the Relationship between Organizational Learning and Application of Information and Communication Technologies, MA Thesis.
11. Jafari, M. 2013. Investigating the Relationship between Organizational Learning and Organizational Intelligence, MA Thesis.
12. Haj Manochehri, M. 2013. Investigating the Relationship between Knowledge Management and Organizational Learning, MA Thesis.
13. Mortezaei, F. 2012. Investigating the Relationship between Organizational Learning and Organizational Innovation, MA Thesis.
14. Reshmeh, J.2005. Investigating the Relationship between Managers' Attitudes towards Change and Innovation and Organizational Learning, MA Thesis.
15. Jafar Abadi, M. 2012. Investigating the Relationship between Managers' Attitudes towards Innovation and Organizational Learning, MA Thesis.