

## **Impact of Motivation to Learn and Job Attitudes on Organizational Learning Culture in a Public Service Organization of Pakistan**

**Muhammad Ehsan Malik**

*University of the Punjab, Lahore*

**Rizwan Qaiser Danish**

*University of the Punjab, Lahore*

### **ABSTRACT**

The present study investigates the concept of organizational learning culture in a public service organization and focuses on its relationship with motivation to learn, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and job involvement. Data was collected from 119 employees of a public service organization. In all, 200 questionnaires were distributed and participation was voluntary and confidentiality was ensured. One hundred and nineteen fully completed questionnaires were returned for a response rate of 60%. It was found that organizational learning culture is significantly and positively related to the satisfaction, organizational commitment and job involvement but not with motivation to learn. Age also proved to be an important demographic variable that explained significant part of the variance. Based on the findings of the study, recommendations and policy implications are discussed and directions for future research are provided.

**KEYWORDS:** Organizational Learning, Organizational Learning Culture, Motivation to Learn, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, Job Involvement.

### **Introduction**

In the academic area, most researchers agree that Senge is the first person to establish the concept of a “learning organization” (Forman, 2000). He was regarded as the “learning man” in Flood’s 1999 book, *Rethinking the Fifth Discipline*. Later, Watkins and Marsick (1993, 1997) developed a seven-factor learning organization concept and its instrument, Dimensions of the Learning Organization Questionnaire (DLOQ) to measure organizational learning. In recent times, the organizations want to be more flexible in order to cope with change, thus the idea of a learning organization is becoming popular day by day. The

concept of learning is merging from personal learning to organizational learning. As learning is indispensable for individuals, it is likewise important for the growth of organizations. Previous studies also provide the growing evidence of a relationship between organizational learning culture and economic performance (Ellinger et al., 2003; Marsick & Watkins, 2003; Selden & Watkins, 2001). Sooner or later, the company will get a payoff from its investment in building organizational learning culture. A good learning culture will not only help employees to show high level of performance but also keep those good employees in the organization. A service organization can only achieve long-term success with the help of some qualified, satisfied, committed and motivated employees and supportive leaders. Zhang, et al. (2002) suggested that building learning practices within an organization is vital for the organization in order to achieve a competitive position in the market. However, organizational learning is still a very new topic for leaders of both private and public organizations in Pakistan.

## **Literature Review**

### **Organizational Learning Culture**

During the first few years after, Senge utilized the term organizational learning. It was considered to be a very abstract concept and only a few individuals knew what to do with it. Then, as more and more influential CEOs (e.g., Jack Welch) became very interested in it, organizational learning became a very popular topic in the business world. Senge (1990: 14) described the learning organization as “one that is continually expanding its capacity to create its future”. But Huber (1991) emphasized on the change of behaviors after processing certain information. He extends the definition of organizational learning by focusing on knowledge acquisition, information distribution, information interpretation and organizational memory. Watkins and Marsick (1993: 8) defined the learning organization as “one that learns continuously and transforms itself”. Worrell (1995: 352) focused on individual development through organizational culture in which incorrect thinking is eliminated or corrected and shared plan is prepared which is supported by teams. Marquardt (1996) suggested that learning organization transforms itself for better management, empower people for learning and use technology to maximize learning and production. Berthoin Antal and Dierkes (2004: 5) defined organizational learning as expansion of behaviors and cognitions through acquiring, sharing, interpreting, using, and storing knowledge to respond the change in better way.

Senge (1990) pointed out five disciplines in a learning organization. They are personal mastery, mental models, shared vision, team learning, and systems thinking. These five disciplines are major elements of many organizational learning efforts. Personal mastery means developing one’s own proficiency; it is a life long discipline that is about one’s unique purpose in life and the process of

fulfilling that purpose. Mental models are those concepts in the mind, which are necessary to stimulate the understanding processes. A vision is called shared vision when every member in an organization understands the philosophy of organization and reveals a greater commitment in pursuance of such vision. He fully performs his role for contributing in organizational vision. Team learning refers to “when teams are truly learning, not only are they producing extraordinary results but the individual members are growing more rapidly than could have occurred otherwise” (Senge, 1990: 10). Systems’ thinking is the skill of considering the world in terms of wholes, and the practice of spotlighting on the relationships in the midst of the parts of a system. In addition, system thinking “is the conceptual corner stone that underlies all of the five learning disciplines.... the cornerstone of how learning organizations think about their world” (Ibid: 69).

Watkins and Marsick (1993, 1996a) enumerated three levels of organizational learning, namely, individual level, team level and organizational level. Individual level consists of continuous learning and dialogue. Team level focus on team learning and collaboration. At organizational level, there are embedded systems, system connections, empowerment and leadership for learning. Some theories of learning organization have emphasized that an organization wants to toil with people at the individual and group level primarily. Individuals have to be empowered by trying on learning initiatives. Consequently, “individuals learn first as individuals, but as they join together in organizational change, they learn as clusters, teams, networks and increasingly larger units” (Watkins & Marsick, 1996b: 4).

Previous studies have linked organizational learning culture to other positive outcomes within the organization, from both an economic and psychological perspective. Learning organizations differ from other traditional organizations. Like traditional organizations, they are concerned about market share, productivity, quality and profitability but they also clearly know that learning is the key to achieve business success. There is a co-relation between the learning organization dimensions and knowledge and financial performance (Watkins, Yang & Marsick, 1997; Yang, Watkins & Marsick, 1998). Sta. Maria (2003) argued that learning culture can be seen as a precondition for successful organizational change and novelty. The emerging literature on learning organization assumes that learning will improve the organizational performance.

### **Motivation to Learn**

Motivation in the work place has become a very popular topic, since 1970s and early 1980s (Ambrose & Kulik, 1999). Based on the literature, we found that researchers have different definitions for motivation to learn. Work motivation was described by Pinder (1998) as “the set of internal and external forces that initiate work-related behavior, and determine its form, direction, intensity and duration” (as cited in Ambrose & Kulik, 1999: 231). Motivation has been studied extensively in education and psychology research (e.g., Weinstein, 1998).

Motivation has been defined as “the collection of accounts of choices, intensities and feelings of acts” (Edwards, 1999: 19), purposive behaviors directed towards achieving a goal (Hodson, 2001: 23), the power that rejuvenates, directs and sustains the behavior towards a goal (Baron, 1992; Pintrich & Schunk, 1996; Hancock, 2004: 159), an inducement, stimulus or drive towards an act (Morris, 1970: 856). In an adult learning context, motivation to learn was defined as “a person’s tendency to find learning activities meaningful and to benefit from them” (Wlodkowski, 1999: 4). Motivation to learn has also been defined as “the direction, intensity, and persistence of learning- directed behavior” (Colquitt, LePine & Noe, 2000) in the training literature.

In the literature regarding motivation to learn and training usefulness, researchers suggested that motivation to learn is an important prerequisite for learning. Goldstein (1992) found a positive relationship between motivation to learn and trainees’ scores on learning measures. Colquitt, et al. (2000) indicated that motivation to learn had a positive relationship with learning performance. Employees, who are motivated when they come up to a learning situation, undoubtedly have a higher probability to attain positive results as compared to those with a lesser altitude of motivation (Goldstein, 2001). Motivation studies in service management showed that employee motivation is a key factor in achieving the success for a service firm. Employees usually learn when they want to learn. Employees’ increased motivation generally predicts increased performance (Porter & Lawler, 1968; Vroom, 1964). Hays and Hill (2001) indicated that employees’ motivation and organizational learning are positively related to service. They also concluded that motivated employees and the learning capacity of the organization are essential for an organization to achieve excellent service quality.

McCloy and Wise (2002) showed that motivating employees to improve performance through learning is the key for an organization to improve individual performance. Therefore, motivation to learn and a learning culture are both very important for an employee to provide high service quality for both internal and external customers. Success in the market place is highly related to learning and how to motivate employees to learn (Argyris, 1991). Smith’s (1994) study stated that motivated employees are needed if an organization wishes to survive in a competitive market environment. Motivated employees will be able to contribute greatly to an organization’s survival and success as compared to less motivated employees. Here we posit our first hypothesis as;

*H1: There is a positive relationship between motivation to learn and organizational learning culture.*

### **Job Satisfaction**

In the past 80 years, researchers have given various definitions for job satisfaction. There is no agreement on a universal definition; the various definitions emphasize various characteristics of job satisfaction (Gruneberg, 1979). For example, job satisfaction was defined as “the pleasurable emotional state resulting from the

appraisal of one's job as achieving or facilitating the achievement of one's job values" (Locke, 1969: 316). Hopkins (1983: 23) defined job satisfaction as "the fulfillment or gratification of certain needs of the individual that are associated with one's work". Chelladurai (1999) identified that level of job satisfaction an employee's experiences and based this on the evaluations of the cognitive, emotional, and behavioral elements of his/her assignment. Job satisfaction is also defined as the thoughts about or sentimental responses towards a job that typically are revealed in six dimensions, i.e., satisfaction with pay, promotion, people, supervision, the work itself and general satisfaction (Smith, Kendall & Hulin, 1969). Akin to Balzer et al. (1990), an employee that experiences job satisfaction might be more effective and efficient in completing the assigned tasks. It is reasonable to say that an individual's approach about his job ought to have momentous inferences about how he performs it. Locke (1976) found an interaction between the job satisfaction and job performance. Porter and Lawler (1968) concluded that performance is the driver of job satisfaction. Thus our second hypothesis is;

*H2: There is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and organizational learning culture.*

### **Organizational Commitment**

Porter et al. (1974: 604) defined the organizational commitment as "... the strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization". They also defined the organizational commitment as having three major characteristics:

- (a) A strong belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals and values,
- (b) A willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization,
- (c) A strong desire to maintain membership in the organization.

They believed that organizational commitment is an unidimensional construct.

Meyer and Allen's (1991) study indicated that there are three dimensions of the organizational commitment. They are affective, normative and continuance. Affective commitment is strong emotional attachment of the employees due to which they continue their job (Meyer & Allen, 1991: 67). Normative commitment is sense of duty towards the organization due to which they think that they must remain part of organization (Ibid.). Continuance commitment is about employees familiarity with the costs attached with leaving the organization (Ibid.). According to Reichers' (1985) study, employees in an organization might have a number of commitments (foci of commitment) that affect their behavior and attitudes in their work place, such as commitment to the organization, to the occupation, to the union, to the work group, and to the job. Thus, employees' work behavior is affected by several commitments, not just one. O'Reilly and Chatman (1986) also mentioned that commitment has different bases. The third hypothesis emerges as;

*H3: There is a positive relationship between organizational commitment and organizational learning culture.*

### Job Involvement

Lodahl & Kejner (1965) define job involvement as “the degree to which a person’s work performance affects his self-esteem”. They also argue that employees who are highly concerned with their jobs also reveal high involvement in their organizations. Kanungo (1982) identified different explanation of job involvement while studying the relationship of job involvement to numerous variables, including job characteristics, performance, turnover, and absenteeism. Lawler & Hall (1970) defined job involvement as the level of importance of one’s job to one’s personality, which is consistent with Lodahl and Kejner (1965). On the other hand, Bass (1965) considered job involvement as the level to which an individual is vigorously participating in his or her job. However, Etzioni (1975) projected three types of involvement: moral, calculative and alienative. He is of the view that individuals are morally involved, if they own the organizational goals. Blau & Boal (1987) stated that job involvement is the measure of extent to which a person recognizes psychologically with his or her job and mull over his or her performance level important to sense of value. From above arguments, the following hypothesis emerges;

*H4: There is a positive relationship between job involvement and organizational learning culture.*

## Methodology

### Study Setting and Data Sample Information

A total of 200 questionnaires were distributed to the employees of a public service organization located in Lahore city which deals in registration of general public. One hundred and nineteen fully completed questionnaires were returned for response rate of about 60%. In this sample, 85 (71%) were males and 34 (28%) were females. 63 % employees were of 30 years or less age (Mean value is 30.48) and only 2 (1.7%) were above 50 years. Among the employees, 60 were married and 59 were unmarried, constituting almost equal percentage (50%). As far as experience is concerned, 55% employees had 5 years or less experience (Mean value is 6.34), only 10% employees had more than 12 years experience (20 employees). 42 were on some managerial position, making 35% of sample and 77 (65%) was non managerial staff.

### Instrumentation

A self-administered questionnaire with a total of 29 items about research variables was designed by the researcher based on other already established instruments to gather data from subjects on the five studied variables. The questionnaire consisted of six sections: (a) organizational learning culture, (b) motivation to learn, (c) organizational commitment, (d), job satisfaction (e) job

involvement and (f) demographic information. Demographic data were gathered at the end of the questionnaire in section 6 including gender, age, marital status, job experience and position.

### **Organizational Learning Culture**

A learning organization is one that can learn continuously and transform itself by expanding its competence to produce its future (Marsick & Watkins, 2003; Senge, 1994). Akin to Watkins and Marsick (1993, 1996), there are three levels of organizational learning: individual, team or group, and organization. The individual level is about:

- 1) How an organization creates continuous learning opportunities (i.e., continuous learning center, on-line learning, and global dialogue teams) for its individual employee.
- 2) How an organization creates a climate supporting a developmental approach to learning through promoting inquiry and dialogue among individual employees (Watkins & Marsick, 1993: 13). A shorter version was used which included 3 items for individual level, 2 items for team or group level and 3 for organizational level. Sample items were “In my organization, people help each other learn”, “In my organization, teams/groups have the freedom to adapt their goals as needed” and “My organization recognizes people for taking initiative”.

### **Motivation to Learn**

Motivation to learn is defined as the employees’ aspiration to learn the knowledge and skills that will let them better serve other employees within the organization (modified from Noe & Schmitt, 1986). It was measured by three items which include “In general, I am always motivated to learn the skills emphasized in performing my duties to others in the organization”.

### **Job Satisfaction**

“Job satisfaction is a positive emotional state that arises when people appraise their job or job experiences” (Locke, 1976). Respondents were asked to point out how satisfied they were with their current job, co-workers, supervisors, current salary, opportunities for promotion and work in general on 6 item scales developed by Schriessheim & Tsui (1980) but with some amendments. The scale for these items ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Cohen & Vigoda (1999); Vigoda & Kapun (2005) used this scale in their studies.

### **Organizational Commitment**

Involvement of an individual within a particular organization is based on three factors. He has firm belief in organizational goals and accepts its values, he is ready to exert great effort for the organization and he wants to remain the member

of organization (Mowday, Steers & Porter, 1979). A short version of six items from the attitudinal Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) by Porter & Smith (1970) was used on Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Higher score meant a higher Organizational Commitment. Reverse scoring was done where needed.

### **Job Involvement**

Steady with the preceding research job involvement was here defined as the degree to which an individual identified with his or her job (Lodhal & Kejner, 1965). A six item version of JIS was used with some amendments to measure this variable. Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) was used. Higher score meant higher involvement in the job.

### **Results**

The purposes of the study were:

- a) To identify the relationships between the dependent variable organizational learning culture and four independent variables; motivation to learn, organizational commitment, job satisfaction and job involvement.
- b) To examine which among the four studied independent variables best explained the variance in the organizational learning culture.

Cronbach's alphas were calculated to examine the reliability of each variable in the study that ranged from 0.71 to 0.89. The means for the dependent and the independent variables were calculated and are presented in Table 1. From this table, it can be noted that all mean scores were well above the mid-point (2.5) of the scale. The highest mean score recorded was for the motivation to learn variable ( $M = 3.83$ ) while the lowest mean score was 3.65 for organizational learning culture.

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Dev</b>
Organizational Learning Culture	3.65	.79
Motivation to Learn	3.83	.70
Organizational Commitment	3.81	.69
Job Satisfaction	3.66	.80
Job Involvement	3.73	.53

**Table 1:** Means and standard deviations of variables ( $N=119$ )

### **Correlation Analysis**

In order to determine the nature and strength of the relationships among variables suggested by the six hypotheses proposed in this study, Pearson's Product Moment Correlation procedure was used. Table 2 presents the correlation coefficients of the relationship between variables. The highlighted variables are those, relevant to the



hypotheses tested in this study. Hypothesis 1, which suggested a positive relationship between motivation to learn and organizational learning culture was not supported. A weak relationship ( $r = .14, p > .05$ ) between these two variables was found. But a positive strong correlation existed between the organizational commitment and organizational learning culture ( $r = .56, p < .01$ ) as well as job satisfaction and organizational learning culture ( $r = .68, p < .01$ ). Therefore, hypotheses two and three were confirmed. Job involvement is positively and significantly related to the organizational learning culture ( $r = .46, p < .01$ ). Thus, hypothesis four was also supported. Hypothesis one was the only rejected one since the correlation matrix proved that there was a weak relationship between motivation to learn and organizational learning culture rather than a strong relationship as proposed.

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Gender									
Age	.046								
Marital Status	.080	-.567(**)							
Job Experience	.007	.867(**)	-.501(**)						
Position	.039	-.249(**)	.064	-.250(**)					
Organizational Learning Culture	.223(*)	.224(*)	-.164	.158	-.064				
Motivation to Learn	.051	.132	-.018	.143	-.243(**)	.147			
Organizational Commitment	.152	.158	-.173	.103	-.194(*)	.564(**)	.405(**)		
Job Satisfaction	.171	.258(**)	-.240(**)	.263(**)	-.189(*)	.677(**)	.217(*)	.552(**)	
Job Involvement	.031	.163	.017	.135	-.222(*)	.464(**)	.478(**)	.513(**)	.531(**)

\* Correlation is significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed).

\*\* Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed).

**Table 2:** Pearson’s correlation among variables ( $N=119$ )

### Hierarchical Regression Analysis

Hierarchical regression was conducted in order to determine the explanatory power of the independent variables in the variance of organizational learning culture, the dependent variable. Also, with the hierarchical regression analysis, one can control for variables that might impact the dependent variable beyond the independent variables.

The first block of variables entered in the hierarchical regression included three demographic variables: gender, age, marital status, job experience and position within the organization. They were input as control variables. Organizational learning culture was entered as the dependent variable. This allowed us to control for the effects of the demographic variables while checking the variance explained by the independent variables.

The second block of variables included all the four independent variables. The result of the hierarchical regression analysis was presented in Table 4 and Table 5. Table 3 showed the Tolerance and VIF statistics for the regression model. According to the correlation matrix on Table 2, the four independent variables were substantially correlated with each other. Thus, multicollinearity should be examined for this study. High tolerance values (near 1.0) indicate that multicollinearity is not a problem; low values (near .00) indicate multicollinearity (Gliem, 2005). The tolerance value for the variables in this study ranged from .86 to .93. Additionally, one must examine Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values as a high value indicates that a particular independent variable is a linear combination of the other independent variables. In general, if the VIF value is over 10, multicollinearity may be a problem (Ibid). All VIF values in this study were lower than 2, thus, while some independent variables were significantly correlated, multicollinearity does not appear to be a problem for this study.

Table 4 showed that the control variables, entered first in the hierarchical regression, explain a significant amount of the variance in the dependent variable,  $F(5, 113) = 2.67, p = .025$  which is due to age. As Table 4 shows that 52% of the variance of the dependent variable, organizational learning culture, can be explained by the linear combination of the four independent variables and 7% through age. After controlling the demographic variables, the relationships between the four independent variables and the dependent variable are still significant,  $F(9, 109) = 27.23, p < .01$ . The beta weights suggest that age ( $\beta = .21$ ), organizational commitment ( $\beta = .27$ ) and job satisfaction ( $\beta = .47$ ) were the biggest contributors to the variance explained in organizational learning culture.

Variables	Tolerance	VIF	Minimum Tolerance
Motivation to Learn	.928	1.077	.220
Organizational Commitment	.902	1.109	.219
Job Satisfaction	.861	1.162	.220
Job Involvement	.924	1.082	.217

Table 3: Tolerance and VIF statistics

Model	R	R Square	Std. Error	R Square Change	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	F Change	F	Sig. F Change
1	.325(a)	.106	.76172	.106	.066	2.674	2.674	.025
2	.743(b)	.553	.54849	.447	.516	27.235	14.969	.000

- a. Predictors: (Constant), Position, Gender of Employee, Marital Status, Job Experience, Age
- b. Predictors: (Constant), Position, Gender of Employee, Marital Status, Job Experience, Age, MTL, JS, OC, JI

Table 4: Hierarchical Regression Analysis of Organizational Learning Culture (A) (N=119)

Model		$\beta$	Std. Error	$t$	Sig.	Partial $r$	Part $r$
1	(Constant)		.828	3.089	.003		
	Gender of Employee	.221	.157	2.452	.016	.225	.218
	Age	.261	.025	1.374	.172	.128	.122
	Marital Status	-.095	.172	-.864	.389	-.081	-.077
	Job Experience	-.125	.032	-.697	.487	-.065	-.062
	Position	-.033	.152	-.357	.722	-.034	-.032
2	(Constant)		.718	-.910	.365		
	Gender of Employee	.088	.117	1.315	.191	.125	.084
	Age	.211	.018	1.529	.129	.145	.098
	Marital Status	.028	.130	.340	.735	.033	.022
	Job Experience	-.143	.024	-1.084	.281	-.103	-.069
	Position	.090	.113	1.309	.193	.124	.084
	Motivation to Learn	-.119	.087	-1.548	.124	-.147	-.099
	Organizational Commitment	.275	.098	3.206	.002	.294	.205
	Job Satisfaction	.474	.086	5.391	.000	.459	.345
	Job Involvement	.130	.133	1.459	.147	.138	.093

a. Predictors: (Constant), Position, Gender of Employee, Marital Status, Job Experience, Age

b. Predictors: (Constant), Position, Gender of Employee, Marital Status, Job Experience, Age, MTL, JS, OC, JI

**Table 5:** Hierarchical Regression Analysis of Organizational Learning Culture (B)

For further examining the part and partial correlation values were examined. Partial correlation is the incremental predictive effect of one independent variable from the collective effect of all others and is used to identify the independent variables that have the greatest incremental predictive power (Hair et al., 1998). Part correlation coefficient is used to measure the relative importance of the independent variables. Part correlation means the unique relationship predicted by an independent variable after the predictions shared with all other independent variables were taken out (Ibid). Squared part correlation coefficients mean the portions of variability in the dependent variable that are uniquely explained by the independent variable. The results of the hierarchical regression analysis displayed in Table 5 show that job satisfaction ( $\beta = .47$ , partial  $r = .46$ , part  $r = .35$ ,  $t(119) = 5.39$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and the organizational commitment ( $\beta = .28$ , partial  $r = .29$ , part  $r = .20$ ,  $t(119) = 3.21$ ,  $p < .05$ ) played significant roles in predicting the dependent variable, compared with other independent variables. Job satisfaction uniquely explained 12% and organizational commitment uniquely explained 4% of the variance of organizational culture when the effects of the other independent variables were removed.

## Discussion

Major purpose of this study was to examine the relationships among motivation to learn, job attitudes and organizational learning culture. Specifically, this study was conducted to find out which factor has the greatest influence on the organizational learning culture in a public service organization. The results showed that most subjects in this study are highly satisfied with their jobs in the organization and their level of commitment and involvement is very high. Compared with other mean scores, the motivation to learn score was the highest (3.83). But when correlation between the motivation to learn and organizational learning culture was found, it showed no significant relationship. Thus, while organizational members perceive that they have low motivation to learn, it appears that there is a gap between their individual motivation and the culture of learning provided in the organization. Employees in an organization can always fulfill their expected roles with high motivation to learn, knowledge and skills (Munroe, et al., 1997). Findings from this study indicated that the employee's motivation to learn is very weak due to which the leaders may take a little bit longer to pro-actively change the learning culture within the organization. Indeed, in this study, the mean age was about 30.48 and the average tenure with the organization was 6.34 years which would lead one to think that employees must be committed to something about the organization.

Correlation analysis indicated that there was a low positive relationship between the organizational learning culture and motivation to learn. Therefore, hypothesis 1 is not confirmed. But a positive strong correlation existed between the organizational commitment and organizational learning culture ( $r = .56, p < .01$ ) as well as job satisfaction and organizational learning culture ( $r = .68, p < .01$ ). Therefore, hypotheses 2 and 3 were confirmed. Job involvement is positively and moderately related to organizational learning culture ( $r = .46, p < .01$ ). Thus, hypothesis 4 was partially supported. Hierarchical regression analysis also showed that job satisfaction uniquely explained 12% and the organizational commitment uniquely explained 4% of the variance of organizational culture when the effects of the other independent variables were removed. In this way, a strong organizational learning culture was predicted through positive organizational outcomes.

It was found that the satisfied employees were those who wanted to be the part of a learning organizational culture and that the satisfied employees also pay attention to improve their service by involving themselves in their jobs. Since they were satisfied with their jobs, they wanted to make improvement in their learning culture through extra effort and commitment with their organization. From the correlation analysis, among the controlled demographic variables, only gender was highly related to the organizational learning culture ( $r = 0.22, p < .05$ ). When all demographic variables (gender, age, marital status, job experience and position) were first entered into the hierarchical regression they explain a noteworthy

amount of variance in the dependent variable,  $F(5, 113) = 2.67, p = .025$  which was due to age. When the other four independent variables were entered as the second block of variables, the regression coefficient for age remained significant at .05 levels. 52% of the variance of the dependent variable, organizational learning culture, was explained by the linear combination of the four independent variables and 7% through age. The beta weights suggest that age ( $\beta = .21$ ), organizational commitment ( $\beta = .27$ ) and job satisfaction ( $\beta = .47$ ) were the biggest contributors to the variance explained in the organizational learning culture. Thus, older workers rated their organization higher on the organizational learning culture. It might be possible that older workers, who have been working for the same organization for a long time, help their coworkers within the organization in creating a learning environment and their learning curve also be higher than other. It might also be possible due to their well familiarity and good orientation with the organizational processes and policies.

### **Implications for Managers**

A good learning culture, to some extent, can help an employee produce a high level of his service for the public and he will stay with the organization for a long period due to this culture. Retaining subservient and strategically imperative employees, predominantly at a skilled or managerial level has become a critical issue for many organizations in Pakistan. A good learning culture will not only help employees to show a high level of performance but also keep those good employees in the organization. HR managers in service organization should be aware of the situation and set up corresponding rules and policies to retain them that are related to the building of a strong organizational learning culture (e.g., set up learning goals in addition to performance goals, encourage trust and clear communication among employees, etc.).

Learning is a process, not a program. Sometimes, employees may not want to share their knowledge with others, since they believe that it harms their success (Marsick & Watkins, 2003). Therefore, HR manager should also promote the continuous learning opportunities for individual employees and keep monitoring the learning culture and environment within the organization and change it accordingly.

Motivation to learn plays a significant role in the changes in performance level within service sector. McCloy and Wise (2002) clearly stated that motivation to progress work through learning is an important factor for organizations interested in the individual performance improvement. In order to improve the employees' motivation, create a good environment for motivating the employees, to be a part of organizational learning culture. HR managers should know what factors can affect the employees' motivation and encourage them to transfer their learning into their real jobs. Thus, for the organization in order to fully take advantage of the high motivation to learn among its employees, it must develop better practices and policies geared toward a greater organizational learning

culture. These include things like encouraging experimentation, innovation, and providing proper training for employee's career development, etc.

**Limitations**

1. The sample was not selected randomly and may not be representative of all employees, working at public service organization.
2. All respondents in this study worked for the same public organization in Pakistan. There are possible differences existing both between organizations in the public sector, the private sector, and organizations in different industry sectors. So, the research findings may not be generalized to other private organizations.
3. Measurement of the variables of organizational learning culture, motivation to learn, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and job involvement are all based on the perceptions and attitudes of the participants through a self-reported questionnaire. According to Gable and Wolf (1993), the participants are more expected to provide precise data when they think that the study is not threatening to them and is confidential. In this study, the subjects were not asked to write down their names on the questionnaire and mentioned at the beginning of the questionnaire that the participation or nonparticipation will not influence their employment within the organization. Still, these perceptions may have somehow been affected by the situations mentioned above.
4. No actual behaviors on the variables were observed. There are neither peer evaluations nor manager feedback in evaluating the employees' behaviors on the studied variables. Thus, the subjects might not answer a question truthfully. For example, they might give us socially desirable responses to some sensitive questions, or they might put wrong demographic information in order to avoid being identified by the researcher. All of these can be potential sources of error in the data set.
5. Finally, this is a correlation study that is limited to describing, explaining and predicting the relationships among studied variables within the sport organization. Hence, the cause and effect type of relationship (the direction of relationships) among variables can not be determined from the correlation data. However, a causal relationship between the organizational learning culture, motivation to learn and other variables might exist in a public service organization in the real world.

**Guidelines for Future Research**

In this study, gender, age, marital status, job experience and position were treated as demographic control variables. Future studies might also consider measuring how other demographic variables such as education and title might influence the relationship between the studied independent variables and the dependent variable. Thus, future studies might need to include education as a demographic control variable when the subjects have diverse educational backgrounds. Second, this study only examined the relationship between organizational commitment and organizational learning culture but previous studies showed that employees can be

committed to different constituencies at the same time -- having commitment but perhaps not to the organization itself (e.g., to the occupation, to the work group, etc.) (Reichers, 1985). Thus, it is still necessary to examine how various forms of the commitment might act together to find out an individual's attitudes and behavior changes to the organizational learning culture.

One study (Lim, McLean, & Yang, 2005) showed that organizational learning culture drives job satisfaction. And further, job satisfaction is the mediator between the learning culture and organizational commitment. Another study (Egan et al., 2004) showed that organization learning culture influences the job satisfaction and motivation to transfer of learning; it can also indirectly influence the turnover intention through job satisfaction. There may be complicated relationships existing among those five variables: organizational learning culture, motivation to learn, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and job involvement. The direction of the relationship and interrelation of those variables might be more complicated than the direction presented in this study. Future studies could explore the relationships further with different methodological (e.g., longitudinal) and statistical (e.g., structural equation modeling) processes.

Finally, different organizations might have different standards to measure the organizational learning culture. The correct measurement could be established through qualitative research before conducting a quantitative study. On the other hand, a researcher could collect quantitative data first and then produce qualitative data later. The rationale for using both quantitative and qualitative data is that the information collected from qualitative methods (i.e., interviews, focus groups, observations), will assist in probing, explaining and interpreting the findings from the quantitative results. Then, the researcher will be able to better understand the dynamic relationships among variables and provide valuable suggestions to the management of the research setting by combining those two different data resources. Therefore, a mixed method (with both quantitative and qualitative research) study is strongly recommended for future study on internal service quality and other studied variables.

## **Conclusion**

This study put the related variables together based on previous studies and found that the organizational learning culture can be explained through motivation to learn and job attitudes. Findings in this study showed that it was worthwhile to invest in building up a learning culture due to its potentially strong relationship with employees' performance at work. The research showed the necessity of extending the impact and influence of HR in an organization and the establishment of the whole organization's learning needed strong support from HR in that. If workplace learning programs fail to get support from the leaders who understand the significant role of learning, there will be less impact on current and future financial performance of the organization (Marsick & Watkins, 2003). Therefore,

a service organization can only achieve long-term success with the help of some qualified, satisfied, committed and motivated employees and supportive leaders.

## **References**

- Ambrose, M. L. & Kulik, C. T. (1999). Old friends, new faces: Motivation research in the 1990s. *Journal of Management*, Vol. 25 (3).
- Argyris, C. (1991). Teaching smart people how to learn. *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 69 (3).
- Balzer, W. K., Smith, K. C., Kravitz, D. A., Lovell, S. E., Paul, K. B., Reilly, B. A., & Reilly, C. E. (1990). User's manual for the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and the Job In General (JIG) scales. Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University.
- Baron, R. (1992). *Psychology* (2nd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bass, B. M. (1965). *Organizational psychology*, Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Berthoin Antal, A. & Dierkes, M. (2004). Hydrogen technology for China's automobile leapfrog. In A. Berthoin Antal, *The organizational learning agenda for sustainable automobilization in China*. Shanghai: China.
- Blau J. G., & Boal, K. B. (1987). Conceptualizing how job involvement and organizational commitment affect turnover and absenteeism, *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 12.
- Chelladurai, P. (1999). *Human resource management in sport and recreation*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Cohen, A. & Vigoda, E. (1999). Politics and the workplace: An empirical examination of the relationship between political behaviour and work outcomes, *Public Productivity & Management Review*, Vol. 22 (3).
- Colquitt, J. A., Lepine, J. A., & Noe, R. A. (2000). Toward an integrative theory of training motivation: A meta-analytic path analysis of 20 years of research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 85 (5).
- Edwards, D. (1999). *Motivation and emotion*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Egan, T. M., Yang, B., Bartlett, K. R. (2004). The effects of organizational learning culture and job satisfaction on motivation to transfer of learning and turnover intention. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, Vol. 15 (3).
- Etzioni, A. (1975). *Comparative analysis of complex organizations*. Free Press, Glencoe, IL.
- Forman, D.C. (2000). Changing perspectives: From individual to organizational learning. Retrieved on Aug 8, 2009, from <http://www.internettime.com/blog/archives/001230.html>
- Gable, R. K., & Wolf, M. B. (1993). *Instrument development in the affective domain*.
- Gliem, J. A. (2005). *Applied multivariate statistical analysis*. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University Copy Center.
- Goldstein, H. (2001). Appraising the performance of performance appraisals. *IEEE Spectrum*, Vol. 38 (11).
- Goldstein, I.L. (1992). *Training in organizations*, (3rd ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Gruneberg, M. M. (1979). *Understanding job satisfaction*. Thetford, England: Lowe and Brydone.
- Hair, J. F. Jr., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hancock, D. (2004). Cooperative learning and peer orientation effects on motivation achievement. *The Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 97 (3).
- Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.



- Hays, J.M. & Hill, A.V. (2001). A preliminary investigation of the relationships between employee motivation/vision, service learning, and perceived service quality. *Journal of Operations Management*, Vol. 19 (3).
- Hodson, C. (2001). *Psychology and work*. New York, NY: Taylor and Francis Inc.
- Hopkins, A. (1983). *Work and job satisfaction in the public sector*. Totowa, NJ: Rowan and Allanheld.
- Huber, G. P. (1991). Organizational learning: *The contributing processes and the literatures*. *Organization Science*. Vol. 2 (1).
- Human Resource Development Quarterly*. Vol. 13 (4).
- Kanungo, R. N. (1982). Measurement of job and work involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 67.
- Lawler, E. E. III, & Hall, D. T. (1970). Relationship of job characteristics to job involvement, satisfaction, and intrinsic motivation, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 54.
- Lim, T., McLean, G. N., & Yang, B. (2005). Relationships among organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and learning organizational culture in one Korean private organization. Unpublished paper.
- Locke, E. A. (1969). What is job satisfaction? *Organizational Behavior & Human Performance*. Vol. 4 (4).
- Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. Dunnette (Ed.),
- Lodahl, T., & Kejner, M. (1965). The definition and measurement of job involvement, *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Vol. 49.
- Marquardt, M. J., (1996). *Building the learning organization*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Marsick, V. J. & Watkins, K. E. (2003). Demonstrating the value of an organization's learning culture: The dimensions of the learning organization questionnaire. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*. Vol. 5.
- McCloy, R. A., & Wise, L. L. (2002). Invited reaction: The effects of personality, affectivity, and work commitment on motivation to improve work through learning. *Measuring attitudes and values in corporate and school settings* (n.d.). (2nd ed.). Boston: Kuwer Academic Publishers.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*. Vol. 1.
- Morris, W. (Ed.) (1970). *The American heritage dictionary of the English language*. New York, NY: American Heritage.
- Mowday, R., Steers, R., & Porter, L. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. Vol. 14.
- Munroe, D., Schumaker, J., & Carr, S. (Eds.) (1997). *Motivation and culture*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Noe, R. A., & Schmitt, N. (1986). The influence of trainee attitudes on training effectiveness: Test of a model. *Personal Psychology*, 39, 497-523.
- O'Reilly, C., & Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: the effects of compliance, identification and internalization on pro-social behaviour. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Vol. 71 (3).
- Pinder, C. C. (1998). *Work motivation in organizational behavior*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Pintrich, P. R., & Schunk, D. H. (1996). *Motivation in education: Theory, research, and applications*. Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Porter, L. W., & Lawler, E. E. (1968). *Managerial Attitudes and Performance*. Homewood, IL: Irwin.
- Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Vol. 59 (5).

## South Asian Studies 25 (2)

- Porter, L., & Smith, F. (1970). The etiology of organizational commitment. Unpublished paper, University of California, Irvine.
- Reichers, A. E. (1985). *A review and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. Academy of Management Review*. Vol. 10 (3).
- Rouge, Baton. (n.d.). Academy of human resource development conference proceedings. LA: Academy of Human Resource Management.
- Schriesheim, C., & Tsui, A. S. (1980). Development and validation of short Satisfaction instrument for use in survey feedback interventions. In Vigoda, E. & Kapun D. (2005). Perceptions of Politics and Perceived Performance in public and private organizations: a test of one model across two sectors, *Policy & Politics*, 33(2), 251–76.
- Senge, P. M. (1990). The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization. New York, NY: Doubleday/Currency.
- Senge, P. M. (1994). Communication and learning. *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 72 (6).
- Smith, G. P. (1994). Motivation. In W. R. Tracey (Ed.), *Human resources management and development handbook* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: AMACOM.
- Smith, P. C., Kendall, L.M., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Sta. Maria, R. F. (2003). Innovation and organizational learning culture in the Malaysian public sector. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*. Vol. 5 (2).
- Vigoda, E. & Kapun D. (2005). Perceptions of Politics and Perceived Performance in public and private organizations: a test of one model across two sectors. *Policy & Politics*. Vol. 33 (2).
- Vroom, V.H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Watkins, K. E., & Marsick, V. J. (1993). *Sculpting the learning organization: Lessons in the art and science of systematic change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Watkins, K. E., & Marsick, V. J. (1996a). *Adult educators and the challenge of the learning organization. Adult Learning*. Vol. 7 (4).
- Watkins, K. E., & Marsick, V. J. (1996b). *In action: Creating the learning organization*. Alexandria, VA: American Society for Training and Development.
- Watkins, K. E., & Marsick, V. J. (1997). *Dimensions of the learning organization questionnaire [Survey]*. Warwick, RI: Partners for the Learning Organization.
- Watkins, K. E., Yang, B., & Marsick, V. J. (1997). Measuring dimensions of the learning organization. In R. Torraco (Ed.), 1997 Academy of human resource development conference proceedings. Atlanta, GA: Academy of Human Resource Management.
- Weinstein, R. (1998). Promoting positive expectations in schooling. In N. Lambert & B. McCombs (Eds.). *How students learn: Reforming schools through learner-centered education*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Winterstein, A. P. (1998). Organizational commitment among intercollegiate head athletic trainers: Examining our work environment. *Journal of Athletic Training*. Vol. 33.
- Wlodkowski, R. J. (1999). *Enhancing adult motivation to learn: a comprehensive guide for teaching all adults*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Worrell, D. (1995). The learning organization: Management theory for the information age or new age fad? *Journal of Academic Librarianship*. Vol. 21 (5).
- Yang, B., Watkins, K. E., & Marsick, V. J. (1998). Examining construct validity of the dimensions of the learning organization questionnaire. In R.J. Torraco (Ed.). (1998).

## Biographical Notes

**Prof. Dr. Muhammad Ehsan Malik** is working as Dean Faculty of Economics & Management Sciences, Director Institute of Business Administration (IBA), Director General Gujranwala Campus, University of the Punjab, Lahore-Pakistan.

**Rizwan Qaiser Danish** is Incharge, Department of Business Administration, University of the Punjab, Gujranwala Campus, Gujrawala-Pakistan.

---