

Full Length Research Paper

Impact of motivation to learn and job attitudes on organizational learning culture in a public service organization of Pakistan

Muhammad Ehsan Malik¹, Rizwan Qaiser Danish² and Ali Usman^{2*}

¹University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan.

²University of the Punjab, Gujranwala Campus, Pakistan.

Accepted 10 October, 2013

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 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 findings of the study, recommendations and policy implications are discussed and directions for future research are provided.

Key words: 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 become more flexible 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 growing evidence of a relationship between organizational learning culture and economic performance (Ellinger et al., 2003; Marsick and Watkins, 2003; Selden and 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 in order for the organization 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.

*Corresponding author. E-mail: usamaz_07@hotmail.com. Tel: +92 334 4477533.

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) described the learning organization as "one that is continually expanding its capacity to create its future" (p.14). 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) defined the learning organization as "one that learns continuously and transforms itself" (p. 8). Worrell (1995) 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 (p. 352). 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) defined organizational learning as expansion of behaviors and cognitions through acquiring, sharing, interpreting, using, and storing knowledge to respond the change in better way (p. 5).

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 lifelong 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 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, p. 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 cornerstone that underlies all of the five learning disciplines.... the cornerstone of how learning organizations think about their world" (Senge, 1990, p. 69).

Watkins and Marsick (1993, 1996a) enumerated three levels of organizational learning namely; individual, team

and organizational levels. Individual level consists of continuous learning and dialogue. Team level focus on team learning and collaboration. At the 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 levels primarily. Individuals have to be empowered try 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 and Marsick, 1996b, p. 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 correlation between the learning organization dimensions and knowledge and financial performance (Watkins et al., 1997; Yang et al., 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 organizational performance.

Rhodes et al. (2008) states that the learning stimulates the employees' perception to mould in such a way that their behavioral patterns get aligned in a view of organizational vision. The employees' perspective of learning from the valuable experience of their co-workers and from the managers' (Hansen et al., 1999) help them prepares themselves for solving the sophisticated and unseen problems. In this way, a chain of knowledge transfer is formulated for greater organizational perspective. Organizational culture shares common practices of work that enable the employees' to perform multiple jobs in organization with greater level of job involvement. Empirical evidence states that employees' learning has a significant impact on their skill variety and job involvement (Pahor et al., 2008). Consequently these behaviorally integrated and disciplined employees are subjected to add value and enhance the financial performance of their organizations by making them more lucrative for the stakeholders and strategic coalitions. Organizational Climate has made them more loyal, committed and intrinsically motivated for gaining momentum in performance by showing their worthy experiences and potential to remain progressive and acquiesce.

In a recent study Hermine et al. (2010) confirmed that learning was fully implanted as an accepted part of a necessary function of the organization but learning and the identity of being a learner were sometimes resisted in the everyday culture of work. They further suggested when it is acceptable to articulate learning as part of work and be identified as a learner at work.

Motivation to learn

Motivation in the workplace has become a very popular topic since the 1970s and early 1980s (Ambrose and 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” (Ambrose and Kulik, 1999, p. 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, p. 19), purposive behaviors directed towards achieving a goal (Hodson, 2001, p. 23), the power that rejuvenates, directs, and sustains the behavior towards a goal (Baron, 1992; Pintrich and Schunk, 1996 from Hancock, 2004, p. 159), an inducement, stimulus or drive towards an act (Morris, 1970, p. 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, p. 4). Motivation to learn has also been defined as “the direction, intensity, and persistence of learning- directed behavior” (Colquitt et al., 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 success for a service firm. Employees usually learn when they want to learn. Employees’ increased motivation generally predicts increased performance (Porter and 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 marketplace 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 characteristic 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, p. 316). Hopkins (1983) defined job satisfaction as “the fulfillment or gratification of certain needs of the individual that are associated with one’s work” (p. 23). Chelladurai (1999) identified the level of job satisfaction an employee experiences and based this on 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, that is, satisfaction with pay, promotion, people, supervision, the work itself and general satisfaction (Smith et al., 1969). Akin to Balzer et al. (1990), an employee that experiences job satisfaction might be more effective and efficient in completing 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 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) defined organizational commitment as “... the strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization” (p. 604). They also defined 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, and (c) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization”. They believed that organizational commitment is a unidimensional construct.

Meyer and Allen’s (1991) study indicated that there are

three dimensions of 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 and Allen, 1991, p. 67). Normative commitment is sense of duty towards the organization due to which they think that they must remain part of organization (Meyer and Allen, 1991, p. 67). Continuance commitment is about employees familiarity with the costs attached with leaving the organization (Meyer and Allen, 1991, p. 67). 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 workplace, such as commitment to the organization, to the occupation, to the union, to the workgroup, 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 and 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 are also revealing 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 and 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 and 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 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 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 and 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, and (2) how an organization creates a climate supporting a developmental approach to learning through promoting inquiry and dialogue among individual employees (Watkins and Marsick, 1993, p. 13). A shorter version was used which included 3 items for measuring organizational learning culture at 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 and Schmitt, 1986). It was measured by three items which include "In general, I am always motivated to learn to 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 Schriesheim and Tsui (1980) but with some amendments. The scale for these items ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) . Cohen and Vigoda (1999); Vigoda and Kapun (2005) used this scale in their studies.

Table 1. Means and standard deviations of variables (N=119).

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev
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

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 et al., 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 and b) to examine which among the four studied independent variables best explained the variance in 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.

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

present 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 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 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.

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, we 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 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 four independent variables. The result of the hierarchical regression analysis was presented in Table 4 and 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

Table 2. Pearson's correlation among variables (N=119)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Gender									
Age	0.046								
Marital Status	0.080	-0.567**							
Job Experience	0.007	0.867**	-0.501**						
Position	0.039	-0.249**	0.064	-0.250**					
Organizational Learning Culture	0.223*	0.224*	-0.164	0.158	-0.064				
Motivation to Learn	0.051	0.132	-0.018	0.143	-0.243**	0.147			
Organizational Commitment	0.152	0.158	-0.173	0.103	-0.194*	0.564**	0.405**		
Job Satisfaction	0.171	0.258**	-0.240**	0.263**	-0.189*	0.677**	0.217*	0.552**	
Job Involvement	0.031	0.163	0.017	0.135	-0.222*	0.464**	0.478**	0.513**	0.531**

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 3. Tolerance and VIF statistics.

Variable	Tolerance	VIF	Minimum tolerance
Motivation to Learn	0.928	10.077	0.220
Organizational commitment	0.902	10.109	0.219
Job Satisfaction	0.861	10.162	0.220
Job Involvement	0.924	10.082	0.217

Table 4. Hierarchical regression analysis of organizational learning culture (A) (N=119).

Model	R	R ²	Std0. error	ΔR ²	Adjusted R ²	F	F	Sig0. ΔF
1	0.325(a)	0.106	0.76172	0.106	0.066	20.674	20.674	0.025
2	0.743(b)	0.553	0.54849	0.447	0.516	270.235	140.969	0.000

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.

value for 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 (Gliem, 2005). 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 variance in the dependent variable, $F(5, 113) = 2.67, p = .025$ which is due to age. As Table 4 shows that the 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.

To examine this further, 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 independent variables that have the greatest incremental predictive power (Hair et al., Black, 1998). The 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 (Hair et al., 1998). Squared part correlation coefficients mean the portions of variability in the dependent variable that are uniquely explained by the independent variable. The results of 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 organizational commitment ($\beta = .28$, partial $r = .29$, part $r = .20, t(119) =$

Table 5. Hierarchical regression analysis of organizational learning culture (B).

Model		β	Std0. error	T	Sig0.	Partial R	Part R
1	(Constant)		0.828	30.089	0.003		
	Gender of employee	0.221	0.157	20.452	0.016	0.225	0.218
	Age	0.261	0.025	10.374	0.172	0.128	0.122
	Marital status	-0.095	0.172	-0.864	0.389	-0.081	-0.077
	Job experience	-0.125	0.032	-0.697	0.487	-0.065	-0.062
	Position	-0.033	0.152	-0.357	0.722	-0.034	-0.032
2	(Constant)		0.718	-0.910	0.365		
	Gender of employee	0.088	0.117	10.315	0.191	0.125	0.084
	Age	0.211	0.018	10.529	0.129	0.145	0.098
	Marital status	0.028	0.130	0.340	0.735	0.033	0.022
	Job experience	-0.143	0.024	-10.084	0.281	-0.103	-0.069
	Position	0.090	0.113	10.309	0.193	0.124	0.084
	Motivation to learn	-0.119	0.087	-10.548	0.124	-0.147	-0.099
	Organizational commitment	0.275	0.098	30.206	0.002	0.294	0.205
	Job satisfaction	0.474	0.086	50.391	0.000	0.459	0.345
	Job involvement	0.130	0.133	10.459	0.147	0.138	0.093

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.

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

The 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 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 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 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 employee motivation to learn is

very weak due to which the leaders may take a little bit longer to proactively 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 organizational learning culture and motivation to learn. Therefore, hypothesis 1 is not confirmed. Although the mean score on all variables is very high but motivation to learn has highest mean score (3.83) which indicates that employees are intrinsically motivated to become the part of learning organization but learning culture in this public service organization is at its development stage and has not mature yet. Its mean score of organizational learning culture is lowest (3.65) as compared to others. But a positive strong correlation existed between 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 moderately related to organizational learning culture ($r = .46, p < .01$). Thus, hypothesis four was partially supported. Hierarchical regression analysis also showed that 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. In this

way, a strong organizational learning culture was predicted through positive organizational outcomes.

It was found that satisfied employees were those who want to be the part of a learning organizational culture and that satisfied employees also pay attention to improving their service by involving themselves in their jobs. Since they were satisfied with their jobs they want 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 organizational learning culture ($r = 0.22$, $p < .05$). When the 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 the .05 level. 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 organizational learning culture. Thus, older workers rated their organization higher on organizational learning culture. It might be that older workers who have been working for the same organization for a long time help their coworkers within organization in creating a learning environment and their learning curve also higher than other. It might also 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 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 building 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 it harms their success (Marsick and Watkins, 2003). Therefore, HR manager should also promote 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 individual performance improvement. In order to improve employees' motivation, create a good environment for motivating employees to be a part of organizational learning culture. HR managers should know what factors can affect employees' motivation and encourage them to transfer their learning into their real jobs. Thus, for the organization 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

First, the sample was not selected randomly and may not be representative of all employees working at public service organization. Second, 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. Third, measurement of the variables of organizational learning culture, motivation to learn, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and job involvement are all based on perceptions and attitudes of participants through a self-reported questionnaire. According to Gable and Wolf (1993) participants are more expected to provide precise data when they think the study is not threatening to them and is confidential. In this study, we did not ask the subjects to write down their names on the questionnaire and mentioned at the beginning of the questionnaire that participation or non-participation will not influence their employment within the organization. Still, these perceptions may have somehow been affected by the situations mentioned above.

Fourth, no actual behaviors on the variables were observed. There are neither peer evaluations nor manager feedback in evaluating employees' behaviors on the studied variables. Thus, 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.

Finally, this is a correlation study that is limited to describing, explaining and predicting relationships among studied variables within the sport organization. Hence, the cause and effect type of relationship (the direction of relationships) among variables cannot be determined from the correlation data. However, a causal relationship between 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 the various forms of commitment might act together to find out an individual's attitudes and behavior changes to the organizational learning culture.

One study (Lim et al., 2005) showed that organizational learning culture drives job satisfaction. And further, job satisfaction is the mediator between learning culture and organizational commitment. Another study (Egan et al., 2004) showed that organization learning culture influences job satisfaction and motivation to transfer of learning; it can also indirectly influence 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 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 information collected from qualitative methods (that is, 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 related variables together based on previous studies and found that organizational learning culture can be explained through motivation to learn and job attitudes. Findings in this study showed that it is 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, in that the establishment of the whole organization's learning need strong support from HR. If workplace learning programs fail to get support from leaders who understand the significant role of learning, there will be less impact on current and future financial performance of the organization (Marsick and 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 ML, Kulik CT (1999). Old friends, new faces: Motivation research in the 1990s. *J. Manage.* 25(3): 231-292.
- Argyris C (1991). Teaching smart people how to learn. *Harv. Bus. Rev.*, 69(3): 99-109.
- Balzer WK, Smith KC, Kravitz DA, Lovell SE, Paul KB, Reilly BA, Reilly CE (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 and Bacon.
- Bass BM (1965). *Organizational psychology*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Berthoin 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 JG, Boal KB (1987). Conceptualizing how job involvement and organizational commitment affect turnover and absenteeism. *Acad. Manage. Rev.*, 12: 288-300.
- 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. *Pub. Prod. Manage. Rev.*, 22(3): 389-406.
- Colquitt JA, Lepine JA, Noe RA (2000). Toward an integrative theory of training motivation: A meta-analytic path analysis of 20 years of research. *J. Appl. Psychol.*, 85(5): 678-707.

- Edwards D (1999). *Motivation and emotion*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Egan TM, Yang B, Bartlett KR (2004). The effects of organizational learning culture and job satisfaction on motivation to transfer of learning and turnover intention. *Hum. Resour. Dev. Q.*, 15(3): 279-301.
- Etzioni A (1975). *Comparative analysis of complex organizations*. Free Press, Glencoe, IL.
- Forman DC (2000). *Changing perspectives: From individual to organizational learning*. Retrieved on Aug 8, 2009, from <http://www.internetttime.com/blog/archives/001230.html>
- Gable RK, Wolf MB (1993). *Instrument development in the affective domain*. Measuring attitudes and values in corporate and school settings (2nd ed.). Boston: Kuwer Academic Publishers.
- Gliem JA (2005). *Applied multivariate statistical analysis*. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University Copy Center.
- Goldstein H (2001). Appraising the performance of performance appraisals. *IEEE Spectrum*, 38(11): 61-63.
- Goldstein IL (1992). *Training in organizations* (3rd ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Gruneberg MM (1979). *Understanding job satisfaction*. Thetford, England: Lowe and Brydone.
- Hair JF Jr, Anderson RE, Tatham RL, Black WC (1998). *Multivariate data analysis* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hancock D (2004). Cooperative learning and peer orientation effects on motivation achievement. *J. Educ. Res.*, 97(3): 159-166.
- Hansen M, Nohria N, Tierney T (1999). "What's your strategy for managing knowledge", *Harv. Bus. Rev.*, 106-16.
- Hays JM, Hill AV (2001). A preliminary investigation of the relationships between employee motivation/vision, service learning, and perceived service quality. *J. Oper. Manage.*, 19(3): 335-349.
- Hermine S, Nicky S, David B, Donna R (2010). When is it OK to learn at work? The learning work of organizational practices, *J. Workplace Learn.*, 22(1/2) 13-26.
- 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 GP (1991). *Organizational learning: The contributing processes and the literatures*. *Org. Sci.*, 2(1): 88-115.
- Kanungo RN (1982). Measurement of job and work involvement. *J. Appl. Psychol.*, 67: 341-349.
- Lawler EE III, Hall DT (1970). Relationship of job characteristics to job involvement, satisfaction, and intrinsic motivation. *J. Appl. Psychol.*, 54: 305-312.
- Lim T, McLean GN, Yang B (2005). Relationships among organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and learning organizational culture in one Korean private organization. Unpublished paper.
- Locke EA (1969). What is job satisfaction? *Organizational Behavior and Hum. Perform.*, 4(4): 309-336.
- Locke EA (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*. 1279-1319: Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Lodahl T & Kejner M (1965). The definition and measurement of job involvement, *J. Appl. Psychol.*, 49: 24-33.
- Marquardt MJ (1996). *Building the learning organization*. New York, NY: McGraw- Hill.
- Marsick VJ, Watkins KE (2003). Demonstrating the value of an organization's learning culture: The dimensions of the learning organization questionnaire. *Adv. Dev. Hum. Resour.*, 5: 132-151.
- McCloy RA, Wise LL (2002). Invited reaction: The effects of personality, affectivity, and work commitment on motivation to improve work through learning. *Hum. Resour. Dev. Q.*, 13(4): 377-382.
- Meyer JZ, Allen NJ (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Hum. Resour. Manage. Rev.*, 1: 61-89.
- Mowday R, Steers R, Porter L (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment, *J. Vocat. Behav.*, 14: 79-94.
- Morris W (1970). *The American heritage dictionary of the English language*. New York, NY: American Heritage.
- Munroe D, Schumaker J, Carr S (1997). *Motivation and culture*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Noe RA, Schmitt N (1986). The influence of trainee attitudes on training effectiveness: Test of a model. *Personal Psychol.*, 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. *J. Appl. Psychol.*, 71(3): 492-499.
- Pahor M, Škerlavaj M, Dimovski V (2008). Evidence for the Network Perspective on Organizational Learning. *J. Am. Society Info. Sci. Technol.*, 59(12):1985-1994.
- Pinder CC (1998). *Work motivation in organizational behavior*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Pintrich PR, Schunk DH (1996). *Motivation in education: Theory, research, and applications*. Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Porter LW, Lawler EE (1968). *Managerial Attitudes and Performance*. Homewood, IL: Irwin.
- Porter L, Smith F (1970). The etiology of organizational commitment. Unpublished paper, University of California, Irvine.
- Porter LW, Steers RM, Mowday RT, Boulian PV (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *J. Appl. Psychol.*, 59(5): 603-609.
- Reichers AE (1985). A review and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. *Acad. Manage. Rev.*, 10(3): 465-476.
- Rhodes J, Lok P, Hung RYY, Fang SC (2008). An integrative model of Organizational learning and social capital on effective knowledge transfer and perceived organizational performance. *J. Workplace Learn.*, 20(4): 245-258.
- Senge PM (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York, NY: Doubleday/Currency.
- Senge PM (1994). Communication and learning. *Harv. Bus. Rev.* 72(6): 182- 183.
- Schriesheim C, Tsui AS (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 Polit.*, 33(2): 251-76.
- Smith GP (1994). Motivation. In W. R. Tracey (Ed.), *Human resources management and development handbook* (2nd ed., pp. 248-261). New York, NY: AMACOM.
- Smith PC, Kendall LM, Hulin CL (1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Sta. Maria RF (2003). Innovation and organizational learning culture in the Malaysian public sector. *Adv. Dev. Hum. Resour.*, 5(2): 205-214.
- 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 Polit.*, 33(2): 251-76.
- Vroom VH (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Watkins KE, Marsick VJ (1993). *Sculpting the learning organization: Lessons in the art and science of systematic change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Watkins KE, Marsick VJ (1996a). Adult educators and the challenge of the learning organization. *Adult Learn.*, 7(4): 18-20.
- Watkins KE, Marsick VJ (1996b). *In action: Creating the learning organization*. Alexandria, VA: Am. Society Train. Dev.
- Watkins KE, Marsick VJ (1997). *Dimensions of the learning organization questionnaire [Survey]*. Warwick, RI: Partners for the Learning Organization.
- Watkins KE, Yang B, Marsick VJ (1997). Measuring dimensions of the learning organization. In R. Torrance (Ed.), *1997 Academy of human resource development conference proceedings 543-536*: Atlanta, GA: Acad. Hum. Resour. Manage.,
- Weinstein R (1998). Promoting positive expectations in schooling. In N. Lambert and B.
- McCombs (Eds.), *How students learn: Reforming schools through learner-centered education* (pp. 81-111). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Winterstein AP (1998). Organizational commitment among intercollegiate head athletic trainers: Examining our work environment. *J. Athletic Train.*, 33: 54-61.
- Wlodkowski RJ (1999). *Enhancing adult motivation to learn: a comprehensive guide for teaching all adults*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley and Sons.

Worrell D (1995). The learning organization: Management theory for the information age or new age fad? *J. Acad. Librarianship*. 21(5): 351-357.

Yang B, Watkins KE, Marsick VJ (1998). Examining construct validity of the dimensions of the learning organization questionnaire. In: R.J.

Torraco (Ed.), *Academy of human resource development conference proceedings*. 83-90: Baton Rouge, LA: Acad. Hum. Resour. Manage.