The Relationship between Organizational Learning Context and Organizational Commitment at University Level

Zahida Javed, Assistant Professor of Education, University of Education Lahore, Joharabad campus, Pakistan. zahida.javed@ue.edu.pk

Hina Dildar, Lecturer Education, University of Education Lahore, Joharabad campus, Pakistan. hina.dildar@ue.edu.pk

Khansa Imam, Lecturer Education, University of Education Lahore, Joharabad campus, Pakistan. khansa.imam@ue.edu.pk

Asif Iqbal, Assistant Professor of Education, University of Education Lahore, Faisalabad campus asif.iqbal@ue.edu.pk

Saba Shahzadi, MPhil Education GC University Faisalabad

Abstract- The current research paper investigated the relationship between organizational learning context and organizational commitment at university level. The data were collected using simple random sampling technique of 452 students from different universities. The instrument, organizational learning & innovation survey was used for collection of data. The Pearson r test revealeda strong positive relationship of product & services, academic learning & innovation, and social adjustment with organizational learning of students.There is a strong positive relationship of culture and moderate positive relationship of process with management commitment of learning. It was found that when the organizational learning of students increases, all the factors i: e, product & services, academic learning & innovation, and social adjustment also increase. It was recommended that iforganizational learning context and organizational commitment improved at university level, the performance of students increased.

Keywords: Organizational learning, commitment, students' performance

I. INTRODUCTION

The 1earning community repe1s destruction and struggle, and able a learner to learn in groups.In institutions, brain power assumed to classify with respect to all learners. Combine studies inspire aa learners to ask more and more questions, describe issues, take interest in discussion when needed, take part in activity and fix the aim, level and goals, talk about their studies with different people in and out of the institution, and find novel ways to become successor. Institutions find plans that enhance the intelligence of learners. These plans are very important for education in which point of view of one person differ with others.

Grouping

Different types of groups contain different types of persons. They differ in gender, beliefs, education, learning, skills, age, social and economic backgrounds. This combination conveys a strong information with different point of views and interesting tasks.Groups are organized and reorganized to get the more and more information when needed. These changing in groups are made for short time and emphasis on the benefits which make learners more efficient. Differences and changing in groups were made for better learning process. In this way, all the learners learn equally.

Teacher Roles

The teacher provides rich environments, experiences, and activities for 1earning by incorporating opportunities for co11aborative work, prob1em so1ving, authentic tasks, and shared know1edge and responsibi1ity.In a co11aborative c1assroom, the teacher must act as a guide - a comp1ex and varied ro1e that incorporates mediation, mode11ing, and coaching. When mediating student 1earning, the teacher frequent1y adjusts the 1eve1 of information and support based on students' needs and he1ps students to 1ink new information to prior know1edge, refine their prob1em-so1ving strategies, and 1earn how to 1earn.Teachers and the students together take part in inquiries in working with authorities. Students use this idea to discover new boundaries and become pioneers of information in society. In this way, by using expertise, instructors become beginner and beginners become the instructor.

Student Roles

Students develop methods and application of these methods to interact with physica1 world, materia1s, techno1ogy, and other peop1e. The chances created by finding out new ways make the students to take decisions meanwhile they also learn about the concepts and parts behind their events, objects and people. By this exercise, learners become thoughtful person and make better through this procedure which is

taken up by the people of this world. In this model, students show up their abilities in multiple aspects and a wide range of actions and narrate their experiences by combining them together. Students make new products for themselves and their society in which they live. These new products generate and combine their knowledge and skills. With the use of this, students contribute a major share to this always increasing knowledge of the world.

Transfer & integration of Knowledge

Knowledge is the outcome of learning. Knowledge can manifest itself in changes in cognitions or behaviour. It can be unambiguous or wordless but challenging to communicate. Knowledge in the sense of a stock and in the sense of a process, both are the forms of knowledge. It has many aspects. For example, knowledge can differ from explicit knowledge that can be transferred to tacit knowledge that is difficult to communicate. A related dimension of knowledge is whether it is declarative or procedural. Declarative knowledgeis knowledge about fact what researchers have termed "know what". Procedural knowledge is knowledge of processes or "know-how." Knowledge may differ to certain degree in its "causal ambiguity" or the confinements to which "cause– effect relationships" are understood. In addition, knowledge can vary in its "demonstrability" or ease of showing its correctness and appropriateness. Further, knowledge can be codified or not. Peculiarities of knowledge influence its retention and transfer. Handling and manoeuvring knowledge one's own interests is important concern for organizations. For example, a fundamental issue of profit for organizations face is how to facilitate the internal transfer of knowledge while blocking its external transfer to competitors. Sharing of knowledge and procedural know-how and problem solving at its earliest can result in enhancement of previously rehearsed or carried out regulations and protocols (Alavi&Leidner, 2001; Cook & Brown, 1999; Edmondson, Winslow, Bohmer, & Pisano, 2003; Kane, 2010; Kogut& Zander, 1992; Lapré, Mukherjee, & Van Wassenhove, 2000; Nonaka& von Krogh, 2009; Orlikowski, 2002; Szulanski, 1996; Tucker, 2007; Vaast&Levina, 2006; Zander &Kogut, 1995; Zollo& Winter, 2002).

Organizational learning and innovativeness

Innovation invo1ves the renovation and manipulation of previous information. It demands the sharing of data from the employees of an organization. Improvement follows the shared information of employees within the organization and this shared data produces mutual insights, in a method of separation and junction, and this new data increase novelty in an organization. As a result, progress, attainment, renovation and manipulation occur with the help of new data which lead toward the organizational innovation. So, it is obvious that, for innovation in an organization, constant efforts required. Related to the features of workplace that encourages efforts of workers and implements innovation in the organization, different perspectives should be noticed. The environment of the organization or a department is important for learning and innovation as we11 as severa1 factors of organizationa1 1earning inf1uencing the organization's abi1ity to stimu1ate innovation. More specifica11y, in the working environment, manageria1 support for 1earning and innovation is a1so potentia11y inf1uentia1 (Jimenez et al., 2008; Martins & Terblanche, 2003; Nonaka, 1994; Van der Sluis, 2004).

Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment is an intellectual ability that accommodate people towards work which lead to the goal of an organization. Most recent1y Meyer and Allen (1991, 1997) gave three types of organizational commitment: sentimental, maintenance, and standard. Firstly, Sentimental commitment is the workers responsiveness toward organization. Secondly, Maintenance commitment regarded as the individual's obligation for the organization because he/she perceives a high cost of 1osing organizationa1 membership. Lastly, standard commitment is the individual's commitment to continue within the organization because of fee1ings of ob1igation (Bentein et al., 2005; Meyer & Allen, 1991; Meyer & Allen, 1997; Meyer et al., 1993; Meyer &Herscovitch, 2001).

Null Hypotheses

Following null hypotheses were formulated to achieve the desired objectives.

H_o1: There is no significant relationship of organizational learning with innovative product & services, academic learning & innovation, and social adjustment at university level.

H_o2: There is no significant relationship of management commitment with innovative culture and process at university level.

H_o3: There is no significant relationship of management commitment with innovative product & services, academic learning & innovation, and social adjustment at university level.

Ho4: There is no significant relationship of systematic perspective with innovative culture and process at university level.

H_o5: There is no significant relationship of systematic perspective with product & services, academic learning & innovation and social adjustment at university level.

II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This part of the research deals with methodology and procedure of the study. It is an elaboration of methodology and procedure used in this chapter. The population, sampling procedure, sample, hypotheses, variables, instruments, validation, pilot testing, data collection, data analysis through statistical techniques, and permission to conduct the research was also taken.

Research Design

This study was descriptive in nature. A survey was conducted to explore the relationship between organizational learning and organizational innovativeness in the results of the teachers working in different institutions.

Population

Population of the study consisted of:

All public sector universities in Faisalabad.

All the students enrolled in B.S., M.Ed., B.A/B.Sc., and M.A/M.Sc. programmes in those universities.

Sample of the study

The data were collected using simple random technique. Four hundred and fifty-two (452) students were randomly approached from public sector universities in Faisalabad, Pakistan. From which 201 were male and 251 were female. The number of respondents from B.S., M.Ed., Graduation and master level were 72, 81, 178, and 121 respectively. Semester wise distribution of data were 52, 58, 42, 63, 53, 53, 52, and 79 from 1st to 8th semesters respectively. Students from science were 249 and from Arts were 203. Two hundred and fifty six (256) students from urban areas and 196 from rural areas were randomly selected.

Instrument of the Study

Organizational Learning and Innovation Survey [OLIS] questionnaire was used to collect the data. A questionnaire (5 point Likert scale) consisted of 45 statements developed by the researcher herself used for data collection.

Pilot Testing of the Instrument

As the instrument was developed by the researcher herself, therefore it was validated by a pilot testing upon the limited population. The instrument was developed in English language keeping in view the literature review and different questionnaires already used for different researchers about learning and innovation.

Organizational learning & Innovation survey

The instrument (closed ended, Likert type scale) was developed by the researcher herself, in which forty five (45) were divided into five (5) dimensions of organizational learning and five (5) dimensions of organizational innovativeness.

Factors of Organizational Learning are: Organizational Learning 5 items; Management Commitment 5 items; Systematically Perspective 4 items; Outdoor & Experimentation 4 items; and Transfer & Integration of Knowledge 5 items.

Factors of Organizational Innovativeness are Culture 4 items; Process 3 items; Product and Services 6 items; Academic learning and innovation 5 items; and Social adjustment 4 items.

Table 1

Item Breakup of Organizational Innovativeness

S. No	Factors of the scale	Item Number
1	Culture	21, 22, 23, 24
2	Process	26, 27, 29
3	Product and Services	30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35
4	Academic Learning and Innovation	36, 37, 39, 40, 41
5	Social Adjustment	42, 43, 44, 45

The table 1 explains the five (5) factors of OI, which have twenty two (22) items. They were further divided into Culture 4 items; Process 3 items; Product and Services 6 items; Academic learning and innovation 5 items; and Social adjustment 4 items.

III. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Table 2

Number of Respondents with respect to University

S. No	University	Frequency	Percent
1	G.C.	123	27.2
2	U.E	94	20.8
3	GCU (W)	120	26.5
4	Agriculture	115	25.4
Total		452	100.0

Table 4.6 means that number of respondents belong to GC University were 123, U.E were 94, GCW University were 120, and of UAF were 115. Their percentage were 27.2%, 20.8%, 26.5%, and 25.4% respectively.

H₀1: There is no significant relationship of organizational learning with innovative product & services, academic learning & innovation, and social adjustment at university level.
Table3
Relationship of Organizational Learning with Product & Services, Academic Learning & Innovation and Social Adjustment

	Organizational Learning	*P-value*
Product & Services	.537	.000**
Academic Learning & Innovation	.547	.000**
Social Adjustment	.517	.000**

**P<0.01

Correlation explains the relationship of product & services, academic learning & innovation, and social adjustment with organizational learning. It is revealed that there is a strong positive relationship of product & services, academic learning & innovation, and social adjustment with organizational learning of students (r= .537, r= .547, and r= .517, P<0.01 & 0.05), which was also significant.So the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship of organizational learning with innovative product & services, academic learning & innovation, and social adjustment at university level was rejected. It was found that when the organizational learning of students increases, all the factors i: e, product & services, academic learning & innovation, and social adjustment also increase.

H₀2: There is no significant relationship of management commitment with innovative culture and process at university level.

Table 4

Relationship of Management Commitment with Innovative Culture and Process

	Management Commitment	*P-value*
Innovative Culture	.508	.000**
Innovative Process	.485	.000**

**P<0.01

The relationship of innovative culture and process with management commitment is clear from the table. It is disclosed that there is a strong positive relationship of culture and moderate positive relationship of process with management commitment of learning (r= .508 and r= .485, P<0.01 & 0.05), which were also significant.So the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship of management commitment with innovative culture and process at university level was rejected. Results show that when the innovation in culture and process increases, the organizational learning of the students also increases. The result of "Pearson r" showed the strong positive relationship of culture and moderate positive relationship of process with organizational learning of the students, which were also significant.

H₀3: There is no significant relationship of management commitment with innovative product & services, academic learning & innovation, and social adjustment at university level.
Table5

Relationship of Management Commitment with Product & Services, Academic Learning & Innovation and Social Adjustment

	Management Commitment	P-value
Product & Services	.540	.000**
Academic Learning & Innovation	.529	.000**
Social Adjustment	.511	.000**

**P<0.01

Correlation shows the relationship of product & services, academic learning & innovation, and social adjustment with management commitment. It is revealed that there is a strong positive relationship of product & services, academic learning & innovation, and social adjustment with management commitment of learning (r= .540, r=.529, and r=.511, P<0.01 & 0.05), as well as significant.So the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship of management commitment with innovative product & services, academic learning & innovation, and social adjustment at university level was rejected. It was apparent that when the management commitment in learning of students' increases, all the aspects i: e, product & services, academic learning & innovation, and social adjustment also increase.

Ho4: There is no significant relationship of systematic perspective with innovative culture and process at university level.

Table6

Relationship of Systematic Perspective with Innovative Culture and Process

	systematic perspective	P-value
Innovative Culture	.537	.000**
Innovative Process	.577	.000**

**P<0.01

Correlation describes the relationship of innovative culture and process with systematic perspective of learning. It is revealed that there is a strong positive relationship of culture and process with systematic perspective of learning (r= .537 and r= .577, P<0.01 & 0.05), as well as significant.So the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship of systematic perspective with innovative culture and process at university level was rejected. It was evident that when the innovation in culture and process increases, the learning of the students also increases. The results of Pearson "r" show the strong positive relationships of culture and process with organizational learning of the students, as well as significant.

H$_o$5: There is no significant relationship of systematic perspective with product & services, academic learning & innovation and social adjustment at university level.

Table7

Relationship of Systematic Perspective with Product & Services, Academic Learning & Innovation and Social Adjustment

	Systematic Perspective	P-value
Product & Services	.533	.000**
Academic Learning & Innovation	.481	.000**
Social Adjustment	.436	.000**

**P<0.01

Correlation proves the relationship of product & services, academic learning & innovation, and social adjustment with systematic perspective. It is revealed that there is a strongly positive significant relationship of product & services, and moderate relationship of academic learning & innovation, and social adjustment with systematic perspective of learning (r= .540, r=.529, and r=.511, P<0.01 & 0.05).So

the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship of systematic perspective with innovative product & services, academic learning & innovation, and social adjustment at university level was rejected. It is concluded that when the systematic perspective in organizational learning of students increases, all the aspects i: e, product & services, academic learning & innovation, and social adjustment also increase.

IV. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Correlation explains the relationship of product & services, academic learning & innovation, and social adjustment with organizational learning. It is revealed that there is a strong positive relationship of product & services, academic learning & innovation, and social adjustment with organizational learning of students.It was found that when the organizational learning of students increases, all the factors i: e, product & services, academic learning & innovation, and social adjustment also increase.
There is a strong positive relationship of culture and moderate positive relationship of process with management commitment of learning. Results show that when the innovation in culture and process increases, the organizational learning of the students also increases.

Correlation shows the relationship of product & services, academic learning & innovation, and social adjustment with management commitment. It is revealed that there is a strong positive relationship of product & services, academic learning & innovation, and social adjustment with management commitment of learning. It was apparent that when the management commitment in learning of students' increases, all the aspects i: e, product & services, academic learning & innovation, and social adjustment also increase.
Correlation describes the relationship of innovative culture and process with systematic perspective of learning. There is a strong positive relationship of culture and process with systematic perspective of learning.

Correlation proves the relationship of product & services, academic learning & innovation, and social adjustment with systematic perspective. It is revealed that there is a strongly positive significant relationship of product & services, and moderate relationship of academic learning & innovation, and social adjustment with systematic perspective of learning. It is concluded that when the systematic perspective in organizational learning of students increases, all the aspects i: e, product & services, academic learning & innovation, and social adjustment also increase.

REFERENCES

1. Alavi, M., &Leidner, D. E. (2001). Review: Knowledge management and knowledge management systems: Conceptual foundations and research issues.*MIS Quarterly, 25* (1), 107–136.
2. Alavi, M., &Leidner, D. E. (2001). Review: Knowledge management and knowledge management systems: Conceptual foundations and research issues. *MIS quarterly*, 107-136. Doi: 10.2307/3250961, http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3250961
3. Cook, S. &Yanow, D. (1995). Culture and organizational learning, In Cohen and Sproull (Eds.)
4. Edmondson, A., &Moingeon, B. (1998). From organizational learning to the learning organization, *Management Learning,*29, 5–20.
5. Jimenez, D.J., Valle, R.S., & Hernandez-Espallardo, M. (2008). Fostering innovation: the role of market orientation and organizational learning. *European Journal of Innovation Management, 11*(3), 389-412
6. Kane, A. A. (2010). Unlocking knowledge transfer potential: Knowledge demonstrability and superordinate social identity.*Organization Science, 21* (3), 643–660.
7. Kane, A. A., Argote, L., & Levine, J. M. (2005). Knowledge transfer between groups via personnel rotation: Effects of social identity and knowledge quality.*Organizational Behaviour and HumanDecision Processes, 96,* 56–71.
8. Kogut, B., & Zander, U. (1992). Knowledge of the firm, combinative capabilities and the replication of technology.*Organizational Science, 3,* 383–397.
9. Kogut, B., & Zander, U. (1996). What Firms Do? Coordination, identity, and learning, *Organization Science, 7*(5), 502-518.
10. Lapré, M. A., Mukherjee, A. S., & Van Wassenhove, L. N. (2000). Behind the learning curve: Linking learning activities to waste reduction.*Management Science, 46*(5), 597–611.
11. Martins, E. C., &Terblance, F. (2003). Building organizational culture that stimulates creativity and innovation. *European Journal of Innovation Management, 6* (1), 64–74.

12. Mayer, R. C., &Schoorman, F. D. (1992). Predicting participation and production outcomes through a two-dimensional model of organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Journal, 35,* 671–684.
13. Mayer, R. C., &Schoorman, F. D. (1998). Differentiating antecedents of organizational commitment: A test of March and Simon's model. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 19,* 15–28.
14. Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). The knowledge-creating company: how Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation. Doi: 10.1016/0969-5931(94)90027-2, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0969-5931(94)90027-2
15. Nonaka, I. (1994). A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation. *Organization science, 5*(1), 14-37.
16. Nonaka, I., &Nishiguchi, T. (2001). Knowledge emergence: Social, technical, and evolutionary dimensions of knowledge creation, New York: Oxford University Press.
17. Orlikowski, W. J. (2002). Knowing in practice: Enacting a collective capability in distributed organizing.*Organization Science, 13*(3), 249–273.
18. Szulanski, G. (2000). The process of knowledge transfer: A diachronic analysis of stickiness. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes, 82*(1), 9-27. doi:10.1006/obhd.2000.2884, http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/obhd.2000.2884
19. Szulanski, G. (1996). Exploring internal stickiness: Impediments to the transfer of best practice within the firm.*Strategic Management Journal, 17*, 27–43.
20. Szulanski, G. (1996). Exploring internal strictness impediments to the transfer of best practice within the firm, *Strategic Management Journal*, 27-44.
21. Vaast, E., &Levina, N. (2006). Multiple faces of codification: Organizational redesign in an IT organization.*Organization Science, 17*(2), 190–201.
22. Van der Sluis, E.C. (2004). Designing the workplace for learning and innovation. Development & learning in organizations: *An International Journal, 18*(5), 10-13.
23. Zander, U., &Kogut, B. (1995). Knowledge and the speed of the transfer and imitation of organizational capabilities: An empirical test.*Organization Science, 6*, 76–92.