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The study was an attempt to explore relationships between learning organization and organizational commitment among lecturers in Technical and Vocational Colleges (TVCs) in Iran. Watkins and Marsick’s (1993) learning organization model with associated questionnaire; Learning Organization Dimensions Questionnaire (LODQ) was employed to collect data to determine lecturers’ perception on learning organization dimensions. Allen and Meyer’s (1996) tridimensional model of organizational commitment with associated questionnaire; Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) was also utilized to collect data and determine lecturers’ perception on organizational commitment. The study was designed to determine levels of learning organization dimensions, organizational commitment scale and subscales, differences in respondents’ perception based on selected demographic variables (age, gender, marital status, teaching experience, employment type, level of education, and monthly income), relationship between learning
organization dimensions and organizational commitment and significant predictors of affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment. The research design was descriptive correlational study and data were collected employing questionnaires. The study utilized proportional and simple random sampling methods to select 295 respondents with the response rate of 95.16% from population in four provinces of Fars, Khouzestan, Boushehr, and Kohgiloya and Boyerahmad in Iran.

The findings showed that lecturers’ perception on learning organization was at moderate level. Out of seven learning organization dimensions, three dimensions of continuous learning, dialogue and inquiry and strategic leadership were rated at high level, and four dimensions of collaboration, embedded system, system connection, and empowerment were rated at moderate level. Level of lecturers’ perception in overall organizational commitment was found to be at moderate level, affective commitment at high level, whereas continuance and normative commitment were rated at moderate level. Differences in affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment by demographics showed that lecturers who were full time, had doctorate degree, were in the age of 50 and more, and had more than $ 800 monthly income had higher affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment than their counterparts. Positive, significant and small to high relationships were found to exist between learning organization dimensions and organizational commitment scale and subscales. Overall correlation between learning organization dimensions and organizational commitment showed to be high, and positive. All seven learning organization dimensions were found to be predictors of organizational commitment, except collaboration. Significant predictors including continuous learning, dialogue and inquiry, embedded system, empowerment, system connection and strategic
leadership accounted for 50.3% of variance in overall organizational commitment. It is recommended that to improve organizational commitment scale and subscales, TVCs leaders should develop and practice learning organization dimensions especially three dimensions of dialogue and inquiry, continuous learning and strategic leadership and associated practices. A human resource development system should also be created to promote a learning culture based on learning organization dimensions and at the same time, to develop, maintain and enhance organizational commitment scale and subscales.
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pembelajaran telah didapati menjadi peramal komitmen organisasi, kecuali dimensi kerjasama. Peramal yang signifikan termasuk pembelajaran berterusan, dialog dan inkuiri, “embedded system”, pengupayaan, “system connection” dan kepimpinan strategik menyumbang 50.3% dari pada varians dalam komitmen organisasi secara keseluruhan.

Untuk meningkatkan skala dan sub skala komitmen organisasi, pemimpin TVCs disyorkan supaya membangun dan mengamalkan dimensi-dimensi pembelajaran organisasi terutamanya dalam tiga dimensi iaitu dialog dan inkuiri, pembelajaran berterusan dan kepemimpinan strategik serta amalan yang berkaitan dengannya. Sistem pembangunan sumber manusia juga perlu diwujudkan bagi mempromosikan budaya pembelajaran berdasarkan dimensi-dimensi pembelajaran organisasi dan pada masa yang sama untuk membangun, mengekal dan memperkasakan skala dan sub skala komitmen organisasi.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

The globalization and information technology as two phenomenon of new era with their unpredictable effects on societies have caused organizations to learn at a rapid pace (Garvin, 1993; Marsick and Watkins, 2003; Toffler, 2005). Organization managers also have found that providing learning conditions in organizations is the best way to survive in the future (Garvin, 1993; Alas and Sharifi, 2002; Marsick and Watkins, 2003; Watkins, 2005; Erwin and Garman, 2010; Veisi, 2010). In addition, the development of learning culture not only helps organization members to create new knowledge, but also helps them remain dynamic (Watkins, 2005; Atak and Erturgut, 2010). In this regard, educational institutions are no exception and they require making rapid and difficult decisions to build a learning culture to make changes more readily (Watkins, 2005)

Moreover, social changes, information technology, and explosion of knowledge have significant effects on educational centers. To adapt and survive in a rapidly changing world, educational leaders have no choice but to create a learning culture among the members of their organizations. Traditional management practices no longer work and managers should develop learning organization practices to access the right knowledge for staying competitive in the globalized educational environment and to
be able to achieve strategic institution goals (Senge, 1990; kumar, 2006; Atak and Erturgut, 2010).

Furthermore, organizations with cultures of improving learning, experimentation, risk taking, and autonomy tend to have higher levels of organizational commitment (Ng et al., 2006). Sayeed (2001) as well as Bhatnagar (2007) stated that the learning direction of the organization is relevant to the context of making employees committed. Thus, providing opportunities of learning for employees to carry out their tasks more effectively with more autonomy and innovative practices is an effective strategy for attaching people to the organizations psychologically (Agarwala, 2003; Ng et al., 2006; Krishna, 2008).

In conclusion, although practitioners and scholars have created descriptions on learning organization and learning culture in the past, empirical studies on the relationship between these concepts and organizational outcomes such as organizational commitment have not been the focus of attention. Accordingly, providing a learning culture is an effective strategic issue that managers should consider if they want to preserve their competitive role in the new era.

1.1.1 Country Background Information

Iran, which is located in the Middle East, has 78 million people with an area of 1,648,000 square kilometers, and a growth rate of 1.08 percent. The capital is Tehran with population more than 14 million. Performing various short and long term development plans, social indicators are relatively high by regional standards. The
government has started on a number of plans such as the National Industrial Development Strategy and the 20-Year Perspective Policy all of which emphasize the need for Iran to capitalize on her social, economic and human resource development. The development of human resource management (HRM) and human resource development (HRD) and the challenges within suggest a need to examine the impact of these on country’s educational organizations (Namazie and Frame, 2007).

1.1.2 An Overview of Education System in Iran

Education in Iran has a long history dating back to the fifth century B.C when Aramid alphabets were invented. After Iran joined the Islamic world in 650 A.D, mosques also became the centers of education. The first modern high school, Darl-al-Fonon, (technical school) was established in 1851. The first modern university, Tehran University, was founded in 1934. The roots of the modern Iranian educational system lie in the mid-19th century. The first ministry of education established in 1855 which was modeled on the French system. Education system is highly centralized, and the year pattern of primary and secondary education is 5-3-3-1. Ministry of Education is the center of power. All textbooks are written in Farsi and learning Arabic language is compulsory in all grades since it is the language of the Holy Quran. Education has always been considered as one of the symbols of the development. The vision and perspective development of education is defined by the government (Ebtekar, 1996; Behbahani, 2010).
1.1.3 The role of Lecturers in Colleges

The quality, capability and competency of academic members are key characteristics to the success of educational systems and act as a significant factor in the development of the society. They are the main assets of the educational systems and have the most significant role in the development of these systems. They are key players in the education system and may be termed as teachers, tutors, facilitators and lecturers. They also play critical roles in advancing economic and technological development through educating human resources (Park, 2005; Chughtai and Zafar, 2006; Hamdhaidari et al., 2007; Awang et al., 2010).

To accomplish educational goals, lecturers have various roles such as; designing and formulating curriculum, performing teaching-learning strategies in the classroom with students, do research projects, participate in decision making processes and preserve high level of institutional standards. They also should give lecturers, supply professional consultations, do academic research, publish their findings, be committed to the goals, values, vision and missions besides teaching in educational institutions. To do these duties, lecturers also require keeping up with new knowledge and teaching-learning strategies to deliver the best to their students (Mohsenpoor, 2004; Chughtai and Zafar, 2006; Hamdhaidari et al., 2007; Awang et al., 2010; Gormley and Kennerly, 2010).

In addition, studies have shown that employees who are “highly committed stay longer and perform their roles better”, (Chughtai and Zafar, 2006, p. 40). Moreover, Reyes (2001) also has stated that a committed teacher works harder, has fewer
tendencies to leave the work place, devotes more time to accomplish school goals, does work better, and does more efforts beyond personal interests. Park (2005) as well as Awang et al., (2010) stressed that highly committed lecturers are expected to acquire expertise in new subjects that contribute to their work to improve their classroom performance.

However, without preparing some conditions in schools these roles cannot be performed. School leaders require to supply in-school working situations in which teachers could develop their knowledge and skills professionally, and build work environments to maintain teacher’s commitment (Billingsley, 2004). This issue is more important in developing countries such as Iran that hope and attempt to be an educational hub in the region (Khorasgani, 2008). Thus, exploring the lecturers’ needs based on learning new skills, professional knowledge and updating their knowledge are significant issues which can be considered as basic factors in the management of the educational institutions. Research results also show that teachers’ commitment and its antecedents have not kept pace with conducted researches (Somech and Bogler, 2004; Chughtai and Zafar, 2006; Joolideh and Yeshodhara, 2008). As a consequence, the conditions required to enhance and support highly committed teachers are of great concern in education systems. Educational administrators have to know and realize the factors that impact lecturers’ commitment to be able to manage their colleges more effectively. That is why commitment has become an important characteristic of a teacher that needs to be nurtured and developed in schools.
1.1.4 Technical and Vocational Colleges

The first formal of technical and vocational college (TVC) was established in 1930 in Iran. This college served as a means for educating skilled manpower in post high school training i.e. higher education in the technological line. This professional college was the recommendation of a German consultant as complementary to the Faculty of Engineering of the University of Tehran which was an academically oriented institution. The activities of this college were gradually terminated in 1965 due to the lack of social status of the technical and vocational education (TVE) as compared with white collar institutions such as the Faculty of Engineering. All technological colleges such as Tehran Polytechnics, which was initially established afterwards to substitute for that college, changed their objectives to serve the science of engineering, since this type of education enjoyed a higher status and prestige. All other attempts to establish TVE colleges failed and this situation had an adverse impact on the lower and secondary TVE schools throughout the country (Ebtekar, 1996).

After Islamic Revolution in 1979, these colleges were developed quantitatively and qualitatively in all provinces. TVCs as higher educational institutions have significant roles in training, nurturing, and educating competent and qualified manpower in Iran. They are also a pioneer in providing technical and vocational human resources in all fields for both boys and girls. They train human resources to fill the vacancy of lack of technicians in both governmental and private sectors. In line with Iran’s march towards an inclusive development plan, TVCs have focused their efforts to develop technical and professional trainings in all fields to educate
skilled and proficient human resources (Khalaghi, 2003; Behbahani, 2010). The number of TVCs is 148 which are the biggest technical and vocational institutions for boys and girls. They absorb students from technical and vocational schools which consist of three fields of industry, agriculture and services. All TVCs have been distributed based on geographical considerations in seven regions throughout Iran. These institutions need educational personnel who know how to match theory and practice in action. They should be able to apply the newest teaching strategies in classes (Ebtekar, 1996; Behbahani, 2010).

Despite significant role of TVCs in filling the vacancy of human resources, the lack of qualified lecturers is the most important obstacle that technical and vocational education faces in Iran. Instability of lecturers has lead TVCs facing the problem of scarcity of qualified and skilled lecturers, whereas commitment to stay and continue in educational organizations is of great importance. That is because experienced lecturers take with them their research, and experiences in teaching and learning skills. Consequently, TVCs live under a continuous risk of losing their core people “lecturers”. Thus, educational institutions are required to afford conditions necessary to develop and enhance faculty members’ commitment that serve as the key assets and foundation of activities and also create an appropriate environment with adequate opportunities to improve commitment of the faculty members.

1.1.5 Learning Organization Concept

Globalization and technology advancement have made organizations maintain and develop a learning culture to preserve organizational members, to meet new
employee expectations and to decrease the growing costs of doing businesses (Egan et al., 2004; Dirani, 2009). To achieve these goals, learning organizations as dynamic organizations, have critical roles to play. In addition, leaders of organizations have realized that to increase effectiveness, accomplish organizational objectives and improve customer service, learning organizations are the best choice.

Moreover, the strategy development of human resources as the key assets of organizations has changed. The use of terminology has changed from “human resources” to “human capital” and one of the basic priorities of organizations is how to manage people in organizations in developing countries (Agarwala, 2003; Jamali and Sidani, 2009; Grinsven and Visser, 2011). Several organization developers have remarked that employee’s empowerment in the light of learning conditions make organizations to be more successful, more adaptive to changes and survive longer than their competitors.

Among organizations, educational institutions are different in the essence of their activities from other organizations. They should constantly promote the skills, ability and knowledge of their employees and use the newest techniques to encourage them to embrace the latest ideas. Administrators of these institutions should insist on individual, organizational, group and continuous learning of their employees. The educational role of administrators in educational institutions is to direct the whole educational system to achieve the defined goals, the most important of which are creating and disseminating new knowledge. According to Awang and Wah (2005), universities are no exceptions. If they are unsuccessful to learn, they too will become
irrelevant. Therefore, it is crucial for universities to keep pace with changes by enhancing their learning capabilities.

Alavi and McCormick (2003) stressed that there may be competencies in the organizational culture of some Iranian organizations which enable them to be prepared for applying the learning organization models effectively. Asadi, Ghorbani, and Naderan, (2009) also have remarked that since human resource is the most valuable asset in educational institutions, it is crucial to develop learning in order to reach a learning organization which enjoys high organizational outcomes. According to Liaghati, Veisi, and Sadogh (2010) utilizing the dimensions, principles, policies, and practices of learning organization can promote ongoing changes and development in higher education institutions. Exploring the extent use of learning organization dimensions in Public and Azad Universities in Iran, Attafar and Bahrami, (2009) also found that despite universities efforts to become learning university, the quality of learning is not satisfied. Finally, Bararpour (2006) found that to become learning university, the following six disciplines can be conducted by educational institutions and universities: 1) improving national dignity instead of tribal and family dignity; 2) performing shared vision based on National Vision in all organizational levels; 3) developing and conducting mental models in organizations; 4) developing system thinking; 5) improving individual skills in organizations in order to solve organizational issues; and 6) providing appropriate conditions and opportunities for people in organizations to learn from each other.

Accordingly, educational institutions as centers of learning should generate, gain, and distribute knowledge. However, White and Weathersby (2005), remarked that
educational institutions “rarely practice even the simplest tenets found in the theories of learning organizations” (p. 292). They stated “the problem for institutions of learning is that they need to promote the practices of the learning organization as we do with our students in the classroom” (p. 292). Furthermore, organizational commitment literature reveals that only a few studies have explored the role of human resource practices on organizational commitment (Bhatnagar, 2007). Dee, Henkin, and Singleton (2006) also stated that few studies have examined the effects of organizational characteristics on teacher organizational commitment. In addition, Lee and Bruvold (2003) as well as Joo and Lim (2009) found that enhancing skills, knowledge and abilities of employees make they show more attitudes towards staying in the organization.

1.1.6 Organizational Commitment

A critical issue which has received much attention over the past four decades in both management literature and research is organizational commitment. It is one of the most encouraging issues for both practitioners and academicians locally and globally because of its practical and theoretical application regardless of the type of organization (Meyer and Allen, 1997; Martin, 2007; Bakan et al., 2011). Employee commitment is not limited to national boundaries or particular organizations. It is a universal issue and needs further research. It is also a key variable that closely attaches the employee to the educational institutions in such a way that the deeper the organizational commitment, the greater the likelihood the employee will continue to stay with the organization longer (Martin, 2007).
Research results show that organizational commitment has many benefits. Some of the most important merits of organizational commitment are: decreased turnover, higher motivation, higher organization citizenship behavior and organizational support (Kwon and Banks, 2004). Beck and Wilson (2000) asserted that organizational commitment has significant effects on efficiency and effectiveness. In addition, it becomes increasingly clear that people are the greatest assets of the organization and the economic future of organizations relies more and more on the quality of workforce. Having a committed workforce is an advantage to the organizations and employees as well (Agarwala, 2003; Boglera and Somech, 2004; Bhatnagar, 2007; Demiray and Curabay, 2008). Therefore, enhancing employee commitment in the workplace is crucial.

Managers also could benefit from understanding the predictors of committed manpower because they can adopt and create the appropriate learning situation in order to improve the level of organizational commitment (Yousef, 2000). Researchers have shown that committed employees, who have strong belief in organizations’ goals and values, do make much effort on behalf of the organization, have high levels of emotional attachment to the organization, and protect organizational assets more (Meyer et al., 2004; Chughtai and Zafar, 2006; Cohen, 2007; Dirani, 2009; Meyer and Parfyonova, 2010).

Researchers have explored organizational commitment as a dependent variable for antecedents such as age, gender, education, and as a predictive indicator in organizational behavior and organizational outcomes such as job satisfaction, work motivation, turnover, intention to leave, absenteeism, and performance (Meyer et al.,
Despite considerable studies on organizational commitment, “questions about the determinants of organizational commitment have remained unanswered”, (Krishna and Casey, 2008, p.2). Also, the literature shows inconsistent results on the relationship between organizational commitment and its predictors (Meyer et al., 2002; Cohen, 2005; Krishna, 2008). In addition, studies show that organizational level forces as predictors of organizational commitment have not been the focus of attention in earlier studies (Cohen, 2007; Krishna and Casey, 2008; Hulpia et al., 2011).

Educational organizations such as schools, colleges and universities should have individuals who are committed to their organization, profession and well-being of their students. The life of all educational organizations lies in the motivation of teachers to contribute to the development of their organizations. Teachers strong in organizational commitment find it easy to be interested in whatever they are doing and can involve themselves unconditionally. In the process, if teachers work in schools seriously and consider commitment factors, there will be all round development of the institution, teachers and students (Chughtai and Zafar, 2006).

The condition is almost the same in universities. Lecturers’ commitment is one of the most important factors for future success in educational institutions (Hulpia et al., 2011). However, few researches on organizational commitment have been conducted within educational settings (Chughtai and Zafar, 2006; Shirbagi, 2007; Joolideh and Yeshodhara, 2008). Also, a review of the literature regarding organizational commitment shows that there is not enough knowledge regarding antecedents of
organizational commitment (Meyer and Herscovitch, 2001; Cohen, 2003; Krishna and Casey, 2008).

Furthermore, organizational commitment literature reveals that only few studies have explored the role of human resource practices on organizational commitment internationally (Bhatnagar, 2007). Dee, Henkin, and Singleton (2006) also point out the need for further research on the effects of organizational characteristics on teacher organizational commitment. In addition, Lee and Bruvold (2003) as well as Joo and Lim (2009) stated that employees who believe that their organization tries to enhance their skills, knowledge and abilities that they need, may exhibit more attitudes and appropriate behaviors regarding their commitment to the organization.

Alatrista and Arrowsmith (2004) as well as Meyer and Smith (2000) also stated that there is a cyclical relationship between employees who feel that the organization is committed to them and psychological attachment of employees to the organization. Yang (2003) as well as Lok and Crawford (2004) suggested that both the learning organization and organizational commitment need to be more investigated empirically to determine their relationships. Therefore, to fill the gap of research regarding learning organization and organizational commitment theoretically and empirically, the current research explored the relationship between these two concepts concurrently in TVCs in Iran.
1.2 Problem Statement

To achieve the strategic goals of development plans, educational institutions have been given a top priority (Hamdhaidari et al., 2007). Among the educational institutions, the key role of TVCs in providing competent and skilled human resources (technicians) and the pivotal role of achieving the goals of National Vision has caused these colleges to be the focus of attention (Asgari et al., 2011). The educational staffs of these institutions are the most key concern and responsible for research, teaching, and guiding students, among other important duties. To conduct such duties, the academic staffs that are highly committed perform better, miss work less often, stay longer and engage more in organizational citizenship behaviors (Mathieu and Zajac, 1990; Chughtai and Zafar, 2006; Malik et al., 2010). However, empirical studies show that the level of organizational commitment in Iranian TVCs is not satisfactory (Shirbagi, 2007; Asgari et al., 2011). High turnover and instability of qualified teaching staffs is a common problem of higher education institutions in Iran (Ebtekar, 1996; Shaikh et al., 2005). In this line, TVCs lecturers with high levels of expertise and skill are becoming increasingly scarce (Hamidi and Keshtidar, 2004; Aminbidokhti and Salehpoor, 2007). High turnover among lecturers, especially when informed lecturers quit, can cause high costs and implications for the educational systems. This is because knowledgeable lecturers take with them their research, teaching skills, and experiences. Consequently, TVCs are under the pressure of losing their core employees “lecturers”. In addition, Meyer and Allen (1996) as well as Chughtai, and Zafar, (2006) stated that low employees’ commitment is one of the basic causes of high staff turnover. Moreover, commitment is negatively related to
turnover, absenteeism, and counterproductive behavior (Meyer et al., 2002; Chunhtai and Zafar, 2006; Dirani, 2009).

Although there are numerous factors affecting organizational commitment, studies show that the role of learning organization is vital (Yaghoubi et al., 2010). Research results show that opportunity for learning, learning environment and work place learning are some key factors underlying the commitment of employees in organizations (Ahmad and Bakar, 2003; Kontoghiorghes and Bryant, 2004; Ng et al., 2006; Krishna, 2008). Hamidi and Keshtidar (2004) also found that team learning, collaboration, communication among lecturers, and participating in policy making were significant determinants of organizational commitment among lecturers in physical education colleges in Iran. Also, Joo and Lim (2009) asserted that “it is likely that the more employee perceive that an organization provides continuous learning, dialogue and inquiry, team learning, an established system, empowerment, a system connection, and strategic leadership, the higher they are psychologically attached to their organization” (p.51).

Therefore, in spite of the role of learning organization in increasing the level of organizational commitment, not much attention has been paid to learning organization dimensions as antecedents of organizational commitment as well as the relationship between learning organization dimensions and organizational commitment (Yaghoubi et al., 2010). In line with this, in TVCs no empirical research has been done yet to show the relationship between learning organization dimensions and lecturers’ organizational commitment. Thus, the present research was proposed due to the lack of research on the relationship between learning organization
dimensions and organizational commitment. The study was also conducted because of the absence of adequate research methodology to explore whether learning organization dimensions can be considered as predictors of organizational commitment scale and subscales. The present study, therefore, aims to fill the gap of theoretical and empirical knowledge and also to understand and improve the development of the two constructs of learning organization and organizational commitment.

1.3 Main Objective of the Study

The overall purpose of the study was to identify the relationship between learning organization dimensions and organizational commitment as perceived by lecturers in TVCs and to determine whether learning organization dimensions can be considered as predictors of lecturers’ organizational commitment to help administrators in TVCs to manage their personnel “lecturers” more effectively.

1.4 Objectives of the Study

Specifically, this study is designed to:

1. Determine the levels of learning organization dimensions as perceived by lecturers.
2. Determine the levels of affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment as perceived by lecturers.
3. Determine significant differences in lecturers’ affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment based on selected demographic variables (age, gender, marital status, teaching experience, employment type, level of education, and monthly income).

4. Determine relationships between learning organization dimensions (continuous learning, dialogue and inquiry, collaboration, embedded system, system connection, empowerment and strategic leadership) and affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment.

5. Determine the predictors of affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment.

1.5 Research Questions

1. What are the levels of learning organization dimensions as perceived by lecturers in TVCs?

2. What are the levels of affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment as perceived by lecturers in TVCs?

3. Are there significant differences in lecturers’ perception towards affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment based on gender?

4. Are there significant differences in lecturers’ perception towards affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment based on type of employment?

5. Are there significant differences in lecturers’ perception towards affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment based on marital status?

6. Are there significant differences in lecturers’ perception towards affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment based on monthly income?
7. Are there significant differences in lecturers’ perception towards affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment based on education level?

8. Are there significant differences in lecturers’ perception towards affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment based on teaching experience?

9. Are there significant differences in lecturers’ perception towards affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment based on age?

10. Is there a significant relationship between learning organization dimensions (continuous learning, dialogue and inquiry, collaboration, embedded system, system connection, empowerment and strategic leadership), and affective commitment?

11. Is there a significant relationship between learning organization dimensions (continuous learning, dialogue and inquiry, collaboration, embedded system, system connection, empowerment and strategic leadership), and continuance commitment?

12. Is there a significant relationship between learning organization dimensions (continuous learning, dialogue and inquiry, collaboration, embedded system, system connection, empowerment and strategic leadership), and normative commitment?

13. Is there a significant relationship between learning organization dimensions (continuous learning, dialogue and inquiry, collaboration, embedded system, system connection, empowerment and strategic leadership), and overall organizational commitment?

14. What are the significant predictors of affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment?

1.6 Significance of the Study

The relationship between learning organization dimensions and organizational commitment is one of the most critical factors for organizational goals achievement. Success in providing a good organizational condition for developing and retaining
educational staffs is one of the priorities of educational institutions. If human resource developers and educational leaders apply dimensions of learning organization in their institutions, institutional goals can be achievable. The study of learning organization dimensions and organizational commitment in TVCs is important for several reasons.

First, in the last two decades many books and articles have been written about learning organization concept specifically in Western countries, but few researchers have tried to measure learning organization dimensions across countries of the world with various national and local cultures in different types of organizations. In Iran, despite critical need of research to uncover learning organization dimensions, few researches have been done in organizations specifically in educational institutions. The results of the present research can fill this gap and provide enough evidences pertaining measuring learning organization dimensions in Iranian educational context.

Second, this study will provide valuable information regarding theory and practice of learning organization dimensions and organizational commitment scale and subscales for educational administrators to manage their lecturers more efficiently.

Third, this study provides information pertaining instruments and methodologies attached to learning organization and organizational commitment theories. The translation and use of both learning organization dimensions questionnaire (LODQ) and organizational commitment questionnaire (OCQ) into Persian assist researchers and practitioners to establish, integrate, and transfer of the knowledge in this regard
into educational institutions. The LODQ and OCQ make bases for future research which leads to the development and improvement of management practices in educational institutions.

Fourth, the present study helps the educational administrators in TVCs to diagnose the strengths and weaknesses of their educational institutions regarding these two constructs to develop appropriate policies and strategies to create an appropriate organizational environment to attract and retain lecturers at their respective colleges.

Lastly, the findings of the current study can notify educational leaders involved in the management of lecturers in TVCs to choose the best policy in managing of the educational institutions.

1.7 Assumptions of the Study

In performing the current research, some assumptions should be considered. Firstly, lecturers appreciate LODQ and OCQ and respond objectively and honestly. Secondly, Watkins and Marsick’s, (1996) LODQ and Meyer and Allen’s (1997) OCQ are applicable to TVCs contexts in Iran. Both of these two survey instrument have been utilized by researchers in various organizations in the world for measuring learning organization dimensions and organizational commitment respectively.

In addition, it is supposed that TVCs are interested in promoting learning organization dimensions and show a high level of commitment to research. Lastly, it
is assumed that lecturers as the representatives of the educational institutions are honest and have more cooperation in completing the survey questionnaires.

1.8 Limitations of the Research

The research is not void of limitation. This study focused on Iranian Technical and Vocational Colleges among lecturers. The study examined relationships between learning organization dimensions and organizational commitment as perceived by lecturers. The research was performed in TVCs in Iran. Therefore, the results cannot be generalized to other institutions and universities until further research is carried out. The research was conducted in one educational region, so the other six educational regions were not participated in the study because of time and monetary problems.

Finally, despite there are other learning organization models proposed by scholars in this field, the current study utilized Watkins and Marsick’s (1996) learning organization dimensions and Meyer and Allen’s (1997) organizational commitment scale and subscales in TVCs. The other learning organization and organizational commitment models were not employed in the current study.

1.9 Definition of the Terms

Organizational Commitment: for the purpose of this study organizational commitment is a psychological link between a lecturer and his or her college that makes it less likely that the lecturer will voluntarily leave the college (Meyer et al.,
Organizational commitment was measured utilizing Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) with eighteen items proposed by Meyer and Allen (1997).

Affective Commitment: explains a lecturer who highly accepts and enjoys the values of his/her workplace, emotionally attached, committed to the institution, continues employment, provides extra effort and stays as a part of the colleges. In this study, affective commitment is the lecturers’ emotional attachment to TVCs (Meyer et al., 2004) and was measured using six items of OCQ proposed by Meyer and Allen (1997).

Continuance Commitment: explains a lecturer whose commitment is determined by investment to the workplace, weighing the costs of leaving the institution, and determines the great risk of leaving institution to find job opportunity outside the institution. In this study, continuance commitment is lecturer’s decisions to continue working in TVCs because they perceive and calculate cost of leaving job opportunity (Meyer et al., 2004) and was measured using six items of OCQ proposed by Meyer and Allen (1997).

Normative Commitment: explains a lecturer whose commitment is determined by moral and feeling of obligation to remain with the college. Lecturers believe that their institution helps them in needy times, so they owe to keep on continuing working in the institution (Meyer et al., 2004). In this study normative commitment refers to lecturers’ level of moral obligation to continue in TVCs and was measured utilizing six items of OCQ proposed by Meyer and Allen (1997).
Technical and Vocational Colleges (TVCs): are educational institutions founded before Islamic revolution which train boys and girls for three years after diploma to be expert in one of the technical and vocational fields and be graduated as technicians in Iran. They are the context of the study.

Learning Organization: for the purpose of this study is a college that learns continuously and transforms itself. Learning is a continuous strategically used process, integrated with and running parallel to work (Watkins and Marsick, 1993, p.8).

Learning Organization Dimensions: these are dimensions that make possible the design of a learning organization. They are as follows: 1) create continuous learning opportunities; 2) promote dialogue and inquiry; 3) encourage collaboration; 4) establish systems to capture and share learning; 5) empower people toward a collective vision; 6) connect the organization to its environment; 7) provide strategic leadership for learning (Watkins and Marsick, 1996). These dimensions are measured by Learning Organization Dimensions Questionnaire (LODQ) with 43 items proposed by Yang, Watkins and Marsick, (2004). The following are short definitions of learning organization dimensions that were adapted from Watkins and Marsick (1996).

Create continuous learning opportunities (continuous learning): The extent that learning is planned into work so that lecturers can learn on work.
Promote inquiry and dialogue (inquiry and dialogue): The extent to which lecturers have achieved necessary and logic skills to communicate their views, and the ability to listen to the views of the others.

Encourage collaboration: The degree to which work is planned so that groups and teams have the possibility of exchange their views, experiences and knowledge.

Establish systems to capture and share learning (embedded systems): The level that both high and low technology are created, utilized and produced and included with work to share learning.

Empower people toward a collective vision (empowerment): The extent to which lecturers are involved in setting, owning, and utilizing a shared vision.

Connect the organization to its environment (system connection): The degree to which lecturers are helped to see the effects of their work on the whole institutions.

Provide strategic leadership for learning (strategic leadership): The degree to which educational leaders in TVCs are model, champion, and provide learning.

Individual Learning Level: The extent to which a lecturer in the colleges makes meaning of experiences, produces new knowledge, tries to improve his/her abilities, mastery of tasks, discovers for being more effective, strives to find new and better methods of achievement individually. Two dimensions of continuous learning and inquiry and dialogue represent this level of learning (Marsick and Watkins, 2003).
Team Learning Level: The degree to which groups of lecturers create new knowledge and work cooperatively. The collaboration dimension represents this level of learning (Marsick and Watkins, 2003).

Organizational Learning Level: The level to which colleges make possible systems, procedures, values and norms of the creation of institution memory for lecturers to learn new knowledge and skills. On the other hand learning is the result of four dimensions: embedded systems, empowerment, system connections, and strategic leadership (Marsick and Watkins, 2003).

Lecturer: is a person with bachelor, master or doctorate degree who teaches, does research and guides students in Technical and Vocational Colleges.
1.10 Summary

This chapter presented a general view of learning organization dimensions, organizational commitment, study context, research problem, objectives and research questions. The issue of learning organization has fascinated managers, educational administrators and human resource developers as a key factor of continuous and sustainable development in organizations for nearly two decades. However, most organizations in the third world countries, especially higher education institutions have not paid attention to this issue, though the previous studies confirmed its profound effects on organizational outcomes, and enhancement of organizational commitment.

The study of the relationships between learning organization dimensions and organizational commitment in TVCs as the context of the study through five general objectives associated with fourteen research questions were explained. The main objective of this empirical study was to determine the relationships between learning organization dimensions and organizational commitment to contribute to the theory and application in TVCs and provide further insights to help educational administrators and leaders of TVCs to manage their core resources “lecturers” more efficient and effective. Some significances, limitations and definition of terms were also discussed and defined.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a general view of the literature on learning organization dimensions, organizational commitment and relationships between these two constructs. The first section presents learning organization dimensions, related theories and models, strengths and weaknesses of the models. In the second section theories of organizational commitment, their weaknesses and strengths will be reviewed. In the third section relationships between organizational commitment and demographics are presented. The empirical and theoretical researches relevant to the current study will be discussed in the last section.

To accomplish the purposes of this chapter, journal articles, doctoral dissertation, World Wide Web (WWW) and books were studied. Yet, few studies were found to be empirical and none was found to examine relationships between learning organization dimensions proposed by Watkins and Marsick (1993) and organizational commitment proposed by Meyer and Allen (1997) in TVCs in Iran.
2.2 Learning Organization Theory

An organizational theory which has fascinated attention of many scholars, researchers and practitioners since the early nineties is learning organization theory (Senge, 1993; Watkins and Marsick, 1997; Garvin, 2000; Marquardt, 2002). It is an increasing area of interest in the fields of human resource development (HRD), management, and school systems (Alavi and McCormick, 2004; Egan et al., 2004) which has been conceptualized by many researchers through different models. In the following, some notable definitions of the learning organization are presented.

2.2.1 Learning Organization Definitions

In the following, definitions associated with learning organization models which span a period of eighteen years include both similarities and a few notable differences are presented. Similar components of the definitions include team or group learning (Senge, 1993; Watkins and Marsick, 1997; Marquardt, 2002), ability to transform (Watkins and Marsick, 1993; Marquardt, 2002), adapt to change (Watkins and Marsick, 1993), knowledge management (Garvin, 2000; Marquardt, 2002), and changes in organizational behavior (Garvin, 2000). Definitions containing unique components include learning how to learn (Senge, 1990), learning as a continuous process (Watkins and Marsick, 2003), integrated and multi-level learning (Watkins and Marsick, 1993), and learning results (Watkins and Marsick, 1993; Rebelo and Gomes, 2008).
According to Kumar (2005), Watkins and Marsick’s (1993) definition of the learning organization is more appropriate for the discussion on the learning organization in higher education institutions context than the other definitions. In addition, Liaghati et al., (2010) as well as Ortenblad (2002) also remarked that among different definitions of learning organization proposed by scholars and writers, Watkins and Marsick’s (1993) definition is the simplest one. Moreover, Sun and Scott (2003) stated that Watkins and Marsick’s definition of learning organization has the characteristics of “living organism and a powerful learning environment” (Kumar, 2005a, p.83). Some of the most representative definitions are highlighted in Table 2.1.
Table 2.1 Some Definitions of the Learning Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/s</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senge (1993)</td>
<td>“Learning organization is an organization where people continually expand their capacity to create the results they truly desire, where new and expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured, where collective aspiration is set free, and where people are continually learning how to learn together” (p.3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watkins and Marsick (1993)</td>
<td>“A learning organization is one that learns continuously and transforms itself. Learning is a continuous, strategically used process: integrated with, and running parallel to work” (p.8).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garvin (2000)</td>
<td>“A learning organization is an organization skilled at creating, acquiring, interpreting, transferring, and retaining knowledge, and at purposefully modifying its behavior to reflect new knowledge and insights” (p.11).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquardt (2002)</td>
<td>“A company that learns effectively and collectively and continually transforms itself for better management and use of knowledge; empowers people within and outside the organization to learn as they work; utilizes technology to maximize learning and production” (p.247).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watkins and Marsick (2005)</td>
<td>“A learning organization is an organization that has an enhanced capacity to learn and to change” (p.415).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebelo and Gomes (2008)</td>
<td>“A learning organization as a particular type of organization that intentionally develops strategies and structures for maximizing productive learning with a view to achieving its goals” (p.301).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.3 Models of Learning Organization

The theoretical models provide proper information in understanding the concept of the learning organization. Explaining a brief literature review to reinforce the major elements of a learning organization and to connect the areas of theory and practice in
a chronological fashion, strengths and weaknesses of each model were reviewed as follows.

2.3.1 Senge Model, Strengths and Weaknesses

Conducting workshops associated with an inclusive literature review, Peter Senge (1993) introduced a model of learning organization with five disciplines including: personal mastery, mental models, shared vision, team learning and system thinking. According to Senge (1993), organizations that discover how to linkage employees’ commitment and ability to learn at all levels can do extremely well in the future.

Personal mastery in Senge’s model refers to providing an organizational environment through learning for developing personal ability of all organization members in the direction of goals achievement. According to Gary (2010), personal mastery refers to individual’s commitment in continuing learning, refining, and clarifying personal vision. Mental models refer to one’s internal image of how the world looks which requires an identification of internal views of the world and a careful examination of them. An organization that develops the capacity to work with mental models would need to begin by working with key decision makers to identify assumptions they hold about the organization. Shared vision refers to a vision which is the results of identifying “pictures of the future” (Senge, 1993, p. 9). It is created through interactions with the individuals in the organization. The vision of the leader is shared to encourage the sharing of visions among others in the organization. Through cooperation between the leader’s vision and individuals’ vision a common direction is reached resulting in the shared vision. Team learning is “the process of aligning
and developing the capacity of a team to create the results its members truly desire” (Senge, 1993, p. 24). System thinking in Senge’s model acts as a glue which links the other learning organization disciplines together.

The prominent features of Senge’s model are: a system approach to decision making, collaborative leadership and the ability to adapt proactively to changing circumstances (Chajnacki, 2007; Gary, 2010). Despite a few good characteristics of this model in creating learning organization, there are some weaknesses related to Senge’s model as follows:

First, Senge was mainly concerned with changing mindsets and achieving merit in organizations, without specifically providing measurable success criteria (Chajnacki, 2007).

Second, Yang, Watkins and Marsick (2004) stated that “despite Senge’s principles can be used as valuable guidelines in working toward learning organization status, the observable characteristics of such organizations have not yet been clearly identified” (p.32). This is related to Senge’s unrealistic ideas concerning the nature of dialogue between levels of management, the downside of inserting innovation in the workplace, and the loose boundaries which exist in most modern organizational systems.

Third, performing work projects, Chandra, (1995) stated that many managers argued that the notion of dialogue in communication is unrealistic. They stated that faithfulness in communication could never be achieved because employees simply...
say what top managers want to hear and what will reward them related to choice assignments and promotions within the organization.

Fourth, when Senge discusses interactions within the organizational system, he fails to acknowledge different perspectives contained in many subsystems that overlap the primary organizational system. Gary (2010) also stated that in Senge’s model boundaries between departments, subsidiaries, suppliers, and contractors are loose.

Fifth, according to Garvin (2000), as well as Yang et al., (2004), Senge model of five disciplines is filled with mystical terminology and is too abstract.

2.3.2 Garvin Model, Strengths and Weaknesses

Utilizing many case studies, Garvin (2000) created his model involving interviews, observations, and internal document reviews. Through this model, he has tried to linkage theory and practice which has been overlooked in most learning organization models. According to Garvin (2000), learning organization is an organization which is skilled at creating, acquiring and transferring knowledge and modifying its behavior to reflect new knowledge and insight. This model consists of five dimensions including: create a learning environment, gather intelligence, learn from experience, provide experiment opportunities and develop learning leaders. To create a supportive learning environment in Garvin’s model, the following characteristics are necessary to be performed in organizations: the appreciation and recognition of different opinions; the provision of timely and factual feedback; the detection of new ways of thinking and the acceptance of errors, mistakes, and occasional failures as
the price of improvement (Chajnacki, 2007). Gather intelligence is related to some mechanisms to be used such as gathering data through search, inquiry, and observation which can help this dimension to be performed. Learn from experience means learning from replication and exposure. Repetition guarantees that the same tasks are performed more efficiently over time. Exposure ensures that a new set of talents is developed through the examination of unknown environments or the assumption of new responsibilities. Leaders within an organization are responsible for three primary tasks. First, they create opportunities for learning by designing settings and events that prompt the necessary activities. Second, they increase the proper tone by development of popular norms, behaviors, and rules of engagement. Third, they must personally lead the process of discussion, framing the discus, posing questions, listening carefully, and providing feedback and conclusion (Garvin, 1993; Garvin et al., 2008).

The most strength of Garvin’s (2000) model is the inclusive explanation of the following three types of organizational learning using a cognitive viewpoint: gathering intelligence, learning from past experiences, and providing opportunities for experimentation (Chajnacki, 2007). Despite the above strength, Garvin model lacks the behavioral perspective which is necessary in individual learning to changing conditions and meeting performance objectives (Marsick and Watkins, 1999; Marsick and Watkins, 2003). In addition, a humanistic standpoint of learning which focuses on the transformative power of personal relationships and individual emotions within the overall realm of individual and team learning have been ignored in this model (Vince, 2002).
2.3.3 Marquardt Model, Strengths and Weaknesses

This model is based on the analysis of the previous models to present an inclusive model. It is the result of wide literature reviews and direct experiences with many organizations trying to become learning organizations (Marquardt and Alexander, 1999; Marquardt, 2002). Marquardt stated that focusing on a single feature like team learning, communication systems, organizational structures, or increased implementation of research and development activities are the limitations of prior learning organizations. In addition, he remarked that most proponents of learning organizations rely a great deal on organizational development initiatives like total quality management, reengineering, change management, or employee involvement to create and continue organizational learning (Chajnacki, 2007). The Marquardt’s (2002) model of the learning organization consists of learning dynamics, organizational transformation, people empowerment, knowledge management, and technology support for learning.

According to Marquardt (2002), organizational learning includes adaptive, anticipatory and action learning which occur at three levels of individual, group, and organizational learning. To transform organization, attention also should be paid to vision, culture, strategy and structure to allow focusing equally on learning and development as well as work and productivity. People empowerment includes six groups of stakeholders (employees, leaders, customers, business partners, suppliers/vendors, community groups) who should be empowered and enabled to learn and share their learning with one another. Knowledge management refers to managing the acquired and generated knowledge of the organization through the
following six distinct stages: acquisition, creation, storage, analysis, dissemination, and application. Technology support means applying high and low technology to achieve the goals of the organization (Chajnacki, 2007).

Marquardt (2002) utilizes organizational structure, people, knowledge, and technology comprehensive systems as major dimensions of learning within organizations. On top of these four dimensions, he applies a learning subsystem which includes five learning skills mostly adapted from Senge’s (1990) model and three learning types (adaptive, anticipatory, action) related to common timeframes (past, future, present) respectively. The strength of Marquardt (2002) model is the utilization of structure and people with knowledge and technology in his model. Although Marquardt’s (2002) model has priorities, it lacks the following characteristics. First, despite this approach works well with the people and knowledge dimensions, it seems to be an artificial application when treating the structure and technology dimensions. Since he uses a heavy dependence on Senge’s (1990) model, the humanistic traits of mental models and personal mastery seem to have little connection. Second, he includes a survey instrument called the Learning Organization Profile which only addresses organizational level learning and lacks any validation of its psychometric properties (Chajnacki, 2007).

2.4 Watkins and Marsick Comprehensive Model

In their book, Sculpting the Learning Organization, Watkins and Marsick (1993) introduced an integrative model of learning organization with seven distinct but interrelated dimensions at three levels of individual, team and organizational level,
which are associated with people and structure (Egan et al., 2004). The seven learning organization dimensions are: (1) continuous learning, (2) dialogue and inquiry, (3) collaboration, (4) embedded system, (5) empowerment, (6) system connection, (7) strategic leadership. Watkins and Marsick’s (1993) learning organization model has the following characteristics which cannot be found in other models.

First, Watkins and Marsick’s insight as educators rather than managers led them to focus on individualistic and employee-based strategies more than on issues dealing with organizational strategies, power, or structure (Chajnacki, 2007).

Second, Watkins and Marsick’s (1993) model associated with a survey instrument (LODQ) which according to Song, Joo, and Chermack (2009), “little has been known about how to adequately measure the learning organization dimensions as a supportive system for organizational learning process until the learning organization dimensions questionnaire (LODQ) came into being” (p.44).

Third, Moilanen (2005) also stated that LODQ is the most inclusive measurement tool to measure learning organization dimensions in terms of span, depth and reliability. There have been several, separate studies which sought to validate this model’s survey instrument. In addition, Song et al., (2009) confirmed that LODQ contains seven positive nature and cultural dimensions of learning-related factors in both people-oriented and structure-oriented components.
Fourth, Watkins and Marsick’s model is integrated because it reveals that organizational level learning incorporates individual and group learning into the organization’s mission and organizational outcomes. Watkins and Marsick (1996) argue that although people begin change on their own as a result of their learning, organizations must prepare facilitative structures to support and capture learning in order to accomplish their missions and objectives.

Fifth, Yang, Watkins, and Marsick, (2004) remarked that learning organization dimensions framework has the following unique characteristics: (1) it has a lucid and complete definition of the constructs of the learning organization; (2) it consists of dimensions of a learning organization at all levels (individual, team and organization); (3) it identifies key dimensions of the learning organization from the literature in a theoretical framework by indicating their relationships. Watkins and Marsick (1993) delineated that their model is more focused on individualistic and employee-based strategies than on issues dealing with organizational strategies, power, or structure. It has been supported by dimensions from other learning organization models, conceptual articles and empirical studies.

Sixth, Song et al., (2009); Kumar and Idris (2006); Yang (2003) and Zhang, Zhang, and Yang (2004), remarked that Watkins and Marsick’s (1993) model maintain the largest number of learning dimensions that has been cross-validated in other accepted and research-based learning organization models.

Seventh, Ortenblad (2002) stated that learning organization dimensions represent four concepts including: organizational learning, learning at work, learning climate,
and learning structure. According to Yang, Watkins and Marsick (2004), this model is the only theoretical framework that covers all four above concepts.

Eighth, Watkins and Marsick (1993) take a relatively concise approach by presenting seven action imperatives. It is important to note that their model selects the “best of the best” by choosing elements that are aligned with other models (Kumar and Idris, 2006).

Nineth, Watkins and Marsick’s model also provides supporting evidence of each dimension from other learning organization models, conceptual articles, and empirical studies (Chajnacki, 2007). It is for these reasons that Watkins and Marsick’s (1993) model of the learning organization has been chosen as the framework of the current study.

Watkins and Marsick (1993) defined learning as a continuous, strategically used process, integrated with, and running parallel to work. People and structure are two main integrated organizational constituents in their model. These two constituents are also viewed as interactive components of organizational change and development. Watkins and Marsick (1996) believe that people learn on individual bases first, and then learn as clusters, groups/teams, networks, and continually make large groups units when they join together in organizational change. Organizations also require preparing facilitative structures to support learning in order to achieve their goals (Watkins and Marsick, 2003; Song et al., 2009).
Watkins and Marsick’s (1993) model is depicted in (Figure 2-1). There are two intersecting triangles in the framework: the bottom intersecting triangle which represents people who make up the organization and the top intersecting triangle which represents organizational structure and culture. The process of learning in this model starts from the bottom where the individual is learning, to the top of the model where individuals are interacting within larger social units, environment and society (Watkins and Marsick, 1993). This model suggests that learning takes place at four levels: individual, team, organizational and global.

Consequently, organizations trying to become learning organizations must encourage and support learning at all the four levels. The intersection of the triangle represents employees’ engagement in team learning and as the model indicates, team learning is the centerpiece of organizational learning providing the link between individual-level and organization-level learning. The global-level learning reveals that the organization functions within a global system require to be connected to its environment. Finally, what guarantees the success of the learning organization is a leader who champion learning on all levels within the organization. All of these action imperatives act together and enable the organization to move toward continuous learning and change.
Watkins and Marsick’s (1993) model with seven distinct but interrelated dimensions at three levels of individual, team, and organization, are explained as follows.

### 2.4.1 Individual Learning

Despite importance in organizational learning, little attention has been given to individual learning process in organizations (Song and Chermack, 2008). Individual learning plays a key role in organizations since organizational learning is “a combination of accumulated and the synergistic impact of individual learning” (Park, 2005, p.33). Learning at individual level is defined as the strategy that people take to make meaning of situations they face, and the way in which they acquire and apply
the knowledge, attitudes, and skills they need to act in new ways (Watkins and Marsick, 1993). Gilley and Maycunich (2000) also defined individual learning as “the increase of skills, insights, knowledge, attitudes, and values acquired by employees through training, self-study, technology-based instruction, insight, observation, and reflection” (p. 109). Lee and Bruvold (2003) stated that the benefits that organizations experience as a result of individual learning are enhanced attraction of good employees; reduced unwanted turnover, and organizational commitment. According to Baruch and Hall (2004), individual learning of academic scholars may occur via conferences, working with students, self learning, learning at work and learning through peers.

According to Song and Cherrmack (2008), individual learning occurs in organizations through three modes of adaptive, generative and transformative. Through adaptive mode, the preexisting individuals’ knowledge could be improved with the help of past experience, daily work experiences and formal/informal interventions. Organizations need to provide the opportunities and positive environmental support for the promotion of individuals and continuous adaptive learning. Generative learning mode which is purposeful to generate skills, knowledge and applicable methods (Sessa and London, 2006) will be more effective through an alliance with social interactions (Bandura, 1986) in the organization. Sessa and London (2006) also stated that individuals’ learning modes are firmly linked with factors including given environment, past experience and reflection on the practices in organization. Transformative learning mode can be considered as the transfer of the learned knowledge to the workplace in both effective and efficient way.
Antonacopoulou (2006) also stated that individual learning occurs through three organizational practices: (a) background of learning, (b) politics of learning at work, and (c) institutional identity of learning. Individual learning has to be transferred to the organization by social interactions in order to create organizational learning which signifies more than just the sum of the individual learners. Otherwise, individual learning will remain inside individual minds without having a real impact within organizations. In addition, it is important to recognize that individuals have different learning styles, so the way they handle and process their experiences would impact preference of a learning style over others (Sessa and London, 2006) which may impact how individual learning is transferred to the organizations.

Watkins and Marsick (1993) remarked that individual learning level happens when differences, surprises, and challenges act as causes to stimulate a response. This process continues so long as individuals choose a strategy or action based on their cognitive and affective understanding of the initial meaning. Then the individuals implement the strategy. In the event that, the chosen strategy or action do not work or are not effective in practice, the cycle begins again. At the end if individuals consider these experiences as positive, they try to retain or embed them as what is learned from the experience. Song and Cherrmack (2008) also stated that “individual learning is the agent of organizational learning process” (p. 428). According to Chan (2002) organizations can learn from their individual learners’ skills and commitments. These skills can be shared between employees to enhance organization outcomes such as organizational commitment.
2.4.2 Team Learning

Team learning is “the process of aligning and developing the capacity of a team to create the results its members truly desire” (Senge, 1990, p. 236). Chajnacki (2007) stated that team members learn and achieve their goals through communication with various systems, including the organization, other teams, and individual members. Team learning will occur when team members first create a base of trusting and respecting each other, sharing significant information and work cooperatively in the direction of goal achievement. Team learning occurs through formal and informal discussions and exchange of information among team members. Marquardt (2002) believes team learning requires three elements. First, teams need to address complex issues through collective insights. Second, teams need to constantly encourage innovative and coordinated action. Third, teams must be committed to encouraging learning among every member and stimulating learning in other teams. Bui and Baruch (2010) stated that “if an organization consists of talented individuals that cannot collaborate within a team, their contribution towards reaching the organizational goals will be severely limited” (p. 214). Mastering team learning is a significant step in building learning organizations. It is the core of learning organization. Katzenbach and Smith (2005) also stressed that the essence of team learning is a shared organizational commitment. Keefe and Howard (1997) stated that those within the school must learn as a group and school leaders must encourage team learning through the use of dialogue and inquiry to investigate complex issues and problems.
Senge (1993) identified three important reasons for team learning within organizations. First, team learning allows for both collective thinking and learning. Second, team learning generates actions among team members that coordinate and complement the actions of others within the team. Third, team learning affects the entire organization, as one team’s action may be the result of another team’s learning, resulting in the creation of continuous learning cycles throughout the organization.

According to Yorks, Marsick, Kasl, and Dechant (2003), culture impacts the process of team learning at multiple levels. They stated that culture firstly provides an outline of references that shape which issues and occurrences make problem for discussion. Secondly, culture channels the kinds of inputs that are considered related to those issues. Thirdly, culture has power both impact and identify the range of appropriate solutions. However, they stated that “The kind of understanding necessary for a complete understanding of team learning within various cultures will require much more research” (p.105). In addition, Nissala (2005) stressed that “despite its importance” team learning remains poorly understood.

### 2.4.3 Organizational Learning

The concept of organizational learning has experienced important growth over the last decades in both the academic and business world (Chiva and Alegre, 2005). Kumar (2005) stated that organizational learning has been the focus of attention as a popular and new concept in recent years. It has been studied in various organizations and many articles and books have been published in this regard. Carroll (1998)
defined organizational learning as a process conducted by individuals, teams and organizations as they gather and absorb information, imagine and plan new actions and implement changes. Murray and Donegan (2003) also state that “organizational learning is concerned with improving the behavior and capability of individuals so that the organization can more effectively respond to its environment” (p.51).

According to Garvin, Edmondson, and Gino (2008), to occur organizational learning three factors are essential: a supportive learning environment; real learning processes and leadership behavior for reinforcement. They remarked that these three building blocks, though they are interrelated, can be measured separately. Garvin et al., (2008) noted that organizational members learn when they feel psychologically safe, differences are recognized, be encouraged to take risks and organization leaders listen and question actively. Argyris and Schon (2002) note that individual learning is a necessary but insufficient for organizational learning. When individuals increase their capacity to learn, they can (collectively) enhance the overall capacity of the organization to learn as long as the organization is receptive to their efforts to use their learning and puts in place appropriate mechanisms to enable, support, and reward the use of what is learned. In short, individual learning is related to organizational learning though not equal to it and potentially interdependent with it. As organizations struggle with increasingly more complex problems, they are discovering that they must be skilled in group level learning. It is for this reason that Senge (1990) believes that unless teams can learn, the organization cannot learn.
2.4.4 The Seven Dimensions of the Learning Organization

Learning organization model serves as the theoretical framework of the present study. According to Yang et al., (2004), the framework proposed by Watkins and Marsick (1993) has the following distinctive characteristics: the construct has been defined clearly and broadly; provides adequate measurement domain and its dimensions are integrated in a conceptual framework which explain interdependent relationships. In addition, studying learning organization literature, Ortenblad (2002) suggested that among all learning organization frameworks, Watkins and Marsick’ (1993) framework was the only one which covered the “most areas of the concept in the literature” (Egan et al., 2004, p. 283).

2.4.4.1 Create Continuous Learning Opportunities

Watkins and Marsick’s (1993) first dimension of learning organization consists of the creation of learning opportunities within the organization for individuals. According to Senge (1993), this concept functions as the basic principle for the learning organization since an organization learns as individuals within the organization learns. Senge (1993) stated that the possibility of the learning organization stem from the fact that humans can learn. Watkins and Marsick (1993) stated that individuals must suppose responsibility to become lifelong learners within the context of the learning organization and the organization must develop the opportunities for continuous individual learning activities.
Continuous learning is typically generated by a problem or challenge on the job. It is embedded within the work. It is shaped by the way the situation is framed and by the capacity of individuals for the work they undertake. It calls for an ability to think in terms of the development of individuals over a twenty year career and can be enhanced when people are proactive, reflective, and creative in their learning (Watkins and Marsick, 1993; Kumar, 2005). In addition, employees in organizations need to be supported to improve their professional qualifications. They learn more effectively through a process of questioning, reflection, and feedback from others that permit deeper understanding.

Various approaches can be provided by the organizations to foster continuous learning through more effective planning for informal learning, learning how to learn, and just in time learning (Watkins and Marsick, 1993). Watkins and Marsick (1993) stated that the approaches taken by the organizations include a continuous learning center, desktop learning, global dialogue teams; developmental coaching linked to career planning, and on-the job learning experiences that include challenging work assignments and mentoring. Furthermore, electronic learning has been growing rapidly as the easiest, cheapest and the most acceptable way of education and training (Roffe, 2002). It is one of the best solutions that enables people to receive information as needed and applied it immediately.

In globalization era, everyone requires to learn for personal development and to meet job requirements. In education systems providing conditions of learning opportunities in school settings is much more on the shoulder of teachers than the school organization. In this regards, Fullan (1995) stated that teachers must lead the
way in being continuous learners throughout their careers. Sarason (2002) also remarked that “unless you [as a teacher] take active responsibility for your professional development, unless you protect yourself against the insidious consequences of intellectual-professional loneliness, you reduce the satisfactions you will derive from your careers” (p.68).

In conclusion, according to Watkins (2005), despite the culture of continuous learning in higher education institutions is the dominant culture, it “is not necessarily present among all members nor even all units,” (p. 414). Accordingly, educational administrators in TVCs need to provide enough facilities to assist their lecturers as the core of educational institutions in acquiring new knowledge and skills continuously.

2.4.4.2 Promote Dialogue and Inquiry

Watkins and Marsick’s (1993) second dimension of learning organization is promoting dialogue and inquiry. Dialogue and inquiry represents cultural factors in learning organizations. According to Watkins and Marsick (1993), inquiry is a dialogue in which people mutually explore ideas, questions, and potential actions. Bohm (2004) stated that dialogue is a common conversation where people interact with one another and do not argue points against each other. Inquiry is based on open-minded curiosity and it requires a climate of trust (Watkins and Marsick, 1993). Alavi and McCormick (2004) also stated that a culture of trust and openness are needed to support the inquiry and dialogue. Watkins and Marsick (1993) asserted that learning organization should provide opportunities for discussion between
organization members. To occur inquiry, an informal meeting with creating opportunities for organization people to find one’s communalities are important elements for encouraging inquiry and dialogue (Chajnacki, 2007). Watkins and Marsick (1993) remarked that inquiry “entails questioning that simultaneously challenges assumptions and yet does not attack the individual” (p.114). Inquiry and dialogue helps organization people to learn creatively on a permanent basis. It can assimilate information from various sources to improve knowledge and skills.

According to Watkins and Marsick (1996), strategies that can be utilized to achieve this purpose are action learning, action science and dialogue circles. Watkins and Marsick (1993) asserted that inquiry and dialogue can occur when there is an environment sustaining a developmental approach to learning, while making errors are acknowledged as apart of learning. Watkins and Marsick (1996) also noted dialogue and inquiry is reflected in a “culture in which people ask questions freely, are willing to put difficult issues on the table for discussion, and are open to giving and receiving feedback at all levels” (p. 82).

Accordingly, leaders and managers in TVCs are expected to develop a culture of questioning among all organization members by providing situations that individuals feel easy to ask and to be asked. Therefore it is necessary to try to develop strong commitment to personal learning, self-improving, and having desire to learn about new issues related to work setting among lecturers to achieve the goals of inquiry and dialogue.
2.4.4.3 Encourage Collaboration

Third dimension of Watkins and Marsick’s (1993) model encourages collaboration and team learning. Senge (1990) defined team learning “as the process of aligning and developing the capacity of a team to create the results its members truly desire” (p.236). Zietlow (2011) stated that “when those within an organization are aligned in their work together, a team is created and each member of the team is then able to support others in the organization” (p.75). Watkins and Marsick (1993) stated that “collaborative learning is developed when team members learn the skills of “framing, reframing, experimenting, crossing boundaries, and creating an integrative perspective” (p.14). According to Piercy (2007), collaboration provides opportunities for individuals in organizations to cooperate in an environment of self-managed learning. Chajnacki (2007) also stated that collaborative learning environment makes opportunities available for organization members to contribute social support to each other, as well as nurturing the improvement of job related skills. Team members should learn how to present ideas in a way which influence other team members. Open communication is the vital process that linkage team members together so that they can learn constantly and produces new ideas to face the environmental difficulties and challenges (Chajnacki, 2007). Dee et al., (2006) also stated that the quality of communication in a school can function as antecedents of organizational commitment. Organizations characterized by open communication tend to be innovative and demonstrate high levels of collaboration, trust and commitment.

The key benefits in collaborative efforts and team learning are producing strategies to make capacity systematically through the organization (Watkins and Marsick,
1996; Kumar, 2005; Chajnacki, 2007). In addition, through team and collaborative learning all individuals, teams and the whole organization learn and what have been learned will not be individuals’ private possessions (Watkins and Marsick, 1993; Kumar, 2005b). According to Senge (1993), team learning has three dimensions: thinking about complex issues insightfully; the need for innovative and coordinated action; and the role of team member on other teams. Zeitlow (2011) asserted that for an organization to change, grow and learn, dialogue and discussion should be established. Sessa and London (2006) stated that true collaboration and team learning will occur through integrating perspectives, experimenting, and crossing boundaries. Senge (1993) stated that collaborative learning is very important because teams are the keys learning units in today’s organizations. Leaders in organizations should encourage collaboration and team learning. Senge (1993) also stated that team learning is a skill that is best learned when the team learns how to learn together.

In conclusion, collaboration is a critical key factor for organizational learning to occur. It is necessary to create effective social structures within the organization to develop and preserve collaboration to facilitate shared vision.

2.4.4.4 Establish Systems to Capture and Share Learning

The fourth dimension of Watkins and Marsick’s (1993, 1996) model requires creating systems to capture and share learning. Watkins and Marsick (1993) stated that share learning and embedded systems can be achieved in two ways. The first approach is a technology-based initiative which organizations can establish systems and share learning with; the second option is a low-tech approach that can be attained
by “bringing people together to redesign their work, plan more systematically for innovation, and to help a global workforce learn more effectively from one another across culture” (p. 15).

According to Kumar (2005b), the aim of embedded system is to develop new technology to share knowledge through increased access to learning in organization. Therefore, information communication technology (ICT) can support learners and learning and provide learning culture in organization. Watkins and Marsick (1993) stated key characteristics of embedded systems are information collection, extensive access to that information, incentive and appreciation for learning and improvement, and widespread sharing of what is learned collectively and constantly through access to information. In a learning organization, everyone needs to be linked through a system which provides sharing information. Also, there should be a shared responsibility for the learning system development (Kumar, 2005). According to Rowley (1998), the creation of learning organization in higher education institutions depends on embedding learning in the management process of the institution.

In conclusion, the rapid pace of organizational change requires direct access to knowledge and learning within the organizations. Technology alone does not guarantee a successful learning organization. Organizational members must also obligate themselves to the process of learning and sharing learning. The successful learning organizations must not only create a collaborative environment formed to stimulate learning, but they must also capture, regain, and distribute new learning all over the organization.
2.4.4.5 Empower People Toward a Collective Vision

The fifth dimension of Watkins and Marsick’s (1993) model is to empower organization members toward a collective vision. Employees’ empowerment has received much attention from researchers to study its relationships with organizational outcomes. Watkins and Marsick (1993) stated that empowerment means ‘to give power to’ (p. 196). Chen and Chen (2008) also remarked that empowerment “is a set of activities and practices by managers that give power, control and authority to subordinates” (p. 281). In addition, employee’s empowerment has been recognized to have positive effects in organizations. Based on Kanter’s (1993) theory of organizational empowerment, employees’ empowerment towards a collective vision provide opportunities for learning which in turn influence employees work, attitudes, and behaviors. Krishna (2008) also stated that the sense of being empowered able the organization members to accomplish their tasks well which creates a kind of satisfaction to the organization for which they work. Kanter (1993) stated that employees who work in such organizations are more committed to their organizations.

In a learning organization, according to Watkins and Marsick (1993), “everyone has an idea of what the whole picture of the organization looks like, knows how to get things done, and has knowledge and skills of how to influence and work with others” (p.17). Watkins and Marsick (1996) also stated agreement on a shared vision; providing required resources to achieve the vision; celebrate the success, forming self-directed work teams, flattening the hierarchy of an organization, and developing a culture that supports decision making are strategies that can be used to implement
empowerment within the organization. Also, empowerment is created “by little day-to-day interactions among individuals, teams, and departments that are characterized by mutual respect, a spirit of collaboration and inquiry, honesty and a climate of safety and trust” (Watkins and Marsick, 1993, p. 216).

In addition, teachers’ empowerment in schools to get a shared vision has always been the focus of attention. According to Boglera and Somech (2004), teacher empowerment consists of professional growth, decision making, status, self-efficacy, autonomy, and impact. To empower teachers professionally, the school should provide teachers with opportunities to grow, to continue to learn, and expand their skills and ability during their work at school. Teacher’s participation in critical decisions, scheduling, and curriculum are also strategies that can be used in schools to empower teachers in the direction of shared vision. Senge (1993) stated that shared vision is the result of shared purpose that those in the organization promote and develop by encouraging commitment to the organization and creating shared ideas of what the future will look like in the organization.

Moreover, supporting teachers to feel mastery in knowledge and practice, have control over aspects of working life including; scheduling, and curriculum development and equip them to help students to learn are strategies which can be performed in schools (Boglera and Somech, 2004). Therefore, leaders in organizations, school administrators, and managers must show that they are serious about empowering their employees by providing professional needs in organizations, because it is believed that empowering employees is a critical factor in becoming a learning organization (Watkins and Marsick, 1993).
2.4.4.6 Connect the Organization to Environment

The sixth dimension of Watkins and Marsick’s (1993) model requires the connection of the organization to its environment. This dimension necessitates an understanding of system thinking concerning the organization and its internal and external environment. Watkins and Marsick (1993) noted that the learning organization is based on a close connection between the organization and its external environment, which include the earth, society, community, competitors, and “other external groups, such as governmental bodies whose actions impose on the organization” (p. 18). Dixon (1994) refers to environment as a wide range forces which influence organizations such as technological, economic, and social changes.

Zellner and Fornahl (2002) asserted that there are three ways through which organizations may enhance knowledge base by identifying with their environment. The first way involves recruiting new members into the organization. The second way is informal networks that members of the organization have with those who may be able to supply expertise, information, or knowledge. The third way develops through creating formal networks between linked organizations in order to achieve general objectives. Consequently, by each of these three networks, organizations build linkages that offer possible opportunities to obtain learning from new sources.

Watkins and Marsick (1993) also stated that learning organizations have to recognize both internal and external environment interdependencies and act upon dilemmas connected with these interdependencies. They contended that being connected to internal environment means being responsive to the members of the organization and
their work life-needs. This is not different from being responsive to external customers who influence all members of an organization (Watkins and Marsick, 1993). They also stated that leaders in organizations can use different strategies to connect the organization to its environment such as: benchmarking and computer data bases for environmental scanning, creating virtual and interpersonal networks across boundaries and creating programs that bring both the organization and community together (Watkins and Marsick, 1993; Kumar, 2005; Chajnacki, 2007). Accordingly, the learning organization should provide its members with a lens to connect what they do individually to the overall organizational objectives as well recognizing the interdependence of the organization to its environment.

2.4.4.7 Provide Strategic Leadership for Learning

Watkins and Marsick’s (1993) last dimension requires strategic leadership to support learning. Leaders have critical role in practice of learning organizations. Bui and Baruch (2010) also stated that a learning environment cannot be created without the support of leaders and managers. Sackney and Walker (2006) refers to leadership in education as “culture building that allows educators, students and parents to be a part of a team that learn together” (p. 355). Leaders are responsible for learning and creating a learning environment for the employees to continually expand their capabilities (Marquardt, 2002; Marsick and Watkins, 2003; Fullan, 2004). According to Fullan, (2004), and Senge (1990), taking the role of designers, stewards and teachers, leadership gives a new meaning to learning organizations.
According to Garvin (2000), leaders have three keys learning tasks. First, leaders must create opportunities for learning by designing settings and events to encourage the search of knowledge. Second, they must promote desirable norms, behaviors, and rules of commitment. Third, they must personally lead meetings for discussion by framing the debate, posing questions, listening attentively, and providing honest feedback to the participants. Marsick and Watkins (1999) also stated that leaders in organizations must use the modern technology in running their organizations and provide conditions for all employees to learn and apply new knowledge and skills. Leaders’ commitment to organizational objectives and vision provide conditions for people in organizations to follow them for organizational purposes. It is the responsibility of leaders in organizations to motivate, encourage and force the organizational members in the direction of being learning organization.

In addition, transformational leadership is needed in today’s world to support, push, and encourage the whole organization to be learning organization (Gary, 2010). Senge (1990) remarked that educational leaders need to respond quickly and stay alert to undercurrents. It is necessary that educational administrators know the “policy landscape of higher educational institutions” to make possible creating learning organization (Senge, 1990, p. 416). The school transformational leader of 21st century will help teachers to learn to be adaptable and be prepared for the world of globalization and information era. Therefore, taking the strategy of providing conditions for lecturers to grow, develop and learn, leaders have significant roles in attaching lecturers to their colleges in TVCs.
2.5 Theoretical and Empirical Studies on Learning Organization

Learning organizations have received much attention theoretically and empirically since 1990. However, most of the researches are descriptive (Ayupp and Perumal, 2008; Dirani, 2009; Tseng, 2010) in nature. It is the objective of this section to describe the more well-developed pieces found within the conceptual, qualitative, and quantitative forms of research. Exploring learning organization, Chajcknacki, (2007) stated that about 20 percent of the learning organization studies could be classified as qualitative research consisting primarily of leader and/or employee interviews and including document reviews, direct observations, or focus groups. In addition, he state that almost 65 percent of the articles could be described as conceptual research which explore concepts or ideas from direct experiences within various organizations or engage a literature review to grant substance to a particular perspective or argument. Moreover, Chajcknacki, (2007), delineated that only about 15 percent of the learning organization articles could be classified as quantitative research consisting primarily of survey-based methodologies. Thus, the fairly small percentage of quantitative research studies signify the continuing need to use quantitative forms of research to further scrutinize the concept of the learning organization.

Through an inclusive study of literature on learning organization dimensions, Ortenblad (2002) suggested four major understandings of the learning organization concepts including: the old organizational learning perspectives; the learning at work perspective; the learning climate perspective, and the learning structure perspective. Watkins and Marsick’s (2003) approach is an integrative model, and the only
conceptual model that covers all four understandings mentioned above (Yang et al., 2004). Basim, Sesem and Korkmazyurek (2007), and Song et al., (2009) further described efforts in developing and validating the integrative measure of learning organization, the LODQ, and concluded that LODQ is the best for organizational studies.

Through the LODQ instrument, Zahabioun and Yousefy (2006) investigated the extent of adaptability of Isfahan Education Organization characteristics with learning organization dimensions based on high school women teachers’ perception in school year 2004-2005 in Iran. They used full version of LODQ proposed by Watkins and Marsick (1993) to collect data from 260 women high school teachers. Using t-test, they reported no significant differences between women teachers’ perception on individual and organizational level of learning. The significant difference was reported between women teachers’ perception in team level of learning. In addition, employing ANOVA, they reported no significant differences in means among After Diploma, Bachelor and Master Degree holders towards individual, team and organizational learning level. Similarly, no significant differences in means of age groups (25-34, 35-44, 45-54, and 55-64 years) were reported towards individual, team and organizational learning level. They also reported that there were no significant differences in means of teaching experiences (5-9, 10-14, 15-19, and 20-24 years) towards team and organizational learning levels, whereas significant differences were reported for individual learning level.

Saffari, Hamidi, and Jalalifarrahani (2010) used LODQ to investigate “The comparison of learning organization dimensions in three organizations: physical
education organization, Olympic national committee and physical education in education organization” with the sample of 195 employees. They found no significant differences in employees’ perception from physical education organization, Olympic national committee and physical education in education organization based on seven dimensions of learning organization. The mean scores of employees’ perception on seven learning organization dimensions were reported low for three mentioned organization. Pimapunsri (2008) employing LODQ to study “Factors affecting learning organization culture and hotel managers’ leadership styles in Thailand” among 360 employees from twelve five-star hotels, reported that age and gender show significant differences based on learning organization dimensions.

Utilizing LODQ to determine the relationships between learning organization dimensions and productivity in Physical Education Organization in Iran, Asadi, Ghorbani and Naderan (2009) reported physical education professionals’ perception on seven learning organization dimensions at moderate level. Finally, Nadi, Jaffari, and Ghoorcheyan, (2007), reported that among three research surveys including; Quality Management Checklist, LODQ and knowledge management researcher-made survey, LODQ was found as a diagnostic tool to differentiate between comprehensive and non-comprehensive Islamic Azad Universities in Iran.
2.5.1 Conceptual Research

The conceptual researches pertaining learning organization with theoretical base can be categorized into different forms which the most important of all can be explained in the following. First, behavioral learning which aims to move organizations from planning and reflection to performance results. These kinds of researches encourage maintain for additional and continued learning (Yeo, 2005; Liaghati et al., 2010). Second, employee participation in decision making and planning stages which will improve employee commitment to the team and organizational mission and therefore satisfy the employees of a learning organization (Ellstrom, 2001). Third, theoretical researches that directly or indirectly reinforce managerial domination of employees. Byrne (2001) states that learning organizations try to control over employees by using the hide of learning programs. Conceptual researches which emphasize the need to energize traditional stagnant organizations within the public or private sector. For example adapting a learning organization within a public school system for adults to learn alongside students throughout the year (Vince, 2002).

Fifth, there are theoretical researches that highlight the pressure that exists between individual learning and organizational expectations for production and quality outcomes (Gardiner et al., 2001). Sixth, there are a few theoretical researches which their aim is to explain the similarities and differences between learning organizations and organizational learning. These kinds of researches are important because most of the conceptual researches try to make blur the distinctions between these two interrelated but independent concepts (Ortenblad, 2002). The high percentage of theoretical researches about learning organization confirms/ necessitates the need to
engage in empirical research. Most theoretical researches have been done to examine several forms of learning that occur in organizations. The researchers also have shown their interests to apply learning organization concept in different types of organizations to develop their learning systems.

2.5.2 Qualitative Research

A few researches have been explored learning organization dimensions qualitatively. These researches can be categorized into the following categorizations. First, most of the researches within this methodology include researches which have been done to explain different elements in different models mostly Senge and Marquardt models. An example of this kind of research includes investigation about Senge’s (1993) disciplines done by Reed (2001). Second, there are qualitative researches that have examined the relationship between learning organization and a branch of organizational concepts such as leadership. Example of this kind of researches are the research which has been done by Vince (2002) among senior managers to find whether emotional intelligence mediates learning organization elements and Watkins and Marsick (2000) study about life histories of learning leaders to find out which leadership traits improve the success of learning organization.

Third, researches which have been done to examine the connection between learning organizations and resistance to changes in organizations. Example of this research is one which has been done by Alas and Sharifi (2002) to show whether the size of the organization affect being learning organization. Fourth, some qualitative researches have the focus of attention to examine how organizations can become learning
organization. Reece (2004) in his study reported that the following ten key dimensions were found to be important to Australian Universities becoming learning organization: leadership, vision, organizational culture, human resource management, role of society, accessibility, resources, innovation and creativity, information communication technology and global reach. The above qualitative researches provide valuable information regarding the meaning and understanding of the learning organization concepts; however, they have been done on a small population or a specific organization which their results cannot be generalized.

2.5.3 Quantitative Research

The quantitative research is the least among all research done on learning organization. They can be categorized in the following categorization. First, there are some researches which have been done to examine the validations of survey instruments to measure the critical elements of learning organizations. Examples of these kinds of researches have been done by (Yang, 2003; Basim et al., 2007).

Second, researches which have been done to examine the relationships between learning organization dimensions and individual characteristics such as (Van Woerkom et al., 2001) for investigating the ideals of a learning organization initiative. Third, there are some investigations to explore the relationships between learning organization dimensions, organizational traits, and some performances of organizations. Some examples of these types of researches have been reported by Tseng (2010), (Asadi et al., 2009), (Attafar and Bahrami, 2009) and (Hamidi and Keshtidar, 2004).
Accordingly, the review of the previous research indicates that despite the inclination of managers to conduct learning organization theory in their organizations as a key factor in response to the increasingly unpredictable complicated organizational environment, there are few empirical and quantitative research evidences pertaining to learning organization concept in the past. In addition, few researchers have tried to find the relationships between learning organization dimensions and organizational commitment.

2.6 Organizational Commitment Theory

There are three approaches related to organizational commitment theories. First, Becker’s (1960) exchange approach that views commitment as the result of transactions between the organization and its members. Exchange approaches or side bets are defined as anything that the employee would view as valuable or any investment the employee has made in the organization (Outram, 2007). Becker’s (1960) theory defines that organization members attach to the organization by spending their time, attempt, work relationships, and organizational-specific skills, for which they obtain rewards. Committed employees are employees who have totally hidden investments, “side-bets,” they have made by remaining in an organization” (Cohen, 2007, p.338). In addition, what makes employees remain in the organization is the lack of alternatives to replace for the loss of these investments or the threats of losing these investments. Thus, when the employee thinks of leaving the organization, he or she will also think of losing his or her investments. These
investments might restrict the employee’s activities of looking for another job (Allen and Meyer, 2004; Cohen, 2007; Outram, 2007; Krishna, 2008).

Second, Porter, Steers, Mowday, and Boulian’s (1974) approach which has changed the focus of attention from side-bets to psychological attachment of employees to the organization. The psychological approaches explain three ways by which organization members could remain committed to the organization: (a) believe in organizational goals and values, (b) make efforts on behalf of the organization, and (c) preserve membership in the organization. Therefore, employees who identify with the organizational goals and objectives would be less likely to think of leaving the organization (Cohen, 2007; Outram, 2007; Atak and Erturqut, 2010).

Third, Meyer and Allen (1996) in accordance with Becker’s (1960) side-bets theory, presented empirical evidences for employee’s organizational commitment that consists of the following three factors: (a) affective, (b) continuance, and (c) normative commitment. Affective commitment refers to the employees’ emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization (Allen and Meyer, 1996; Meyer et al., 2002). The affective commitment is identical to Mowday, Porter, and Steers’s (1992) theory of organizational commitment. Cohen (2007) also stated that affective commitment provides a good representation of the employee’s psychological attachment to a particular organization. Continuance component involves the costs that employees accept with leaving an organization (Allen and Meyer, 1990; Meyer et al., 2002; Cohen, 2007; Bakan et al., 2011). Cohen (2007) stated that the impact of the side-bets approach is obvious in continuance commitment. Lastly, normative commitment refers to employees’ feelings of
obligation toward the organization (Allen and Meyer, 1990; Cohen, 2007; Meyer and Parfyonova, 2010; Bakan et al., 2011) which is the equivalent of Mowday and Colleagues’ theory of the desire to maintain membership in the organization. According to Cohen (2007), normative commitment is the employees’ feeling of moral obligation to the organization that pushes employees to continue in the organization. Meyer and Allen (1997) stated that this sense of moral obligation is developed during employees’ early socialization in organization culture and family.

2.6.1 Conceptualization of Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment has been defined as one-dimensional and multidimensional construct (Allen and Meyer, 1996; Cohen, 2007; Krishna, 2008). Porter et al., (1974) stated that commitment is the result of “a strong belief in and acceptance of organizational goals and values, a willingness to exert effort on behalf of the organization, and a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization” (p.604). Most of the researchers consider commitment as multidimensional constructs (O’Reilly and Chatman, 1986; Meyer and Allen, 1996; Cohen, 2007).

O’Reilly and Chatman (1986) stated that psychological attachment of individuals may be predicted based on three factors: Compliance (instrumental), identification (affiliation), and internalization. Compliance occurs when attitudes and behaviors are adopted to gain specific rewards. Identification occurs when an individual accepts influence to establish a satisfying relationship. Individual feels proud to be a part of a group or organization. Internalization occurs when influences are accepted because
the induced attitudes and behaviors are congruent with one’s own values; the values of individuals and group or organization are the same.

Mowday et al., (1992) conceptualized organizational commitment as attitudinal and behavioral commitment. According to Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979), attitudinal or affective commitment can be defined as “an emotional attachment into an organization characterized by acceptance of organizational values and willingness to remain in the organization” (p. 228). In general, attitudinal commitment refers to the processes by which people come to think about their relationship with the organization. Behavioral commitment (continuous commitment) focuses on behaviors and the exchange relationships that are formed between employees and organization. This type of commitment sees the individual “as bound to the organization through unrelated interests (pension, tenure) rather than positive effects toward the organization” (Mowday et al., 1992, p. 229). On the other hand, behavioral commitment refers to the processes by which employees become locked into a specific organization (Cohen, 2007; Giffords, 2009).

According to Meyer and Allen (1996) the psychological linkage between employees and their organization can take three quite distinct forms, each of which given a distinguishable label. Affective commitment refers to “identification with, involvement in and emotional attachment to the organization. Employees with strong affective commitment continue employment with the organization because they want to do so” (Meyer and Allen, 1997, p. 235). Continuance commitment refers to “an awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organization. Employees whose primary link to the organization is based on continuance commitment remain because
they need to do so” (Meyer and Allen, 1997, p. 235). Normative commitment reflects “a sense of feeling of obligation to continue employment. Employees with a high normative commitment remain because they ought to” (Meyer and Allen, 1997, p. 235). Meyer et al., (2002) considered affective, continuance, and normative commitment to be components and not different types of commitment. These three components reflect varying degrees of an employee’s relationship with an organization. Krishna (2008) stated that “these three forms of commitment interact and employees can experience all the three forms in varying proportions” (p. 32). Utilizing these three components of organizational component, Meyer and Allen (1997) defined that a “committed employee is one who stays with the organization through thick and thin, attend work regularly, put in a full day, protect organization assets, and share organization goals” (p. 3).

Based on the review of various definitions of commitment, it does appear that there is some general agreement that commitment is a force that binds an individual to the organization (Cohen, 2007; Malik et al., 2010; Bakan et al., 2011). It is an individual’s psychological attachment to an organization or a psychological bond that connects an individual to his/her organization (Meyer and Herscovitch, 2001; Cohen, 2007). Meyer and Allen’s three factor concepts and the instrument of organizational commitment were utilized in the current study to measure perceived levels of lecturers’ commitment in TVCs.
2.6.2 Antecedents of Organizational Commitment

The relationships between organizational commitment and its antecedents have been explored in numerous studies. However, the research results show that they are much more varied and inconsistent (Mathieu and Zajac, 1990; Krishna and Casey, 2008), paradoxical (Krishna and Casey, 2008), “unsystematic”, (Meyer and Herscovitch, 2001), and as Mowday et al., (1992) asserted there are few clear cut answers with respect to antecedents of organizational commitment.

Steers (1977) classified antecedents of organizational commitment into three main categories: (a) personal characteristics, (b) job characteristics, and (c) work experiences. Mowday et al., (1992) proposed another component to the above category, (d) role-related characteristics as the fourth antecedent of organizational commitment. Meyer and Allen (1991) also used these categories in their discussion of antecedents, but combined job-related characteristics with work experience (Krishna, 2008; Malik et al., 2010; Tseng, 2010; Bakan et al., 2011). Brookover (2002) stated that antecedents of organizational commitment can be categorized into two groups: (a) personal antecedents (employee-based antecedents) consists of things the employees bring to an organization such as age, marital status, gender, education; and (b) organization-based antecedents or those demographics that related to employment such as salary, position and length of service.

Personal variables (employee-based antecedents) which are frequently investigated are comprised of variables that define the individuals. Among the most personal characteristics which have been studied more are age, gender, different personality
factors, education, and race (Krishna and Casey, 2008; Gormley and Kennerly, 2010; Bakan et al., 2011). Job characteristics and the aspects of the job which have been researched as predictors of organizational commitment are comprised of job scope, task, autonomy, job challenge, job level, job variety, leadership, communication and organization support. According to Krishna (2008), despite a considerable research on the relation of job characteristics and organizational commitment, no study has presented a theoretical framework to link these variables. Likewise, various studies regarding role-related characteristics and organizational commitment can be found in the literature, however none has explained why and how these variables relate to organizational commitment. In addition, the results of identifying antecedents of organizational commitment show that personal variables were among the most researched.

Therefore, it is evident from the antecedents of organizational commitment that despite considerable research regarding organizational commitment during the past four decades, there is a lack of understanding due to incomplete knowledge regarding antecedents that influence commitment. This means that the commitment literature has ignored to explore newer antecedents to commitment. The commitment literature also has ignored that organizational commitment is contextual (Cohen, 2007; Krishna and Casy, 2008). As a result, learning organization dimensions as organizational level variables which can be antecedents of organizational commitment scale and subscales have not received much attention in the organizational commitment literature. Cohen (2007) has stated that it is important to consider organizational level variables that impact the development of organizational commitment because commitment develops on account of both individual and organizational level forces.
Therefore, one of the primary purposes of this study is to explore whether learning organization dimensions as organizational level variables impact the development of organizational commitment scale and subscales to help TVCs educational leaders to retain and attract their core personnel "lecturers". Based on this knowledge, they may be able to adjust some of these fundamental factors or predictors to create higher levels of organizational commitment among their lecturers in TVCs.

2.6.3 Dimensions of Organizational Commitment

Despite there is some general agreement that commitment is a force that attaches an employee to an organization, there is disagreement pertaining the dimensionality of organizational commitment (Krishna and Casey, 2008). However, Meyer and Allen (1991) have proposed multidimensional model of organizational commitment which is the most widely researched model with three constructs of affective, continuance and normative.

A four dimensional model has also been proposed by Delobbe and Vandenberghe (2000) which consists of internalization, compliance, affective and calculative. Internalization refers to the attachment to the organization’s goals based on personal–organizational value similarity. Compliance commitment is a result of abiding by organizational expectations instead of rewards. Affective and calculative, the other two types of commitment in this model have been adapted from Meyer and Allen’s (1991), and Meyer et al., (2002) model.
Penley and Gould (1988) proposed a model with three components including: moral, calculative and alienative forms of commitment. Moral commitment is related to the acceptance of the organization goals and values. Calculative commitment is defined as an outcome of the benefits that an employee receives on behalf of the organization, while alienative commitment is the result of lack of alternative. To differentiate the key dimensions of organizational commitment is difficult on account of the use of different terms to refer to the same concept or the use of different concepts to refer to the same terminology (Krishna, 2008).

Based on different conceptualization and dimensions of organizational commitment in the organizational commitment literature, all organizational commitment models can be categorized into two groups: two factor-models and three factor-models or more. In the following their classification, strengths and weaknesses are discussed.

2.6.4 Two-Factor Models of Organizational Commitment

Researchers in the field of organizational commitment have utilized two factor models to show employees’ tendency and behavior to the organization. According to Cohen (2007), and Krishna (2008) the conceptualization developed by Porter and associates utilize two factors; attitudinal commitment which refers to the ways in which employees’ values fit together with those of the organization and behavioral commitment which refers to the ways in which an employee is “locked in” to an organization (Reyes, 2001; Cohen, 2003; Bhatnagar, 2007). Another two factor model is presented by Angle and Perry (1981) who classified organizational commitment into value commitment which refers to positive connection with the
organization, a psychological attachment to the organization and commitment to stay which refers to the importance of economic relationship between employee and the organization (Cohen, 2003, Krishna and Casey, 2008). These two organizational commitment models are the only two-factor models which have been studied in commitment literature. In the following its strengths as well as weaknesses will be discussed.

2.6.5 Strengths and Weaknesses of Two Factor Models


Vandenberg et al., (2007) explained that O’Reilly and Chatman (1986) identification scale contributed nothing beyond the explanations already captured through the organizational commitment questionnaire created by Meyer and Allen. Bennett (1994) concluded quite correctly that internalization and identification appear to be tapping similar constructs and that the compliance dimension does not really reflect psychological attachment to the organization (Meyer and Herscovitch, 2001). In conclusion, while O’Reilly and Chatman (1986) presented an interesting approach to commitment, for unclear reasons and because of its questionable operationalization,
few researchers have followed this approach. Instead, the approach of Meyer and Allen became the dominant one to the study of commitment (Cohen, 2007).

2.6.6 Three-Factor Models of Organizational Commitment

Several researchers have developed models of commitment that utilize three factors (Cohen, 2007; Vandenberghe et al., 2007). Penley and Gould (1988) built their model based on previous models into three factors. They proposed moral commitment which refers to identification with the organization’s goals; calculative commitment, which is seen as the exchange of organizational inducements for employee contribution; and alternative commitment, which is a consequence of a lack of control and a perceived absence of alternatives. The findings of Penley and Gould’s (1988) study indicated that commitment does in fact originate from several different sources, including the individual’s personality-based predispositions, the supervisor’s influence, and the organizational culture (Cohen, 2007).

Reviewing different conceptualization of organizational commitment, Meyer and Allen (1991) observed that there were both similarities and differences among the existing one-dimensional conceptualization of organizational commitment. The idea that commitment binds an individual to an organization was common to all one-dimensional conceptualization of organizational commitment.

Meyer and Allen also realized that organizational commitment needs to be observed using a multiple-component model. The three components of affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment form the basis of a new
conceptualization of organizational commitment (Meyer and Allen, 1997; Meyer and Parfyonova, 2010). Affective commitment refers to the employee’s “emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization” (Meyer and Allen, 1991, p. 67). A person with high affective commitment belongs to an organization because he/she wants to (Meyer and Allen, 1991; Cohen, 2007). Continuance commitment refers to “an awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organization,” such as loss of prestige, status, or monetary incentives (Meyer and Allen, 1991, p. 67). An individual who has high levels of continuance commitment stays with an organization because they need to do so (Meyer and Allen, 2004; Cohen, 2007). Normative commitment “reflects a feeling of obligation to continue employment” (Meyer and Parfyonova, 2010). Individuals with high levels of normative commitment stay with an organization because they feel it is the “morally right” thing to do for the organization (Meyer and Parfyonova, 2010, p. 285). Meyer and Allen (1997) define organizational commitment as “reflecting the affective orientation toward the organization, recognition of costs associated with leaving the organization and a moral obligation to remain with the organization” (p.11).

2.6.7 Strengths and Weaknesses of Three Factor Models

Among models of organizational commitment, three factor models have been more accepted to use and measure organizational commitment structurally (Cohen A., 2007; Joolideh and Yeshodhara, 2008; Solinger et al., 2008). According to Meyer and Herscovitch, (2001) three factor models are widely acknowledged that organizational commitment to be considered as tridimensional. Meyer and Allen
model (1991; 1997) has been recognized as a comprehensive model among others. This is because of the followings.

First, Meyer and Allen three component models has evolved as the model of choice for many researchers (Meyer et al., 2002; Chughtai and Zafar, 2006; Cohen, 2007), has undergone the most extensive empirical evaluation to date associate with its measure (Bashir and Ramay, 2008; Joolideh and Yeshodhara, 2008). Cohen (2007) also stated that “for more than 20 years, the leading approach to studying organizational commitment has been the three-dimensional (affective, normative, and continuance)” (p. 336).

Second, with more than 40 different studies using three-construct model, Meyer and Allen’s conceptualization is a widely accepted theoretical framework (Allen and Meyer, 1996; Cohen, 2007) and a practical alternative to the conceptualization posited by Porter et al., (1974).

Third, the driving force for the development of this model was the changing nature of work which requires organization to find new ways to “organize”, leading to more adaptable and flexible organizational forms. These new organizational forms will impact the types and strength of commitments between the organization and its employees (Meyer and Allen, 1997). Meyer and Allen’s (1997) three-component model of organizational commitment encourages a flow of research in commitment and is currently the widespread commitment construct (Chughtai and Zafar, 2006; Cohen, 2007).
Fourth, it is important to point out that Meyer and Allen do not see these three components as separate “types” of commitment, but interconnected in a way that reflects the unique nature of each individual’s level of commitment to an organization (Allen and Meyer, 1996; Kang and Bartlett, 2004). The model assumes that each individual will have some level of all three commitments.

Fifth, affective commitment as a construct of organizational commitment prepared by Meyer and Allen has been regarded to be the global and most important component in terms of explaining human in an organization (Chughtai and Zafar, 2006; Cohen, 2007; Dirani, 2009).

Sixth, Cohen (2007) asserted that Meyer and Allen’s (1991, 1997) organizational commitment model advantages are consists of “good psychometric properties of the current scales, acceptable discrimination validity of the three dimensions, and research findings that showed the usefulness and acceptable content validity of the three-dimensional approach” (p. 336).

Accordingly, through a comprehensive literature review, Meyer and Allen’s (1997) model was recognized as a suitable model with its associate questionnaire to be used in achieving the purpose of the current study.
2.7 Learning Organization Dimensions and Organizational Commitment

Relationship

The relationships between learning organization dimensions and organizational commitment have been investigated by some researchers empirically. These studies have found that participation in training and learning activities increases employees’ organizational commitment (Ahmad and Bakar, 2003; Cho and Kwon, 2005; Wang, 2005; Cho et al., 2006; Dirani, 2007; Tseng, 2010). In the following, the most important and relevant of all are noted.

Lim (2003) in his study “Relationships among organizational commitment, learning organization culture and job satisfaction in one Korean private organization”, using OCQ instrument short version, LODQ to measure learning organization culture, and job satisfaction questionnaire, has reported that most correlations between organizational commitment, learning organization culture, and job satisfaction were positive, significant but weak relationship. To fill the gap in existing literature regarding relationships among organization learning culture, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment in native Chinese enterprise, Wang (2005) reported their relationships as positive, significant and moderate. Using quantitative survey measures in the Lebanese banking sector, Dirani (2009) reported the relationship between learning organization culture, organizational commitment and job satisfaction as significant and moderate relationship. Employing the stepwise regression method, Dirani (2009) reported providing leadership, empowering people, promoting inquiry and dialogue and system connectedness were significant
predictors of organizational commitment, whereas creating continuous learning, collaboration, and shared systems were not significant predictors in the model.

Joo and Lim (2009) investigated the effects of organizational learning culture, perceived job complexity, and proactive personality on organizational commitment and intrinsic motivation in Korean context, reported that all correlations were positive and significant. They reported that when employees perceived that an organization provided continuous learning, dialogue and inquiry, team learning, an established system, empowerment, a system connection, and strategic leadership, they tended to be psychologically more attached to their organization.

Hamidi and Keshtidar (2004) in their study “the study of organizational structure and organizational commitment in physical education colleges in Iran” found that team learning, team working, collaboration, communication among lecturers, and participating in policy making were significant determinants of organizational commitment among lecturers. They reported that the more organizational structure is organic, the more academic staffs are attached psychologically to the organization and have less inclination to leave the organization.

Formal workplace training and organizational commitment have been the focus of attention by many studies (Bartlett, 2001; McMurray and Dorai, 2001; Ahmad and Bakar, 2003). These studies show that formal training programs play an important role in enhancing employees’ organizational commitment. Cho and Kwon (2005) in their study “self-directed learning readiness as an antecedent of organizational commitment” found that self-directed learning was a meaningful variable in terms of
both affective and continuance commitment. Kontoghiorghes and Bryant (2004) also found that employees’ perception of learning and growth in the workplace plays an important role in enhancing organizational commitment. In addition, through a review of the related literature, Meyer and Allen (1997) summarized that ‘although more research is necessary, existing evidence suggests that commitment can be affected by training experiences in organizations.

Joiner and Bakalis (2006) found that supportive and interactive collaboration with colleagues is strongly and positively correlated with organizational commitment. Kontoghiorghes and Bryant (2004) found that teamwork based on cooperation is positively associated with organizational commitment. Lok and Crawford (2004) discovered that supportive and innovative cultures have a strongly positive effect on organizational commitment, while bureaucratic culture has a negative effect on organizational commitment.

The quality of communication in a school can also function as an antecedent of organizational commitment (Dee et al., 2006). In terms of organizational commitment, open communication serves as a means for integration into the organization that in turn may strengthen commitment to the employing organization. Organizations characterized by open communication tend to be innovative and demonstrate high levels of collaboration and trust and commitment (Dee et al., 2006). It was revealed that employees’ attitude toward learning and training, such as social support for training, motivation to learn, and perceived benefits of training, are highly related to organizational commitment (Bartlet, 2001).
In a review of the school teamwork literature, Buckley (2000), and Dee et al., (2006) identified four primary team structures: team teaching, curriculum development, governance and administration, and school community relations. Dee, et al., (2006) stated that team teaching and curriculum teamwork had the strongest effects on organizational commitment. Participation in site-based governance teams may enable teachers to engage in issues that relate to school mission, strategy, and external relations. These activities can strengthen identification with school wide goals and improve the extent of fit or alignment between individual and organizational goals (Dee et al., 2006).

In conclusion, there are some short comings in the above researches which the researcher in the following notes some of them. First none of the researches have noted the different levels of learning (individual, team, and organization), and analyze them in organizational context. Second, despite significant differences between learning organization and organizational learning conceptually, these two terms have been used interchangeably. Third, the effects and relationships of seven action imperatives which are important in creating learning culture in organizations have not been analyzed and defined in details with organizational commitment constructs (affective, normative, and continuance). Accordingly, to achieve the above purposes, the current research was performed to provide enough knowledge theoretically and empirically.
2.8 Demographic Variables and Organizational Commitment

Demographics play a key role in organizational commitment (Mathieu and Zajac, 1990; Meyer and Allen, 1997; Meyer et al., 2002; Ng et al., 2006; Brown and Sergeant, 2007). Giffords (2009), Brown and Sargeant (2007) also stated that to promote, systematize, and facilitate organizations’ functioning in achieving their goals, mission, and objectives, factors such as demographics should be noticed by the managers of the organizations. Hulpia, Devos, and Van Keer, (2011) also stated that teachers’ organizational commitment can be affected by contextual variables such as demographics, however, many questions regarding relationships between demographics and organizational commitment have remained unanswered. Angle and Perry (1981), Bakan et al., (2011), Brown and Sargeant (2007) and Tseng (2010) also stated that demographics are worth investigating because they showed contradictory results with organizational commitment. Accordingly, in the current study demographic variables including age, gender and marital status, level of education, type of employment, teaching experience, and monthly income were studied to find out their relationships with organizational commitment.

2.8.1 Age

A review of the relationship between organizational commitment and age indicates contradictory results. Meyer et al., (2002), found positive, though not very strong linkage between age and different levels of attitudinal commitment. Bashir and Ramay (2008), Meyer and Allen also found that age was positively correlated with affective and normative commitment, but not with continuance commitment.
However, Lim (2003) in his study in a Korean private organization found that there was no significant difference between age and organizational commitment. Gurses and Demiray (2009) and Outran (2007) also reported that there was no significant difference between age groups (17-22, 23-30, 31-40, 41-50, 51 and more) and affective, continuance and normative commitment. Thus, these inconsistent results necessitate determining the effects of age on organizational commitment scale and subscales in TVCs.

### 2.8.2 Gender

Similarly to age, gender and organizational commitment relationship show opposing results. Gurses and Demiray (2009) indicated that mean points for all affective, continuance and normative commitment were higher for females when compared to males in organizational commitment. Dennis and Alan (2004) reported that gender in educational settings was the most important predictor of organizational commitment. Lim (2003) reported significant differences on affective and continuance variables between men and women. Males showed a higher score on affective and continuance variables than females. In addition, Angel and Perry (1981), Mathiew and Zaiac (1990), Davoodipoor, Ahancheyan and Rezvani (2008), Mirzamohammadi and Abdolmaleki (2009) reported significant differences between men and women according to organizational commitment.

However, Cristina, Salome, and Cristina (2009) in their study “how to raise commitment in public university lecturers” reported that gender proves to be non-significant to organizational commitment. Outram (2007), Khatibi, Asadi and
Hamidi (2009), Henkin and Holliman (2009) and Salami (2008) also reported no significant differences between male and female towards organizational commitment. Thus, the inconsistent results regarding the relationship between gender and organizational commitment warrant investigation between gender and organizational commitment.

2.8.3 Marital Status

Marital status is another variable which has been the focus of attention pertaining to organizational commitment scale and subscales. Correspondingly to age and gender, marital status shows inconsistency results with organizational commitment. Outram (2007) reported no significant differences between single and married in terms of mean rank for organizational commitment. Khatibi et al., (2009) found that there was no significant difference between single and married employees in National Olympic and Paralympics Academy in Iran by organizational commitment. Also Chughtai and Zafar’s (2006) findings in Pakistan and Cristina et al., (2009) results in Spain showed no significant differences in organizational commitment in terms of marital status. Conversely, Salami (2008) in his research “Demographic and Psychological factors Predicting Organizational Commitment among Industrial workers” asserted that there were significant differences between male and female employees and organizational commitment.
2.8.4 Level of Education

The paradoxical relationships between level of education and organizational commitment have been reported by many researchers. Some researchers have reported inverse linkage between education level and organizational commitment. Henkin and Holliman (2009) have reported significant relationship between educational level and organizational commitment. Yaghobi, Yarmohammadyan and Javadi (2007) in the study of “relationship between organizational commitment and job stress among educational hospitals managers in Isfahan, Iran” found that level of education was significantly correlated with organizational commitment. The higher the level of education, hospital managers showed more commitment to the goals, and missions of the organization. Khatibi et al., (2009) also reported significant differences between postgraduate and graduate employees in organizational commitment in National Olympic in Iran. Those who had post graduate degree were more committed than those with graduate degrees. Shaikh et al., (2005) Mirzamohammadi and Abdulmalek (2009) also found that level of education was significantly correlated with affective commitment. They reported the higher the level of education; the more staffs are attached to the organization psychologically. Whereas, Lim (2003), Hamidi and Keshtidar (2004), and Davoodipoor et al., (2008) have reported no significant differences between employees with different education level and organizational commitment. Accordingly, the contradiction results regarding the relationship between level of education and organizational commitment requires exploring their relationship in TVCs in Iran too.
2.8.5 Teaching Experience

The study of the relationship between teaching experience and organizational commitment scale and subscales show different results. Koohestani and Shojaeefar (2007) reported that the length of teaching experience among lecturers in Mashad colleges in Iran was significantly correlated with organizational commitment. Mirzamohammadi and Abdolmaleki (2009) also reported significant relationship between working experience and organizational commitment among Shahed University non-boards of employees in Iran. They stated that the more employees had working experience, the more they showed commitment to the organization. Salami (2008) also reported significant relationship between working experience and organizational commitment.

Conversely, Lim (2003) reported no significant difference by years of services in organizational commitment among employees of one Korean private organization. Tella, Ayeni and Popoola (2007) also in Nigeria, found that there was no relationship between organizational commitment of the library personnel and their years of experience in the organization. Davoodipoor, et al., (2008) studying organizational commitment among guidance school teachers reported that there was not significant differences between teaching experience and organizational commitment scale and sub scale. Accordingly, these international and local contradiction results pertaining to organizational commitment scale and subscales and teaching experience confirm studying teaching experience and organizational commitment in TVCs among lecturers in Iran.
2.8.6 Type of Employment

The relationship between organizational commitment and type of employment has been reported by some researchers. Sabagheyan, et al., (2006) in their study, “the relationship between organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and retention of physical education lecturers in Islamic Azad University” in Iran reported that there were significant differences between affective, continuance, normative and organizational commitment of full time and part time lecturers. Full time lecturers have been reported to be more committed than part time lecturers. Mirzamohammadi, and Abdolmaleki, (2009) studying “Relationship between Organizational Commitment and Quality of Production Services among Official and Educational Employees in Shahed University” in Iran, reported that full time employees were more committed than contract employees. However, Thomas (2008) reported insignificant relationship between type of employment and organizational commitment.

2.8.7 Monthly Income

Similar to mentioned demographics, the relationship between organizational commitment and monthly income show discrepancy results, though there are few studies investigating their relationship. Outram (2007) reported that there was no meaningful correlation between income and organizational commitment, whereas Poon (2004) in his study “Career commitment and career successes: Moderating role of emotion perception” reported that salary levels were positively correlated with commitment. Comparing the affective, continuance and normative commitment
levels of Anadolu University Open Education Faculty students based on their income level, Demiray and Curabay (2008), found that there was significant difference between continuance and normative commitment levels and income level, but not with affective commitment. Accordingly, the inconsistency results of the effects of demographic variables on affective, normative, continuance, and overall organizational commitment necessitate their studying in TVCs with different cultural and social backgrounds.

2.9 Theoretical Support to Relate Learning Organization Dimensions and Organizational Commitment

In this section, the theoretical framework of the relationships between learning organization dimensions and organizational commitment are presented. Various empirical researches were also used to support the theoretical relationships between these two constructs. To relate learning organization dimensions to organizational commitment, Parsons and Shils’s Social Action Theory (1962), Kanter’s Theory of Organizational Empowerment (1993) and Nonaka’s (1994) explanatory framework were utilized.

Based on Social Action Theory, learning is considered as socially created through the interactions of people in a social system (Parsons and Shils 1962). Learning organization theorists also considers learning organization as a social system in which learning as a collective process is created through dynamic interactions (Garvin, 2000). Nonaka (1994) has stated that learning that is created on account of social and dynamic interaction among employees impact the development of
organizational commitment by creating common perspectives among organizational members.

In addition, Kanter (1993) based on theory of organizational empowerment stated that organizations that provide continuous learning opportunities and development, empower and influence employees’ work attitudes and behaviors which cause organizational members experience a sense of empowerment that enable them to achieve their tasks well. Kanter (1993) stated that employees who work in such environments experience a higher degree of satisfaction and commitment and trust the management. Cho et al., (2006) also stated that empirical research has tested Kanter’s theory and has found a positive association between workplace empowerment and organizational commitment.

Moreover, Nonaka (1994) stated that there are three factors producing commitment in the workplace including: intention, autonomy and environmental fluctuations. Intention refers to the way in which employees form their approach to organization and make sense of their environment. Autonomy refers to the extent to which employees can do their work and activities with minimal supervision. Environmental fluctuation refers to the ambiguity, redundancy, noise, and randomness that are created by the organization and its environment. The learning organization constructs impact the development of organizational commitment by influencing these three commitment-producing factors.

According to Watkins and Marsick (1993), continuous learning opportunities, inquiry and dialogue represent culture and organization values. Organizations with a
strong culture for learning provide autonomy to employees to carry out their tasks with minimal control (Nonaka, 1994). As a result it is supposed that learning environment with strong culture and values will enhance organizational commitment by a) employees development (Bhatnagar, 2007); b) continuous learning opportunities (Ng et al., 2006); c) employee autonomy (Nonaka, 1994). Allen and Meyer (1997) stated that the existing research which has examined the effects of autonomy on commitment has approved the positive correlation between autonomy and organizational commitment.

Inquiry and dialogue provides mechanisms for questioning, reflection, and feedback (Watkins and Marsick, 1996). According to Krishna (2008) the inquiry and dialogue impact the way employees approach the world and organization and their sense making capabilities. By influencing employees’ sense making capabilities, the inquiry and dialogue will in turn affect their intention and commitment. Joo and Lim (2009) stated that when employees perceive that an organization has provided continuous learning opportunities, dialogue and inquiry processes they tend to be psychologically more attached to their organization. Ng et al., (2006) has also reported a significant positive association between creating continuous learning opportunities and organizational commitment.

According to Nonaka (1994), information sharing impacts the development of organizational commitment. Based on this premise, collaboration creates an atmosphere of common perspectives and knowledge sharing among organization members that attach them psychologically to the organization. Also, based on Parson and Shils’s theory (1962), high involvement and group interactions will make an
atmosphere in organization among employees that make organization members to feel secure and emotionally attached to the organization and accept values, norms and conditions in which they are working (Kanter Rosabeth Moss, 1968; Krishna and Casey, 2008). In addition, the sense of security created by sharing and information diffusion, makes reducing the fluctuations in the environment (Krishna, 2008). Moreover, according to Chen, et al., (2006) diffusion of job related information among organization members have a positive significant correlation with organizational commitment. Empirical support to relate collaboration and team learning to organizational commitment can be found in Joiner and Bakalis’s (2006) study who found supportive and interactive collaboration with colleagues is strongly and positively correlated with organizational commitment, Kontogiorghes and Bryant (2004) and Heffner and Rentsch (2001) who confirmed that social interaction among employees was an important antecedent for organizational commitment. Dee et al., (2006) also reported that open communication in organizations makes the employees tend to be innovative and demonstrate high levels of collaboration, trust and commitment.

Creating systems to capture and share learning as social structures to unite and facilitate employees’ organizational commitment to organization have been recognized by theoretical and empirical studies. As the aim of learning organization is continuous learning by applying various systems such as low and high technology systems, this mechanism help employees to acquire relevant knowledge and skills. Providing and supporting systems in organization for appropriate knowledge sharing and transferring, according to Kanter (1968) will create a dynamic interaction which the result will be the development of commitment among employees. The created
sharing information and skills will reduce environmental fluctuations Nonaka (1994) that affect organizational commitment. According to Watkins and Marsick (1993) greater collaboration and partnership with other people in the light of creating new systems have a major contribution towards providing continuous learning opportunities in the organization. Pounder (1999) as cited by Dee et al., (2006) stated that in educational settings, team teaching, curriculum development, governance, administration and school community relations are four team structures that affect teachers’ commitment to the schools.

The internal and external environment has direct implications for environmental fluctuation. Krishna (2008) stated that the activities directed at internal and external environment will raise organization members’ awareness through creating new information about the rapidly changing environment. Morrison (2002) stated that new information and knowledge reduce uncertainty and help employees to understand, predict, and control the environment. New information is likely to develop commitment among employees through reduction in fluctuations. “The more likely employees to be committed to an organization, the less degree of uncertainty, redundancy, noise and randomness they experience” (Krishna, 2008, p.17). In educational setting, school parent associations and neighborhood groups which act as system connections has been reported to act as teachers’ commitment to the school organization (Dee et al., 2006). Studying the impact of organizational communication on organizational commitment, Chen et al., (2006) also found a significant positive correlation between the dissemination of job related information with organizational commitment.
Leadership plays a central part by empowering organization members to think beyond their environment (Hulpia et al., 2011). In addition, recognizing good points of the organization members, empowering and rewarding them, would increase their commitment in achieving desired goals (Avolio et al., 2004). Walumbwa and Lawler (2003) also stated that encouraging employees to think critically and seeking new ways to approach problems and challenges, involving them in decision-making process, and inspiring loyalty through the leadership process in organizations create an atmosphere that attaches employees to the organization emotionally.

Allen and Meyer (1996) stated that employees’ development by using leadership support can enhance organizational commitment among employees. In an empirical study, Avolio, William and Bhatia (2004) found that there was a significant relationship between transformational leadership and organizational commitment. In a similar study Walumbwa and Lawler (2003) found positive association between transformational leadership and work related-outcomes such as organizational commitment. Thus, leaders have significant roles in empowering, motivating, providing continuous learning opportunities, reducing environmental fluctuations, and increasing commitment of people to the goals, values and norms of the organizations.

In conclusion, it is evident from the previous discussions that both theoretical and empirical supports exist to relate learning organization dimensions to organizational commitment. Learning organization dimensions based on Watkins and Marsick’s (1993) conceptualization have theoretical and empirical relationships with
organizational commitment. To show these relationships, the comprehensive theoretical framework is depicted in (Figure 2-2).

Figure 2-2 Conceptual Framework
This chapter reviewed the literature on learning organization dimensions, organizational commitment and their relationships. Each section covered theory, definitions, various models, previous researches, their strengths and weaknesses. The link between learning organization dimensions and organizational commitment were reviewed theoretically and empirically. It was revealed that Watkins and Marsick’s (1993) model of learning organization was leading model in producing a culture of learning in different organizations. In addition, practicing Watkins and Marsick (1993) seven action imperatives was approved to have relationships with organizational commitments.

Moreover, Meyer and Allen’ (1996) tridimensional organizational commitment model which consists of affective, continuance and normative commitment was approved to be the prominent model among others to define the various linkages of employees with their organizations. Differences in organizational commitment scale and subscales were examined using demographics such as age, marital status, gender, type of employment, education level, teaching experience and monthly income in TVCs in Iran. Relationships between learning organization dimensions and organizational commitment were reviewed empirically and theoretically. Finally theoretical framework was presented.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter explains methods and procedures to accomplish the objectives of the study. The sub titles that will be discussed in this chapter are: a) research design, b) location of the study, c) population and sampling, d) instrumentation, e) instrument translation, f) instrument validity and reliability, g) data collection, and h) data analysis.

3.2 Research Design

Descriptive correlation research design as the most suitable method was employed to determine relationships between learning organization dimensions and organizational commitment in TVCs in Iran. The correlation analysis utilized to determine the nature and power of the relationship between independent and dependent variables. It is descriptive since it creates data that could be used in describing the characteristics of the variables under study. In addition, the study employed quantitative research approach as the analysis process to measure the variables objectively. It used parametric statistics to investigate differences in means and frequency distribution of respondents’ perception in learning organization dimensions and organizational commitment scale and subscales.
3.3 Location of the Study

The organizational setting for this research was TVCs in four provinces: Fars, Khouzestan, Boushehr and Kohgiloya and Boyerahmad in Iran in 2010. All TVCs in Iran have been categorized into seven regions. These four provinces have been categorized as region four regarding TVCs by the Ministry of Education. This categorization is mostly based on geographic characteristics. TVCs have been developed quantitatively and qualitatively after Islamic Revolution, and they are one of the main sources of providing men and women technicians for private and governmental sectors (Behbahani, 2010). The four provinces of Fars, Khouzestan, Boushehr and Kohgiloya and Boyerahmad are shown on the map of Iran (Figure 3-1).
Figure 3-1 Map of Iran showing the place sited

3.4 Research Framework

Utilizing a quantitative survey measure, learning organization and organizational commitment based on Watkins and Marsick (1993) and Meyer and Allen (1997) conceptualization were used respectively to show their relationships. The learning organization is operationalized by the Learning Organization Dimensions Questionnaire (LODQ) as follows: continuous learning opportunities, dialogue and
inquiry, collaboration, embedded systems, system connections, empowerment and providing strategic leadership. These dimensions serve as independent variables. The LODQ was validated for use in Iranian context.

The learning organization model created by Watkins and Marsick (1993) has been disclosed through three levels of individual, team and organizational levels. It has fascinated many researchers and scholars since 1990 (Watkins and Marsick, 1993; Yang B., 2003; Dirani, 2009; Joo and Lim, 2009). Watkins, (2005) stated that the solid aspect of learning at three levels creates diverse perceptions which makes possible understanding the concept. Two dimensions of inquiry and dialogue and continuous learning are under the heading of individual learning. They will be promoted in a culture to support the developmental approach to learning in which people have the opportunity to ask questions freely, are willing to put difficult issues on the table for discussion, are open to give and receive feedback through formal and informal situations (Watkins and Marsick, 1996; Kumar N., 2005). Collaboration as the only dimension under the team level is created through supporting an organizational culture in which employees establish an efficient alignment, learn and work cooperatively and feel they are all part of the same team. Team learning impacts the whole organization, since one team’s action can be the result of another team’s learning, resulting in the creation of continuous learning cycles throughout the organization (Marsick and Watkins, 2003; Dirani, 2009; Atak and Erturgut, 2010).

Embedded system, empowerment, system connection and strategic leadership are four dimensions under the organizational learning level. Embedded system can be
achieved through two-way communication, systems of measurement of current and desired outcomes through open meetings, internet, intranet and electronic bulletin boards. Empowerment is achieved through providing conditions for taking initiatives, give people choices, participate employees in decision making process, give autonomy of controlling resources, and supporting employees who take calculated risk. System connection can be achieved through balancing work and family, persuade employee to think from a universal perspective, consider the impacts of decisions on employees’ moral and reciprocal communication with inside and outside community. Finally, strategic leadership will be achieved by supporting employees’ request for learning, sharing needed information with employees, helping others to do their works well, instructs, teaches and mentor those they lead (Watkins and Marsick, 1993). In the current study, Watkins and Marsick’s (1993) model with seven dimensions merged into three levels of learning is utilized as independent variables. This model is the only model with two main organization components: people and structure (Yang et al., 2004; Dirani, 2009), associated the most inclusive tool in terms of span, profundity and reliability (Moilanen, 2001), shows four concepts: organizational learning, learning at work, learning climate, and the learning structure (Ortenblad, 2002). Watkins (2005) remarked that performing these dimensions will produce “a potential for success and enhanced capacity for learning” (p. 420).

The dependent variable consists of organizational commitment scale and subscales which is operationalized by Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) developed by Meyer and Allen (1997). The OCQ has three scales including affective (refers to employees’ emotional attachment, identification and involvement in the
institution), continuance (refers to an awareness of the costs associated with leaving
the institution) and normative commitment (refers to the feeling of obligation to
continue employment in organization). The organizational commitment explains the
association between an organization and an organization's employee and in general
has implications associated with employees’ desire, wishes, and a sense of obligation
to stay in the organization. Educational administrators can profit from understanding
the predictors of organizational commitment since they can adjust, and generate the
proper situation in order to develop the level of employees’ organizational
commitment (Yousef, 2000; Chughtai and Zafar, 2006; Dirani, 2009). The major
objective of this study was to investigate relationship between learning organization
dimensions and organizational commitment as perceived by lecturers in TVCs to
determine whether learning organization constructs can be considered as predictors
of organizational commitment to help administrators in TVCs to manage lecturers
more effectively.

The research framework also consists of lecturers’ demographics bases on age,
gender, marital status, education level, type of employment, teaching experience and
monthly income. The aim is to explore significant differences in organizational
commitment scale and subscales by demographics, since organizational commitment
literature shows few researches pertaining lecturers’ demographics and commitment
in Iran educational institutions which the results can help educational administrators
to manage their colleges more effectively and efficiently. The research framework is
designed in Figure 3.2 to show the relationship between variables under study.
3.5 Population of the Study

One important step towards arriving at the correct sample size, is defining population of the study carefully. Ary et al., (2006) remarked that population consists of all members of any well-defined class of people, events, and objects which the
researcher would like the results to be generalized. The target population in this study was the lecturers in all TVCs in region four in four provinces of Fars, Khouzestan, Boushehr, and Kohgiloya and Boyerahmad. Based on the lists of lecturers obtained from TVCs, there were 1606 lecturers serving in school year 2010 in the above mentioned provinces. Lecturers have different roles in developing TVCs. They do teaching-learning activities, participate in decision making process and preserve high level of institutional standards. In addition, they require obtaining capability in new subjects that contribute to their work and are committed to the values, goals and institution norms. Accordingly they are at the right position in responding to the survey questionnaires.

3.6 Determining the Sample Size

One of the basic principles in research methodology is determining the sample size. Ary et al., (2006), remarked that it is not generally needed to study all possible cases to know the variables under study. The most significant thing to be considered is that the sample must be representative of the target population to permit the researcher to make generalization from the sample statistics to the population (Ary et al., 2006). Hence, the power of a sample survey really lays in the ability to get the required information from a fairly few respondents to explain the characteristics of the whole target population.

Saunders, Lewis, and Thornhill, (1997) stated that there are four requirements for the identification of sample size. These requirements must be considered in order to calculate the sample size of the study. They are as follows: 1) the level of certainty of
the collected data to represent the characteristics of the total population; 2) the margin of error that the researchers can accept; 3) the type of analyses researchers employ in answering research questions and achieving the objectives of the study; 4) the size of the total population from which the sample is being drawn.

In the current study, the G power (3.0.10) statistical software developed by Edfelder, Faul and Buchner (1996) was employed to calculate the appropriate sample size. According to Cohen (1988), in order to accomplish a statistical power analysis, three factors ought to be taken into consideration including: alpha level, effect size and desired power. Alpha level is the risk that the researcher accepts to take in making errors in determining the sample size. Effect size signifies the amount to which the occurrence is present in the population (Cohen, 1988). To establish the sample size, a priori power analysis which was regarded as the ideal type of power analysis by most authors from G power main menu was chosen. In a priori power analysis, the researcher defined the effect size, the alpha level and the required power level of the test (1-beta). By creating these conditions, it was possible to calculate the required sample size. The statistical level of significance of the study was fixed at \( \alpha = 0.05 \). According to Cohen (1988), it is usual to choose effect sizes which are either “small”, “medium”, or “large”.

Based on the research questions and objectives of the study four statistical tests including independent sample t-test, one way analysis of variance (ANOVA), Pearson product moment correlation (\( r \)) and multiple regression analysis were utilized in answering the research questions. In sampling procedure the number of
samples for each statistical analysis was calculated and then the largest sample sizes were selected.

For independent samples t-test, whereas the research questions were two tails, the effect size was 0.5 (medium), $\alpha = .05$, power (1-$\beta$) = .95, actual ratio N2/N1 = 1, the minimum sample size was 210. For one-way ANOVA, while the effect size was .25 (medium), $\alpha = .05$, power (1-$\beta$) = .95, number of groups = 4, $\lambda = 17.50$, critical $F_{(3,276)} = 2.63$, the minimum number of samples were 280. For correlation analysis, while the effect size was 0.5 (large), $\alpha = .05$, power (1-$\beta$) = .95, critical $Z = 1.95$, the number of samples were 152. For multiple regression analysis, while the effect size was .15 (medium), $\alpha = .05$, power (1-$\beta$) = .95, number of predictors = 7, $\lambda = 22.95$, critical $F = 2.07$, the number of samples were 153.

Based on G power output, the most number of samples were computed for ANOVA which were 280. However, the sample size of 280 recommended for this study was inflated by 10 percent given that the response rate for mailed survey is likely to yield less proportion than that was distributed. This type of sample size change may perhaps make sure the researcher to get proper number of responses regardless of return rate. Accordingly, the sample size of the study was 310.

### 3.7 Sampling Technique

A basic issue in survey study is choosing the appropriate sampling technique. The sampling technique is the fundamental base for selecting samples from population. In addition, to make valid inferences about the population, the researcher must select
the sample so that it is representative of the total population. One of the sampling methods used in survey research is stratified random sampling technique. According to Gliner et al., (2009), strata are variables (i.e., race, geographical region, age, gender) that could be used to divide the population into segments. Gliner et al., (2009) also stated that “when participants are geographically spread across the country (or a state), it is common to stratify based on geography so that appropriate proportions of the selected sample come from the different regions of the country or state”, (p. 121). The number of samples that the researcher employs from each group (geographical region) is equal to their proportion in the population. According to Ary et al., (2006) as well as Lodico, Spaulding and Voegtle, (2006) in this type of sampling the sample selected is more representative of the population. Cooper and Schindler (2003) also remarked that the proportionate stratified sampling technique is more popular in comparison with other sampling methods because: 1) more easily carrying out than the other methods; 2) the proportion of the sample size for each group is equal to their proportion in the population. Therefore, the proportional stratified random sampling technique based on geographical region was chosen as the most appropriate sampling technique of collecting data in this study.

To get hold of the number of lecturers, the researcher requested the colleges in four provinces to send him the number of lecturers in the first semester of the school year of 2010. This was made by helping Education Organization formally. After a complete list of respondents in all colleges were obtained and made available, a true proportional random sample was carried out. The sample size of each college was its proportion (percentage) in the population multiplied with the adjusted sample size (310). To perform a simple random sampling method, a table of random digits was
utilized. Lecturers from each list of colleges were allocated numbers from one to the last digit of the proportional sample size of the study as specified for that college. Then a sample was drawn using a table of random digits for required sample size. Finally, the sum of proportional size from each college was made to get the sample size of the study. In fact, by this way, all respondents had the same chance of being selected in the study. Also, the choice of respondent in no way influence the selection of another and thus the sample was supposed to be unbiased. Table 3.1 reveals the distribution of colleges, frequency and percentage of both population and sample in the study.
Table 3.1 Distribution of Samples in four Provinces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fars</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estahban</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fassa</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abadeh</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eghlid*</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Darab</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shiraz (1)</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>9.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shiraz (2)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>6.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shiraz*</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marvdasht</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nayriz*</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kazeroon*</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Larestan</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noorabad</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>53.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Khouzestan</strong></td>
<td>Ahvaz (1)</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>9.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ahvaz (2)</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>6.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ahvaz*</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>7.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ahvaz</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dezfoul</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>28.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boushehr</strong></td>
<td>Boushehr</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>5.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boushehr*</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>9.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kohgiloya</strong></td>
<td>Yasouj</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yasouj*</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>7.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1606</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asterisk (*) indicates the Girl Centre
3.8 Instrumentation

The current study used self-report questionnaires to collect data from respondents. The questionnaire comprised of three main parts. Part A comprised of seven items to measure demographic information of the respondents; part B comprised of forty three items to measure learning organization dimensions; and part C consisted of eighteen items to measure organizational commitment. Permissions were given by Watkins and Marsick to use Learning Organization Dimensions Questionnaire and Meyer and Allen to use Organizational Commitment Questionnaire to measure organizational commitment. (Appendix F)

3.8.1 Demographic Information

Respondents were asked to provide personal information to indicate their gender, marital status, level of education, type of employment, age, teaching experience and monthly income. Mathieu and Zajac, (1990); Meyer et al., (2002); and Ng et al., (2006) stated that demographic variables may have effects on organizational commitment and therefore should be controlled for.

3.8.2 Learning Organization Dimensions Questionnaire

The LODQ comprised of seven dimensions with forty three items. The LODQ was used to assess the perception level of respondents pertaining to seven learning organization dimensions. Seven dimensions of LODQ are continuous learning, dialogue and inquiry, collaboration, embedded system, empowerment, system
connection and strategic leadership. These seven dimensions have been categorized under three levels individual, team and organizational learning. Individual level of learning consists of two dimensions: continuous learning and dialogue and inquiry. Team level of learning consists of one dimension: collaboration. Organizational level of learning comprised of four dimensions: embedded system, empowerment, system connection and strategic leadership. O’Neil (2003) stated that LODQ provide information about the respondents’ perception and focused on how well individuals and teams in the organization have developed the capability of learning.

Among 43 items, 7 items (1-7) are related to continuous learning with a sample item (In my college, lecturers help each other learn) , 6 items (8-13) are related to dialogue and inquiry with a sample item (In my college, lecturers listen to others’ views before speaking), 6 items (14-19) are related to collaboration with a sample item (In my college, teams/groups have the freedom to adapt their goals as needed), 6 items (20-25) are related to embedded system with a sample item (My college enables lecturers to get needed information at any time quickly and easily), 6 items (26-31) are related to empowerment with a sample item (My college, gives lecturers choices in their work assignment), 6 items (32-37) are related to system connection with a sample item (My college encourages lecturers to think from a global perspective) and 6 items (38-43) are related to strategic leadership with a sample item (In my college, leaders mentor and coach those they lead). A five-point Likert scale was used to measure the respondents’ perception (1= Almost Never; 2= Seldom; 3= Sometimes; 4= Often; 5= Almost Always). On the whole, Watkins and Marsick structured LODQ in a way that it enables researchers to evaluate learning at individual, team, and organization level.
3.8.3 Organizational Commitment Questionnaire

The second instrument that was utilized to collect data concerning respondents’ organizational commitment was the OCQ. The organizational commitment survey consists of three well-validated scales, the Affective Commitment Scale (ACS), the Continuance Commitment Scale (CCS) and Normative Commitment Scale (NCS). The OCQ consists of eighteen items; there are six items for each scale. A five-point Likert scale that ranges from strongly disagree to strongly agree was used to measure affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment of respondents. Meyer and Allen (1991) asserted that “a 5-point scale works quite well,” (p. 5). Three items of affective commitment (3, 4 and 5) and one item of normative commitment (1) were negative items, designed to control for acquiescence response bias (Meyer and Allen, 1991, 1997). Scores on these items were reversed (i.e., 1= 5, 2 = 4, 3 = 3, 4 = 2 and 5 = 1) before computing scale scores.

Accordingly, responses were measured on a five-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral (Undecided), 4 = Agree and 5 = Strongly Agree).

A sample item for measuring affective commitment is “I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this college”. A sample item for measuring continuance commitment is “It would be very hard for me to leave this college, even if I wanted to”. A sample item for measuring normative commitment is “I would feel guilty if I left my college”. Among 18 items 6 items (1-6) are related to affective commitment, 6 items (7-12) are related to continuance commitment, 6 items (13-18) are related to normative commitment.
Section A of the survey instrument consists of seven demographics including: gender, marital status, level of education, type of employment, age, teaching experience and monthly income. Section B of the survey instrument consists of the “Learning Organization Dimensions Questionnaire” (LODQ) created and developed by (Watkins and Marsick, 1997; Marsick and Watkins, 2003). The LODQ was used to measure respondents’ perception pertaining Learning Organization Dimensions. Section C of survey instrument consists of Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) developed by Meyer and Allen which was used to measure affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment. The contents, level of measurement and number of items for demographic factors, learning organization dimensions and organizational commitment are shown in Table 3.2 of the following. The English final versions are shown in Appendix A.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Study Identifier</th>
<th>Level of Measurement</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 1 Demographic</td>
<td>Gender (item 1)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information (7 items)</td>
<td>Marital Status (item 2)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education Level (item 3)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type of employment (item 4)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age (item 5)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching Experience (item 6)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monthly Income (item 7)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sum of all items</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2 Learning</td>
<td>Creating continuous learning (items: 1-7)</td>
<td>LOD1</td>
<td>Interval</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Dimensions</td>
<td>Promoting inquiry and dialogue (items:8-13)</td>
<td>LOD2</td>
<td>Interval</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration (items:14-19)</td>
<td>LOD3</td>
<td>Interval</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Embedded System (items:20-25)</td>
<td>LOD4</td>
<td>Interval</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empowerment (items:26-31)</td>
<td>LOD5</td>
<td>Interval</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>System connection (items:32-37)</td>
<td>LOD6</td>
<td>Interval</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.8.4 Instrument Translation

The two questionnaires of learning organization dimensions and organizational commitment were originally developed in English. While some respondents were fluent in English in Iran, lots of them were not been able to answer an English version of the two instruments. Thus, it was necessary to translate the two instruments from English to Persian before the field study. The translation technique that was used in the current study followed the forward-then-back translation approach. The process of translation of the two questionnaires was undertaken carefully to provide the most accurate Persian version of the questionnaires. Although the two questionnaires have been used in many different cultural and language contexts, many of the statements included in the questionnaires may not have been used in Persian context previously. Being aware of this, the translation
process was carefully carried out with the assistance of two bilingual instructors of English language at the Iranian universities and the researcher who has experience in teaching English in educational institutions in Iran. The translation process was forward translation from English to Persian, back translation from Persian to English and comparing of the back translated version with English original ones. The aim was to provide a Persian translation that was conceptually equivalent with both English and Persian. Then an independent, qualified and experienced associate professor at the university translated the Persian version into English. The back translated version was compared with the English version with the assistance of an expert, bilingual and professor of linguistics at the university. Item and conceptual equivalence were carried out by comparing meaning between original and back-translated versions. It was resulted some modifications in the translation. Language and culture considerations were two concepts that were taken into accounts when establishing conceptual equivalence between the original and back-translated versions (Chen et al., 2005). For instance, “in my organization” was replaced with the equivalent of “in my college”, “people” replaced with “lecturers”, “my organization” with “my college”, “customer” with “student”, “employee” with “lecturer”, and “this organization” with “this college” in Persian. Also, the phrase “town hall” was eliminated because there is no such concept in Iranian culture.

On the whole, the result from the comparison was satisfactory. After reconciling the differences and resolving problematic items, the Persian version was edited by an expert, qualified and lecturer of Persian language at the university. After editing the last Persian version, the researcher contacted the translators and provided them the last edited Persian version. They were satisfied with the final edited Persian version. Finally, to apply
formally the Persian version of two questionnaires, pilot tests was conducted to check the validity and reliability of the two questionnaires.

### 3.8.5 Instrument Validity

Instrument validity refers to the suitability and value of measurement instrument. After confirming the questionnaires by committee members as the most appropriate instruments for achieving the goals of the current research; three experienced, expert and qualified lecturers in Malaysia also confirmed face, content and construct validity of the English versions of the questionnaires for achieving the goals of the study. Then, the Persian translated version of two questionnaires was validated into Persian language. To ensure the content, items, and face validity of Persian version adequate, a panel of four academics who were lecturers and researchers in the field of organizational behavior, educational administration, psychology and educational sciences from Shiraz and Yasouj University were employed in Iran. The panel had experience in research, guiding national and international projects, teaching research methodology at the university, graduated from foreign universities and some were familiar with the questionnaires. The panel was asked to indicate about the orientation of each item, face, content and construct validity, word order and selection of words. To get the panel ideas, the researcher explained, defined and discussed with them. They agreed that the final Persian version was appropriate for achieving the goals of the study and performing in TVCs. The panel information is shown in Appendix B.
3.8.6 Instrument Reliability

In order to verify the strengths of results, the reliability of the questionnaires is established. In the current study, the researcher utilized Cronbach’s alpha which is an indicator of reliability, widely utilized to measure the reliability. It is a single correlation coefficient that offers an estimate of the average of all the correlation coefficients of the items within a test using a statistical package such as SPSS. Table 3.3 indicates a rule of thumb to interpret Cronbach’s Alpha that was suggested by George and Mallory (2001) and DeVellis (1991).

Table 3.3 Rule of Thumb to interpret Cronbach’s Alpha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha &gt; .9$ – excellent</td>
<td>$\alpha &gt; .9$ – excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha &gt; .8$ – good</td>
<td>$0.80 &lt; \alpha &lt; 0.9$ – very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha &gt; .7$ – acceptable</td>
<td>$0.70 &lt; \alpha &lt; 0.8$ – respectable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha &gt; .6$ – questionable</td>
<td>$0.65 &lt; \alpha &lt; 0.70$ – minimal acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha &gt; .5$ – poor</td>
<td>$0.60 &lt; \alpha &lt; 0.65$ – undesirable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha &lt; .4$ - unacceptable</td>
<td>$\alpha &lt; .60$ – unacceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: George and Mallery (2001, p. 21) and DeVellis (1991, p. 85)

To achieve the purpose of the reliability of instruments in the current study two pilot tests were conducted. In the first round of pilot test, the researcher selected twenty lecturers from the target population as a convenience sample. They were asked to complete and comment on any problems that they had while answering the items of two questionnaires of LODQ and OCQ. Some lecturers claimed and commented that some items were a little unclear and some typing errors. The researcher found that those
problems were mainly related to the word order rather than selection of words. The respondents seemed that they understand the items meant and message. Thus, the researcher changed the word order of the items that were needed with maintaining the main idea and corrected typing errors.

After revising the instruments based on the panel ideas, a pre-test was conducted to further ensure the reliability of LODQ and OCQ so that the instruments could be used in the Iranian context, particularly in the TVCs. According to Zikmund (2003), the pretest allows the researcher to determine whether respondents have any difficulty understanding the questions, whether there are any unclear or biased questions and to identify the length of time needed to answer the questions. Sudman (1976) stated that a pre-test of 20-50 cases are usually enough. Thus, thirty lecturers were selected randomly in the meeting which lecturers had with each other in the beginning of the second semester and thirty questionnaires were distributed personally. After they completed the questionnaires some discussions took place to ensure that the questionnaires were appropriate and free from errors. After performing the instruments, the researcher was sure that all items were understood by the respondents without problems. Only some parts of instructions and time allocated from fifteen to twenty minutes according to the recommendations of two respondents were changed.

Finally, the results of reliability test on LODQ and OCQ using SPSS version 18 showed Cronbach’s alpha ranged from .80 to .89 for the seven learning organization dimensions and .86 to .87 for the three scales of organizational commitment respectively. Based on the pre-test results, the researcher was assured that all items in the LODQ and OCQ were understood without any problems. Through the above
processes, the final instrument was produced in Persian with seven items in section one to measure demographics, forty three items in section two to measure learning organization dimensions and eighteen items in section three to measure organizational commitment of the respondents. Based on the review of many learning organizations measurements, Moilanen (2005) remarked that Watkins and Marsick’s Learning Organization Dimensions Questionnaire is the most inclusive with scientific and empirical tested background among others. Table 3.4 depicts the reliability results (Cronbach’s Alpha Values) of some previous studies and the current study carried out in Iran.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/s</th>
<th>D1</th>
<th>D2</th>
<th>D3</th>
<th>D4</th>
<th>D5</th>
<th>D6</th>
<th>D7</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Total Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Watkins, Selden and Marsick,(1997)</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watkins and Marsick, (2000)</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirani, (2007)*</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang, (2005)</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saffari, Hamidi and Jalali (2008)</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tseng, (2010)*</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Study, (2011)</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: D1= Continuous Learning; D2 = Dialogue and Inquiry; D3 = Collaboration; D4= Embedded Systems; D5= Empowerment; D6=Systems Connections; D7= Strategic Leadership; n= Sample Size; NR= not reported. Astrik indicates that the short version of LODQ has been used.

Regarding the OCQ, Meyer and Allen (1991) stated that the three scales are suitable to measure organizational commitment scales based on emotional attachment,
perceived cost, and feelings of obligation. Table 3.5 reveals the reliability results of some previous studies and the results of the current study performed in Iran.

Table 3.5 Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability for Organizational Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/s</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Total Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delgoshaei et al., (2009)</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabagheyan et al., (2006)</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyer and Allen, (1997)</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joolideh and Yeshodhara, (2009)</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Study, (2011)</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: AC = Affective Commitment; CC = Continuance Commitment; NC = Normative Commitment; n = Sample Size; NR = Not Reported

3.9 Data Collection Procedure

Before the data collection, the researcher requested the permission from the central office of TVCs which is located in Tehran to permit doing the study in TVCs in region four. The central office located in Tehran manages all TVCs in Iran on behalf of The Ministry of Higher Education. The central office agreed and sent the approval official letter to all colleges in region four and wanted them to cooperate with the researcher (Appendix E). The researcher sent a researcher made form to all identified colleges to send him information regarding their lecturers such as name, surname, field of study, teaching hours per week and whether they were full time or part time after getting the approval letter from the central office. Since letters were sent to colleges through
official channel, after ten days almost all colleges sent the requested information regarding the lecturers.

In the second phase, the researcher prepared 22 packages containing cover letters, questionnaires, official letter of the central office and lists of selected lecturers for each college. According to Gall et al., (2003) accompanying the cover letter with questionnaires influences the return rate. The researcher distributed the packages among colleges into two ways: personally and via the mail. Since Khouzestan and Boushehr provinces were far to deliver the packages personally, the researcher posted their packages. For Fars and Kohgiloya and Boyerahmad provinces, the researcher delivered their packages personally. Deputy Dean of the colleges was assigned by the central office to follow the process of receiving the questionnaires to posting them after completion. The researcher called deputy dean of the colleges and explained them the importance of the work. After following up, almost all questionnaires were returned completed. Ten of the questionnaires were not returned, because of not completing on time by the respondents. The return rate was 96.16 percent.

3.10 Data Analysis

To analyze data, the raw data obtained from the questionnaires had to be cleaned up. SPSS 18 was used to analyze data. Data analysis was conducted into two stages: (1) exploratory data analysis; and (2) performing five statistical procedures: descriptive analysis, t-test, ANOVA, correlation analysis and multiple regression analysis.
3.11 Exploratory Data Analysis

A preliminary analysis was utilized to identify mistakes made during the data coding process, checking missing data and outliers in the data set including: visually inspecting, stem and leaf, histogram, and box plot. To check the data set met the basic assumptions of normality, linearity and homogeneity of variance a preliminary analysis was performed including: normal Q-Q plots, detrended normal plots, histogram of standardized residuals, normal probability P-P plot and scatter plot. It revealed no violation of the mentioned assumptions. The results are shown in Appendix C and D.

3.12 Test of Normality

There are many ways, both graphical and statistical, to assess normality. In this study both statistical analysis and graphical methods showed that the data were normally distributed. Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests were employed to assess normality of both learning organization dimensions and organizational commitment statistically. Table 3.6 depicts the results.

| Table 3.6  Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk Test |
|------------|-----------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|
| Variables  | Kolmogorov-Smirnov | Shapiro-Wilk |
|            | Statistic | df | Sig. | Statistic | df | Sig. |
| Learning Organization Dimensions | .048 | 295 | .099 | .991 | 295 | .078 |
| Organizational Commitment | .059 | 295 | .014 | .993 | 295 | .155 |
Kolmogorov-Smirnov test for normality produced K-S statistic of .099 and Shapiro-Wilk test produced S-W statistic of .078 which were not significant at 0.05 (p value was larger than 0.05) for learning organization dimensions. Also, Shapiro-Wilk test produced S-W statistic of .155 which were not significant at 0.05 for organizational commitment. Thus, it can be concluded that data were normally distributed for learning organization dimensions and organizational commitment.

3.13 Descriptive Statistics

To describe, simplify and summarize the data so that they can be easily understood by the others, measures of central tendency and dispersion or variability were utilized. Descriptive statistics were also employed to categorize learning organization dimensions and organizational commitment into three levels of low, moderate and high. Scores within 1 to 2.33 were considered low, 2.34 to 3.66 moderate and 3.67 to five high. This procedure is based on class interval width. It is the difference between the lower endpoint of an interval and the lower endpoint of the next interval. A combination of descriptive statistics such as mean, frequency, variance, rank and standard deviation helped to provide a more comprehensive description of the data presented.

3.14 Inferential Statistics

Inferential statistics are methods used to make decisions, inferences, predictions and estimation about the characteristics of unknown population based on the data obtained from the known research samples (Abu Samah and Suandi, 1999). In the current study,
dependent sample t-test, one-way ANOVA, correlation and multiple regressions as inferential statistics were employed to answer the research questions.

### 3.14.1 Independent Sample t-test

In this study independent sample t-tests were employed to show the mean differences between two groups of gender (male and female), marital status (single and married), type of employment (full time and part time) and monthly income (< $799 and > $800) based on affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment. According to Fah and Hoon (2009), independent sample t-test is used to determine significant difference in the mean of two independents samples.

### 3.14.2 One-way Analysis of Variance

In the current study, one-way ANOVA was performed to compare the mean differences among three groups of respondents in three education levels (doctorate, master and bachelor), four groups of respondents in teaching experiences (< 5 years, 6-15, 16-25 and > 26 years) and four groups of respondents based on age category (< 29 years, 30-39, 40-49 and > 50 years) according to affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment. The basic procedure involved in analysis of variance is to obtain the estimates of two different population variances: between group and within group variance based on the data collected from samples. This is followed by the calculation of F-ratio which shows the ratio of between-group variance and within-group variance (Fah and Hoon, 2009). Each of the groups must be random samples from the normal population, the variances in all groups must be equal.
in the population and observations are independent (Abu Samah and Suandi, 1999). Tukey test as a follow-up test was employed to compare which pairs of mean show a significant difference.

### 3.14.3 Correlation Statistics

Correlation statistics were used to measure the strength of the linear relationship that exists between two quantitative, interval or ratio variables. In this study Pearson product-moment correlation was used as the correlation index. The strength of the relationship between two continuous variables is measured by coefficient of the correlation \( r \) whose value range from –1 to +1. The closeness of the correlation coefficient to one means a strong relationship between two variables (Ary et al., 2006). To employ Pearson correlation, the assumptions of linearity, normality and homosedasticity must be met. According to Cohen’s (1988) rule of thumb and Tian and Wilding (2008) guidelines as stated by Tseng (2010), correlation values between 0.1 and 0.29 are referred to a small correlation, correlation values between 0.30 and 0.49 indicate a moderate correlation, and correlation values between 0.50 and 1.0 indicate a high correlation.

### 3.14.4 Multiple Regression Analysis

Multiple linear regressions were employed to determine the contribution of independent variables towards the variance in the dependent variable. This study employed Enter regression method to determine those independent variables that contributed most significantly to the prediction of the dependent variable. Using Enter
method, all independent variables must be entered into the analysis simultaneously. The end result of regression is creation an equation in which the contribution of each of the independent variables will be recognized (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007). Table 3.7 depicts the research questions and types of statistical analysis used in the current study.
Table 3.7 Research Questions and Type of Statistical Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Types of Statistical Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- What are the levels of learning organization dimensions as perceived by lecturers in TVCs?</td>
<td>Descriptive Statistics (Mean, Standard Deviation, Frequency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- What are the levels of affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment as perceived by lecturers in TVCs?</td>
<td>Descriptive Statistics (Mean, Standard Deviation, Frequency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Are there significant differences in lecturers’ perception towards affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment based on gender?</td>
<td>Independent Sample t-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Are there significant differences in lecturers’ perception towards affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment based on type of employment?</td>
<td>Independent Sample t-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- Are there significant differences in lecturers’ perception towards affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment based on marital status?</td>
<td>Independent Sample t-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- Are there significant differences in lecturers’ perception towards affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment based on monthly income?</td>
<td>Independent Sample t-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- Are there significant differences in lecturers’ perception towards affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment based on education level?</td>
<td>One-way ANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8- Are there significant differences in lecturers’ perception towards affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment based on teaching experience?</td>
<td>One-way ANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9- Are there significant differences in lecturers’ perception towards affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment based on age?</td>
<td>One-way ANOVA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10- Is there significant relationship between learning organization dimensions (continuous learning, dialogue and inquiry, collaboration, embedded system, empowerment, system connection and strategic leadership) and affective commitment? Pearson Product Moment Correlation

11- Is there a significant relationship between learning organization dimensions (continuous learning, dialogue and inquiry, collaboration, embedded system, empowerment, system connection and strategic leadership) and continuance commitment? Pearson Product Moment Correlation

12- Is there a significant relationship between learning organization dimensions (continuous learning, dialogue and inquiry, collaboration, embedded system, empowerment, system connection and strategic leadership) and normative commitment? Pearson Product Moment Correlation

13- Is there a significant relationship between learning organization dimensions (continuous learning, dialogue and inquiry, collaboration, embedded system, empowerment, system connection and strategic leadership) and overall organizational commitment? Pearson Product Moment Correlation

14- What are the significant predictors of affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment? Multiple Regression Analysis
This chapter presented research design, population of the study, sample and sampling procedures, and methods of analyzing research questions. Correlation research methodology as the most appropriate technique in the context of TVCs with 295 lecturers from four provinces in Iran was employed and explained in this chapter. The way of choosing respondents through stratified random sampling and simple random sampling and also methods of analysis of fourteen research questions were explained. Descriptive and inferential statistics such as mean, standard deviation, t-test, ANOVA, regression analysis and Pearson correlation were explained.

In addition, a complete explanation pertaining validity, reliability and instrument translation were presented. The LODQ and OCQ, their items and scales were explained. It was recognized that they were the most appropriate instruments in terms of validity and reliability to achieve the objectives of the study. The previous researches showed that both learning organization dimensions questionnaire and organizational commitment questionnaire were valid and reliable to be performed in different countries and organizations.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the results of data analysis and the procedures used to analyze the survey data. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used as analytical tools. Various types of statistical analyses were employed including: independent t-test, analysis of variance (ANOVA), Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient \((r)\) and multiple regressions. First, demographic characteristics of respondents are introduced. The level of learning organization dimensions and organizational commitment among respondents are reported in the second section. In section three, the results of utilizing t-test and one-way ANOVA are presented. The relationship between levels of learning in learning organization model and organizational commitment using Pearson Correlation Coefficient are reported in the forth section. In the fifth section, the predictors of affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment by employing Enter method is presented. In the last section, discussion is presented based on the results. The SPSS 18.0 was used to conduct the statistical analysis.
4.2 Profile of Respondents

Table 4.1 indicates demographic variables (gender, age, marital status, type of employment, education level, teaching experience and monthly income) frequency distribution and percentage of respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency (n=295)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>75.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Type</td>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part time</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>&lt; 29</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Experience</td>
<td>&lt; 9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Monthly Income</td>
<td>&lt; $799</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; $ 800</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Monthly income is in US Dollars
Table 4.1 reveals that two hundred ninety five lecturers in TVCs in Iran participated in this study. Out of 295 lecturers participated in the study, 208 (70.5 %) were male and 87 (29.5%) were female. The results showed that the majority of the lecturers participated in the study were males. Regarding marital status, the data showed that 234 (79.3%) of the lecturers were married and 61 (20.7%) were single. This suggested that the overwhelming majority of lecturers in TVCs were married. In terms of education level, the results showed that 224 (75.9%) of the respondents had master degree, 37 (12.5%) had bachelor and 34 (11.5%) had doctorate degree. This showed that overwhelming majority of lecturers in TVCs had master degree. For employment type, the results showed that the majority of the respondents, 172 (58.3%) were part time and 123 (41.7%) were full time. The findings also indicated that 125 (42.4%) of the respondents were between 40-49 years, and 108 (36.6%) between 30-39 years. The results showed that 45 (15.3%) were less than 29 years and 17 (5.8%) were more than 50 years. Regarding teaching experience, the results showed that 118 (40.0%) of the respondents had teaching experience between 20-29 years, 98 (33.2%) between 10-19 years, 45 (15.3%) more than 30 years and 34 (11.50%) had teaching experience less than 9 years. Finally the findings indicated that the majority of respondents, 173 (58.6%) had monthly income > $ 800, while 122 (41.4%) had monthly income < $ 799.
4.2.1 Perception Level of Learning Organization Dimensions

This section presents the level of respondents’ perception on learning organization dimensions (continuous learning, dialogue and inquiry, collaboration, embedded system, empowerment, system connection and strategic leadership). Descriptive statistics such as mean, standard deviation, rank, and three levels of low, moderate and high were used to show lecturers’ perception on learning organization dimensions in TVCs as required by the first research question as follows:

What are the levels of learning organization dimensions as perceived by lecturers in TVCs?

4.2.2 Perception Level of Continuous Learning

Table 4.2 shows seven continuous learning items as the first construct of learning organization dimensions. They have been categorized by three levels of low, moderate and high. Based on respondents’ perception, the items have been rated from high to moderate.
Table 4.2 Descriptive Statistics on Items in Continuous Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale/Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuous Learning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 In my college, lecturers openly discuss mistakes in order to learn from them.</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 In my college, lecturers identify skills they need for future work tasks.</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 In my college, lecturers help each other learn.</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 In my college, lecturers can get money and other resources to support their learning.</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 In my college, lecturers are given time to support learning.</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 In my college, lecturers view problems in their work as an opportunity to learn.</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 In my college, lecturers are rewarded for learning.</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Low (1-2.33), Moderate (2.34-3.66), High (3.67-5), N = 295

Table 4.2 shows TVCs lecturers’ perception on continuous learning among their colleges. The results show three items at high level and four items at moderate level. The item that showed high level is items 6, “In my college, lecturers view problems in their work as an opportunity to learn”, M = 4.02, SD = .74. This is followed by items 3, “In my college, lecturers help each other learn”, M = 3.97, SD = .69 and item 1, “In my college, lecturers openly discuss mistakes in order to learn from them”, M = 3.79, SD = .77. The items 4, “In my college, lecturers can get money and other resources to support their learning”, M = 3.33, SD = .77, item 5, “In my college, lecturers are given time to support learning”, M = 3.54, SD = .69, and item 7, “In my college, lecturers
are rewarded for learning”, $M = 3.59$, $SD = .78$ obtained the lowest ranking respectively. None of the items were rated low. Overall score for continuous learning is high ($M = 3.69$, $SD = .46$). This means that educational leaders in TVCs have prepared continuous learning opportunities for lecturers so that they can learn at work.

4.2.3 Perception Level of Dialogue and Inquiry

Dialogue and inquiry as the second dimension is comprised of 6 items. Based on respondents’ perception, these items have been rated from moderate to high. Table 4.3 depicts the results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale/Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue and Inquiry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 In my college, lecturers give open and honest feedback to each other.</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 In my college, lecturers listen to others’ views before speaking.</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 In my college, lecturers are encouraged to ask &quot;why&quot; regardless of rank.</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 In my college, whenever lecturers state their view, they also ask what others think.</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 In my college, lecturers treat each other with respect.</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 In my college, lecturers spend time building trust with each other.</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Low (1-2.33), Moderate (2.34-3.66), High (3.67-5), $N = 295$
Table 4.3 displays TVCs lecturers’ perception on dialogue and inquiry among their colleges. The results show four items high and two items at moderate level. None of the items were rated low. The items that showed high level are items 12, “In my college, lecturers treat each other with respect”, $M = 3.93$, $SD = .65$, item 13, “In my college, lecturers spend time building trust with each other”, $M = 3.89$, $SD = .54$, item 9, “In my college, lecturers listen to others’ views before speaking”, $M = 3.85$, $SD = .63$, and item 8, “In my college, lecturers give open and honest feedback to each other”, $M = 3.83$, $SD = .66$. The items 11, “In my college, whenever lecturers state their view, they also ask what others think”, $M = 3.60$, $SD = .56$ and item 10, “In my college, lecturers are encouraged to ask "why" regardless of rank”, $M = 3.55$, $SD = .59$, were rated at moderate level. This result indicates that lecturers can express their views, treat each other with respect, and have the ability to listen to the views of the others.

4.2.4 Perception Level of Collaboration

Table 4.4 indicates collaboration as perceived by lecturers in TVCs. Collaboration as the third construct of learning organization is composed of 6 items.
Table 4.4 Descriptive Statistics on Items in Collaboration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale/Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Low (1-2.33), Moderate (2.34-3.66), High (3.67-5), N = 295

Table 4.4 depicts TVCs lecturers’ perception on collaboration among their colleges. The results show two items at high level and four items at moderate level. The items that displayed high level are items 15, “In my college, teams/groups treat members as equals, regardless of rank, culture, or other differences”, M = 3.77, SD = .73, and item 18, “In my college, teams/groups are rewarded for their achievement as a team/group”, M = 3.72, SD = .69. The lowest rank was reported in items 14, “In my college, teams/groups have the freedom to adapt their goals as needed” M = 3.17, SD = .77, and item 19, “In my college, teams/groups are confident that the college will act on their
recommendations”, M = 3.26, SD = .76. This is followed by item 17, “In my college, teams/groups revise their thinking as a result of group discussions or information collected”, M = 3.30, SD = .75, and item 16, “In my college, teams/groups focus both on the group's task and on how well the group is working”, M = 3.61, SD = .67. Overall score for collaboration is moderate (M =3.47, SD = .57). The moderate level of collaboration indicates that to access various modes of thinking among lecturers group working and team discussion have not been the focus of attention in TVCs.

4.2.5 Perception Level of Embedded System

Embedded system is the fourth constructs of learning organization dimensions which is composed of six items. Based on respondents perceptions these items are rated from moderate to high. Table 4.5 shows the results.
Table 4.5 Descriptive Statistics on Items in Embedded System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale/Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Embedded System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 My college uses two-way communication on a regular basis, such as suggestion systems, electronic bulletin boards and open meetings.</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 My college enables lecturers to get needed information at any time quickly and easily.</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 My college maintains an up-to-date data base of lecturers’ skills.</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 My college creates systems to measure gaps between current and expected performance.</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 My college makes its lessons learned available to all lecturers.</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 My college measures the results of the time and resources spent on training.</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Low (1-2.33), Moderate (2.34-3.66), High (3.67-5), N = 295

Table 4.5 reveals TVCs lecturers’ perception on embedded system among their colleges. The results show all six items at moderate level. None of the items were rated low and high. The findings indicated that the items 20, “My college uses two-way communication on a regular basis, such as suggestion systems, electronic bulletin boards and open meetings, M = 3.27, SD = .74, item 22, “My college maintains an up-to-date data base of lecturers’ skills”, M = 3.38, SD = .75, item 21, “My college enables lecturers to get needed information at any time quickly and easily”, M = 3.40, SD = .73, and item 25, “My college measures the results of the time and resources spent on training”, M = 3.50, SD = .72 obtained the lowest rank. This is followed by
item 23, “My college creates systems to measure gaps between current and expected performance”, M = 3.51, SD = .72, and item 24, “My college makes its lessons learned available to all lecturers”, M = 3.54, SD = .67. The moderate results regarding overall embedded system indicate that high and low technology system have not been integrated with lecturers’ work to share learning in TVCs.

4.2.6 Perception Level of Empowerment

Table 4.6 indicates respondents’ perception on empowerment as the fifth construct of learning organization dimension. Empowerment dimension is composed of six items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale/Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 My college recognizes lecturers for taking initiative.</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 My college gives lecturers choices in their work assignments.</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 My college invites lecturers to contribute to the organization's vision.</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 My college gives lecturers control over the resources they need to accomplish their work.</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 My college supports lecturers who take calculated risks.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 My college builds alignment of visions across different levels and work groups.</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Low (1-2.33), Moderate (2.34-3.66), High (3.67-5), N = 295
Table 4.6 presents TVCs lecturers’ perception on empowerment among their colleges. The results show two items at high level and four items at moderate level. The items that showed high level are items 30, “My college supports lecturers who take calculated risks”, M = 3.75, SD = .66. This is followed by item 29, “My college gives lecturers control over the resources they need to accomplish their work”, M = 3.71, SD = .68. The results revealed that item 28, “My college invites lecturers to contribute to the college’s vision”, M = 3.33, SD = .76, and item 31, “My college builds alignment of visions across different levels and work groups”, M = 3.43, SD = .78 had the lowest mean scores. This is followed by items 27, “My college gives lecturers choices in their work assignments, M = 3.45, SD = .78, and item 26, “My college recognizes lecturers for taking initiative”, M = 3.49, SD = .85. The results indicate that lecturers are not involved in decision making process to take initiative, and to implement a joint vision regarding colleges’ vision and their work assignment.

4.2.7 Perception Level of System Connection

System connection as the fifth construct of learning organization dimensions has six items. Based on respondents’ perception, all items are at moderate level. Table 4.7 depicts these items, together with their mean, standard deviation, levels and rank.
### Table 4.7 Descriptive Statistics on Items in System Connection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale/Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System Connection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>My college helps lecturers balance between work and family life appropriately.</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>My college encourages lecturers to think from a global perspective.</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>My college encourages everyone to bring the students' views into the decision making process.</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>My college considers the impact of decisions on lecturers’ morale.</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>My college works together with the outside community to meet mutual needs.</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>My college encourages lecturers to get answers from across the organization when solving problems.</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Low (1-2.33), Moderate (2.34-3.66), High (3.67-5), N = 295

Table 4.7 shows TVCs lecturers’ perception on system connection among their colleges. The results display that all six items are in moderate level. The item 36, “My college works together with the outside community to meet mutual needs”, showed moderate mean score (M = 3.59, SD = .72). This is followed by items 34, “My college encourages everyone to bring the students’ views into the decision making process”, M = 3.48, SD = .71 and item 33, “My college encourages lecturers to think from a global perspective”, M = 3.41, SD = .77.

Item 32, “My college helps lecturers balance between work and family life appropriately” and item 35, “My college considers the impact of decisions on
lecturers’ morale” obtained the lowest mean score (M = 3.15, SD = .74, M = 3.38, SD = .65) respectively. None of the items were rated low and high. Overall score for system connection is moderate (M = 3.40, SD = .53). The results indicate that the impact of lecturers’ work on internal and external environment have not been considered in TVCs.

4.2.8 Perception Level of Strategic Leadership

Table 4.8 depicts strategic leadership analysis with six items rated from high to moderate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale/Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Leadership:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 In my college, leaders generally support</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>requests for learning opportunities and training.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 In my college, leaders share up to date</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information with employees about competitors,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>industry trends and organizational directions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 In my college, leaders empower others to</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>help carry out the organization's vision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 In my college, leaders mentor and coach those</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they lead.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 In my college, leaders continually look for</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunities to learn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 In my college, leaders ensure that the</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colleges' actions are consistent with its</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>values.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Low (1-2.33), Moderate (2.34-3.66), High (3.67-5), (N = 295)
Table 4.8 displays TVCs lecturers’ perception on strategic leadership among their colleges. The results show four items at high level and two items moderate. The item that showed high level is item 42, “In my college, leaders continually look for opportunities to learn”, $M = 3.87$, $SD = .58$. This is followed by items 38, “In my college, leaders generally support requests for learning opportunities and training”, $M = 3.84$, $SD = .70$, and item 43, “In my college, leaders ensure that the colleges’ actions are consistent with its values”, $M = 3.83$, $SD = .66$. Also item 41, “In my college, leaders mentor and coach those they lead”, $M = 3.74$, $SD = .64$ is in high level. The lowest rank was obtained in item 39, “In my college, leaders share up to date information with lecturers about competitors, educational trends and colleges directions”, $M = 3.50$, $SD = .67$, and item 40, “In my college, leaders empower others to help carry out the colleges’ vision”, $M = 3.54$, $SD = .74$. None of the items were rated low. Overall score for strategic leadership is high, $M = 3.72$, $SD = .49$. The results indicate that educational leaders in TVCs support request for learning, share up to date information with lecturers, mentor and coach those they lead.

4.2.9 Perception Level of Overall Learning Organization

Table 4.9 shows respondents’ perception on learning organization dimensions. Learning organization is comprised of seven dimensions: continuous learning, dialogue and inquiry, collaboration, empowerment, system connection and strategic leadership. Based on lecturers’ perception of learning organization dimensions, three out of seven dimensions were rated at high level and four were rated at moderate level.
Table 4.9 Descriptive Statistics on Dimensions of Learning Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Statistics</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Low (43-100)</th>
<th>Moderate (101-158)</th>
<th>High (159-215)</th>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Learning</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>126 &lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; (42.7) &lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>169 (57.3)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue and Inquiry</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>129 (43.7)</td>
<td>166 (56.3)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>9 (3.1)</td>
<td>189 (64.1)</td>
<td>97 (32.8)</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded System</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>18 (6.1)</td>
<td>200 (67.8)</td>
<td>77 (26.1)</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>190 (64.4)</td>
<td>105 (35.6)</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Connection</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>10 (3.4)</td>
<td>205 (69.5)</td>
<td>80 (27.1)</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Leadership</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>147 (49.8)</td>
<td>148 (50.2)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Learning Organization</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>189 (64.1)</td>
<td>106 (35.9)</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Low (1-2.33), Moderate (2.34-3.66), High (3.67-5), <sup>a</sup> = Frequency/Count, <sup>b</sup> = Percent

Table 4.9 displays TVCs lecturers’ perception on the level of learning organization dimensions among their colleges. The results indicated that lecturers’ perception on continuous learning, dialogue and inquiry and strategic leadership are at high level, whereas their perception on collaboration, embedded system, empowerment, and system connection are at moderate level. Findings indicated that the lecturers’ perception in dialogue and inquiry was high with a mean rating of M=3.78 and SD = .41, where 166 (56.3%) of lecturers rated high on this dimension, 129 (43.7%)
moderate and none rated low. Similarly, the results showed that lecturers’ perception in strategic leadership was high with $M = 3.72$ and $SD = .49$, whereas 148 (50.2%) of lecturers rated high level and 147 (49.8%) rated moderate on this dimension. Likewise, findings revealed that lecturers’ perception in continuous learning was high with a mean rating of $M = 3.69$ and $SD = .46$, whereas 169 (57.3%) of lecturers rated high, and 126 (42.7%) rated moderate on this dimension. The findings also indicated that four out of seven dimensions of learning organization were at moderate level including: system connection ($M = 3.40$, $SD = .53$), embedded system ($M = 3.43$, $SD = .55$), collaboration ($M = 3.47$, $SD = .57$) and empowerment ($M = 3.53$, $SD = .53$). The lowest scoring learning organization dimensions was system connection ($M = 3.40$ and $SD = .53$). None of the dimensions were rated low. Overall, 189 (64.1%) of lecturers rated moderate, whereas 106 (35.9%) rated high and none rated low on overall learning organization dimensions. These results mean that TVCs’ lecturers perceive learning organization dimensions among their colleges at moderate level.

4.3 Perception Level of Individual, Team and Organizational Learning

Table 4.10 depicts the levels of lecturers’ perception on individual, team and organizational level of learning among lecturers in TVCs. The seven dimensions of learning organization have been categorized into three levels of learning: individual learning, team learning and organizational learning. Individual learning is comprised of two dimensions: continuous learning and dialogue and inquiry. Team learning dimension is comprised of one construct; collaboration. Organizational learning
dimension is comprised of four constructs; embedded system, empowerment, system connection and strategic leadership.

Table 4.10 Descriptive Statistics in Learning Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Statistics</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low (43-100)</td>
<td>Moderate (101-158)</td>
<td>High (159-215)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Learning</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>122&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; (41.4)&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>173 (58.6)</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Learning</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>9 (3.1)</td>
<td>189 (64.1)</td>
<td>97 (32.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Learning</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>207 (70.2)</td>
<td>88 (29.8)</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Low (1-2.33), Moderate (2.34-3.66), High (3.67-5),
<sup>a</sup> Frequency/Count, <sup>b</sup> Percent

Table 4.10 displays TVCs lecturers’ perception on individual, team and organizational learning among their colleges. The findings indicated that lecturers’ perception on individual learning was in high level, whereas their perception on team learning and organizational learning were in moderate level. The results show that TVCs lecturers’ perception on individual learning is high (M = 3.73, SD = .35), organizational learning (M = 3.52, SD = .30) and team learning (M = 3.47, SD = .57) are at moderate levels. Findings depict 122 (41.4%) of lecturers rated moderate, 173 (58.6%) rated high on individual learning. Similarly, 97 (32.8%) of lecturers rated high, 189 (64.1%) moderate and 9 (3.1%) rated low on team learning. For organizational learning, some 88 (29.8%) reported high, 207 (70.2%) reported
moderated and none rated low. This means that TVCs activities pertaining learning organization dimensions, fall in individual learning activities first, then organizational learning and third in team learning activities. It can be concluded that organization learning and team learning could be further improved.

4.4 Perception Level of Organizational Commitment

Correspondingly, with the same procedure as used with independent variables (learning organization dimensions), the perception level of lecturers on organizational commitment was calculated. Mean, standard deviation, levels and rank were utilized to determine respondents’ perception on affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment as required by research question two as follows:

What are the levels of affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment as perceived by lecturers in TVCs?

4.4.1 Perception Level of Affective Commitment

Table 4.11 displays respondents’ perception on affective commitment in TVCs. Affective commitment is comprised of six items. Based on respondents’ perceptions, affective commitment items mean scores were rated from high to moderate.
Table 4.11 Descriptive Statistics on Items in Affective Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale/Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this college.</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 I really feel as if this college’s problems are my own.</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 I do not feel a strong sense of &quot;belonging&quot; to my college.</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 I do not feel &quot;emotionally attached&quot; to this college.</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 I do not feel like &quot;part of the family&quot; at my college.</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 This college has a great deal of personal meaning for me.</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Low (1-2.33), Moderate (2.34-3.66), High (3.67-5), N=295

Table 4.11 displays TVCs lecturers’ perception on affective commitment in their colleges. The results show five items at high level and one item at moderate level. The highest rank was reported for item 49, “This college has a great deal of personal meaning for me”, $M = 4.09$, $SD = .61$. This is followed by item 46, “I do not feel a strong sense of "belonging" to my college, $M = 3.98$, $SD = .68$ (reverse item) and item 47, “I do not feel "emotionally attached" to this college”, $M = 3.95$, $SD = .64$ (reverse item), and item 44, “I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this college”, $M = 3.76$, $SD = .66$. None of the items were ranked low. Overall score for affective commitment was high ($M = 3.86$, $SD = .45$). These results mean that lecturers in TVCs have rated high in explaining their perception on affective commitment.
4.4.2 Perception Level of Continuance Commitment

Table 4.12 shows respondents’ perception on continuance commitment as the second construct of organizational commitment. There are six items in continuance commitment. Based on respondents’ perception, continuance commitment items were rated moderate.

Table 4.12 Descriptive Statistics on Items in Continuance Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale/Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Staying with my college is a matter of necessity as much as a desire.</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 It would be very hard for me to leave my college, even if I wanted to.</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my college.</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this college.</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 If I had not already put so much of myself into this college, I might consider working elsewhere.</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 One of the few negative consequences of leaving this college would be the scarcity of available alternatives.</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Low (1-2.33), Moderate (2.34-3.66), High (3.67-5), N=295

Table 4.12 shows TVCs lecturers’ perception on continuance commitment for their colleges. The results display that all six items are in moderate level. The item 50,
“Staying with my college is a matter of necessity as much as a desire” reported the highest mean score (M = 3.62, SD = .75). This is followed by items 51, “It would be very hard for me to leave my college, even if I wanted to”, M = 3.53, SD = .83 and item 54, “If I had not already put so much of myself into this college, I might consider working elsewhere”, M = 3.52, SD = .68. The lowest rank was reported for item 55, “One of the few negative consequences of leaving this college would be the scarcity of available alternatives”. Overall score for continuance commitment is moderate (M = 3.48, SD = .56). These results mean that TVCs’ lecturers have rated moderate in explaining their perception on continuance commitment.

### 4.4.3 Perception Level of Normative Commitment

Table 4.13 shows respondents’ perception on normative commitment as the third construct of organizational commitment. There are six items in normative commitment. Based on respondents’ perception, normative commitment items were rated from high to moderate. One item of normative commitment (56) was negative item, designed to control for acquiescence response bias.
Table 4.13 Descriptive Statistics on Items in Normative Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales/Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Normative Commitment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current administrator.</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my college.</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 I would feel guilty if I left my college.</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 This college deserves my loyalty.</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 I would not leave my college because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 I owe a great deal to my college.</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Low (1-2.33), Moderate (2.34-3.66), High (3.67-5), N=295

Table 4.13 shows TVCs lecturers’ perception on normative commitment in their colleges. The results show that one item at high level and five items at moderate level. The item 61, “I owe a great deal to my college”, M= 3.68, SD = .70 was rated high by respondents. The findings revealed that item 57, “Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my college”, M = 3.31, SD = .75, item 58, “I would feel guilty if I left my college”, M = 3.43, SD = .59, item 60, “I would not leave my college because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it”, M = 3.45, SD = .69 were rated moderate respectively. None of the items were rated low. Overall score for normative commitment is moderate (M = 3.49, SD = .46). These results show that TVCs’ lecturers perceive normative commitment among their colleges at moderate level.
4.4.4 Perception Level of Overall Organizational Commitment

Table 4.14 reveals respondents’ perception on organizational commitment and their frequencies, levels and ranks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Statistics</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>127&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Low (1-2.33), Moderate (2.34-3.66), High (3.67-5), <sup>a</sup>= Frequency/Count, <sup>b</sup>= Percent

Table 4.14 indicates TVCs lecturers’ perception on organizational commitment in their colleges. Findings revealed that the lecturers’ perception on affective commitment was high with a mean rating of M=3.86 and SD = .45, while 168 (56.9%) of lecturers reported that they possess a high level of perception, 127 (43.1%) moderate and none rated low. The results showed that lecturers’ perception on continuance commitment was moderate with M = 3.48 and SD = .56, whereas 95...
(32.2%) of lecturers reported that they possess a high level perception, 194 (65.8%) moderate and 6 (2%) rated low. Likewise, findings revealed that lecturers’ perception on normative commitment was moderate with a mean rating of $M = 3.49$ and $SD = .46$, while 79 (26.8%) of lecturers showed they possess a high level, 216 (73.2%) moderate and none rated low. None of the dimensions were perceived as low. Overall, 172 (58.3%) of lecturers rated they possess moderate, while 123 (41.7 %) high and none rated low in overall organizational commitment. This means that lecturers’ perception on overall organizational commitment was moderate in TVCs.

4.5 Organizational Commitment by Demographics (t-test)

This part deals with affective, continuance, normative as well as overall organizational commitment. Independent sample t-test was employed to compare lecturers’ perception towards affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment based on demographics (gender, marital status, type of employment and monthly income). Independent sample t-test compares the mean values of affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment for one group with the mean values of a second group.

4.5.1 Organizational Commitment by Gender

Table 4.15 shows the results of independent sample t-tests for affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment according to gender as required by research question three as follows:
Are there significant differences in lecturers’ perception towards affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment based on gender?

Table 4.15  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>-.387</td>
<td>.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>2.975</td>
<td>.003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Commitment</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>1.107</td>
<td>.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note* Significance Level, p< .05, df = 293, SD = Standard Deviation, Two tailed

Table 4.15 reveals independent samples t-test on affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment based on gender in TVCs. Findings show no significant differences in mean scores of affective commitment (t = -.074, p = .941), continuance commitment (t = -.387, p = .699) and overall organizational commitment (t = 1.107, p = .269) for male and female lecturers in TVCs. Whereas for normative commitment, the findings revealed significant differences in mean scores (t = 2.975, p = .003) for male (M = 3.53, SD = .49) and female lecturers (M = 3.37, SD = .38). The two means suggested that normative commitment was higher for male lecturers than female lecturers in TVCs. Male lecturers demonstrated a higher perception of normative commitment than female lecturers. Thus it can be concluded that male lecturers were more committed normatively than female lecturers in TVCs. This
means that male lecturers feel more obligations to the people and colleges to stay with in comparison with female lecturers, feel guilty if they leave colleges, and would prefer to continue with the current colleges.

4.5.2 Organizational Commitment by Type of Employment

Independent samples t-test was utilized in Table 4.16 to show differences in affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment by employment type in TVCs required by research question four as follows:

Are there significant differences in lecturers’ perception towards affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment based on type of employment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.16 t-test between Organizational Commitment by Employment Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note* Significance Level, p<.05,  df = 293,  SD = Standard Deviation, Two tailed
Table 4.16 indicates the results of independent samples t-test between full time and part time lecturers on their perception on affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment in TVCs. Findings show significant difference (t = 5.260, p = .001) in mean scores for full time lecturers (M = 4.02, SD = .45) and part time lecturers (M = 3.57, SD = .42) for affective commitment. Similarly, for continuance commitment the result of t-test revealed significant difference (t = 2.678, p = .001) in mean scores for full time lecturers (M = 3.59, SD = .58) and part time lecturers (M = 3.41, SD = .52). Likewise, for normative commitment, the results of t-test revealed significant difference in mean scores (t = 4.735, p = .001) for full time lecturers (M = 3.64, SD = .51) and part time lecturers (M = 3.64, SD = .51). For overall organizational commitment, the results of t-test also showed significant difference in mean scores (t = 7.340, p = .001) for full time lecturers (M = 3.75, SD = .30) and part time lecturers (M = 3.57, SD = .30). The results suggested that the mean scores of full time lecturers in affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment were higher than mean scores of part time lecturers. Affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment of full time lecturers were different from part time lecturers. The t-test revealed that full time lecturers were more committed than part time lecturers in TVCs.

4.5.3 Organizational Commitment by Marital Status

Independent samples t-test was utilized in Table 4.17 to show differences in affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment by marital status in TVCs as required by research question five as follows:
Are there significant differences in lecturers’ perception towards affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment based on marital status?

### Table 4.17 t-test between Organizational Commitment by Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.846</td>
<td>.398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>-.284</td>
<td>.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.580</td>
<td>.562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Commitment</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.309</td>
<td>.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note* Significance Level, p<.05, df = 293, SD = Standard Deviation

The results of t-test in Table 4.17 showed no significant differences in affective commitment (t=.846, p = .398), continuance commitment (t=.284, p =.776), normative commitment (t=.580, p=.562) and overall organizational commitment (t=-.309, p =.757) between married and single lecturers in TVCs. Marital status was not a significant variable that might make lecturers committed in any components of the organizational commitment. It can be concluded that there was no significant difference in affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment of single and married lecturers in TVCs.
4.5.4 Organizational Commitment by Monthly Income

Table 4.18 shows differences in affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment based on monthly income as requires by research question six as follows:

Are there significant differences in lecturers’ perception towards affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment based on monthly income?

Table 4.18  t-test between Organizational Commitment by Monthly Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Monthly Income</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>&lt; $799</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>-2.977</td>
<td>.003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; $800</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment</td>
<td>&lt; $799</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-1.670</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; $800</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment</td>
<td>&lt; $799</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>-1.712</td>
<td>.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; $800</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Commitment</td>
<td>&lt; $799</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-3.507</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; $800</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note* Significance Level, p<.05, df = 293, SD = Standard Deviation, Two-tailed $ = US Dollars

Table 4.18 indicates the results of independent samples t-test between lecturers with $ 799 or less monthly income and lecturers with $ 800 or more monthly income on their perception on affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment in TVCs. Findings show significant differences (t = -2.977, p = .003) in
mean scores of lecturers with $799 or less monthly income (M = 3.77, SD = .47) and lecturers with $800 or more monthly income (M = 3.93, SD = .43) in affective commitment. Similarly, t-test results showed significant differences (t = -3.507, p = .001) in mean scores of lecturers with $799 or less monthly income (M = 3.54, SD = .27) and lecturers with $800 or more monthly income (M = 3.66, SD = .30) in overall organizational commitment. Whereas there was no significant differences (t = -1.670, p = .096) in mean scores of lecturers with $799 or less monthly income (M = 3.42, SD = .56) and lecturers with $800 or more monthly income (M = 3.53, SD = .55) in continuance commitment. Similarly, findings revealed no significant differences (t = -1.712, p = .088) in mean scores for lecturers with $799 or less monthly income (M = 3.43, SD = .44) and lecturers with $800 or more monthly income (M = 3.52, SD = .47) in normative commitment in TVCs.

The results show that lecturers with $800 or more monthly income demonstrated more commitment than lecturers with $799 or less monthly income in affective and overall organizational commitment in TVCs. It can be concluded that monthly income was a significant indicator in making difference between lecturers with $800 or more monthly income and lecturers with $799 or less monthly income in affective and overall organizational commitment, but not in continuance and normative commitment in TVCs.

4.6 Organizational Commitment by Demographics (ANOVA)

This section deals with respondents’ perception on affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment by education level, teaching experience and
age in TVCs. The analysis of variance (ANOVA) was utilized to determine whether the group means on affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment differ significantly from each other. If there were significant differences from ANOVA results, the follow-up tests were performed to evaluate pairwise differences among the groups. For this study, Tukey-test of multiple comparisons procedure was employed to determine which group is significantly different based on the variable under study.

4.6.1 Organizational Commitment by Education Level

Table 4.19 shows the results of one-way ANOVA to determine whether there were differences in affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment for education levels as required by research question seven as follows:

Are there significant differences in lecturers’ perception towards affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment based on education level?
Table 4.19 ANOVA test of Organizational Commitment by Education Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Commitment</th>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2.559</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.280</td>
<td>6.300</td>
<td>.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>59.308</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61.867</td>
<td>294</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4.906</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.453</td>
<td>8.204</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>87.303</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>92.208</td>
<td>294</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3.379</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.689</td>
<td>8.148</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>60.541</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63.920</td>
<td>294</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall commitment</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3.400</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.700</td>
<td>21.878</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>22.688</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26.088</td>
<td>294</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * Significance Level, p<.05

Table 4.19 reveals ANOVA results of overall organizational commitment scale and subscales by education level as required by the seventh research question. ANOVA test revealed significant differences in means among doctorate, master and bachelor degree holders on their perception towards affective commitment (F (2, 292) = 6.300, p = .002), continuance commitment (F (2,292) = 8.204, p = .001), normative commitment (F (2,292) = 8.148, p = .001). Similarly, findings depicted significant differences among doctorate, master and bachelor degree holders on their perception towards overall organizational commitment (F (2,292) = 21.878, p = .001). Tukey test as a follow up-test was used to examine pairwise differences among mean scores.
of doctorate, master and bachelor lecturers in affective, continuance, normative, and overall organizational commitment.

4.6.2 Affective Commitment by Education Level

Table 4.19 shows mean scores of doctorate, master and bachelor lecturers (M =4.11, M=3.84 and M=3.76 respectively) on their perception on affective commitment in TVCs. The ANOVA test showed that there was a statistically significant difference in the mean ($p < .05$) for affective commitment among doctorate, master and bachelor lecturers ($F (2,292) = 6.300, p = .002$). Tukey test as a follow up-test was used to examine pairwise differences among mean scores of doctorate, master and bachelor lecturers in affective commitment. The results of Tukey test are shown in Table 4.20.
Table 4.20  Tukey test of Affective Commitment by Education Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>(I) Education Level</th>
<th>(J) Education Level</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Sig (p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>.26°</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>.35°</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>-.26°</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>-.35°</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.534</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level

The findings of Tukey test in Table 4.20 showed significant differences between doctorate and master lecturers in affective commitment. Similarly, the findings revealed statistically significant differences between doctorate lecturers and bachelor degree holders in affective commitment. While, no significant difference was observed in affective commitment between master and bachelor lecturers. The findings show lecturers with doctorate degree holders had higher perception in affective commitment than lecturers with Master and Bachelor degree holders.

4.6.3  Continuance Commitment by Education Level

Table 4.19 reveals mean scores of doctorate (M = 3.74, SD = .53), master (M = 3.49, SD = .56) and bachelor lecturers (M = 3.21, SD = .45) on their perception towards continuance commitment in TVCs. The ANOVA test revealed significant difference
in means for continuance commitment among three groups of lecturers (doctorate, master and bachelor), (F (2,292) = 8.204, p = .001). The Tukey multiple comparison tests confirmed statistically significant difference in means of the following pairs: doctorate and master, doctorate and bachelor, master and bachelor. Findings are shown in Table 4.21.

Table 4.21 Tukey test of Continuance Commitment by Education Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>(I) Education Level</th>
<th>(J) Education Level</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Sig (p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>-.52*</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level

The findings of Tukey test in Table 4.21 statistically showed significant differences in mean scores between doctorate and master, doctorate and bachelor in continuance commitment. The post hoc comparisons of Tukey test of master lecturers also showed higher mean scores for continuance commitment than lecturers with bachelor degree. Thus, significant differences were observed among lecturers with doctorate, master and bachelor degrees on continuance commitment. It was revealed that education level was a significant indicator in continuance commitment among decorate, master and bachelor lecturers in TVCs.
4.6.4 Normative Commitment by Education Level

Table 4.19 shows mean scores of doctorate (M=3.75, SD = .52), master (M = 3.47, SD = .45) and bachelor lecturers (M = 3.33, SD = .37) on normative commitment in TVCs. The ANOVA test indicated that there was a statistically significant difference in the mean (p < .05) for normative commitment among three groups of lecturers (F (2,292) = 8.148, p = .001). Tukey test as a follow up test was used to examine pairwise differences among mean scores of doctorate, master and bachelor lecturers in normative commitment. The results of Tukey test are shown in the Table 4.22.

Table 4.22 Tukey test of Normative Commitment by Education Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>(I) Education Level</th>
<th>(J) Education Level</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Sig (p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>-.42*</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level

The results of Tukey test analysis in Table 4.22 showed that there was statistically significant difference between doctorate and master and doctorate and bachelor mean scores in normative commitment. No significant difference was reported between
master and bachelor mean scores in normative commitment. Lecturers with doctorate degrees showed higher normative commitment than lecturers with master and bachelor degrees. It was revealed that education level was a significant indicator to make difference among doctorate, master and bachelor lecturers in normative commitment in TVCs. Those who were less educated were also less committed to the colleges.

4.6.5 Overall Organizational Commitment by Education Level

Mean scores of doctorate (M=3.87, SD = .31), master (M=3.60, SD = .27) and bachelor lecturers (M = 3.43, SD = .24) on their perceptions on overall organizational commitment are shown in Table 4.19. ANOVA test indicated significant difference for overall organizational commitment among three groups of lecturers (F (2,292) = 21.878, p = .001). Tukey test as a follow up test was used to examine pairwise differences among mean scores of doctorate, master and bachelor lecturers in overall organizational commitment. The results of Tukey test are shown in Table 4.23.
Table 4.23 Tukey test of Overall Commitment by Education Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>(I) Education Level</th>
<th>(J) Education Level</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Sig (p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Commitment</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>-.43*</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level

The post hoc comparisons using Tukey test in Table 4.23 showed lecturers with doctorate degree had significantly higher mean scores than lecturers with master degree and bachelor degree in overall organizational commitment. The results also showed that overall organizational commitment of lecturers with master degree was significantly different from those with bachelor degree. It was revealed that education level was a significant indicator in overall organizational commitment in TVCs in Iran.

In conclusion, the results revealed lecturers with higher education level are significantly more committed in affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment in TVCs in Iran. Doctoral degree holders showed higher level of commitment than masters in organizational commitment scale and subscales. Master degree holders also showed higher level of commitment than bachelors in
continuance and overall organizational commitment, indicating that the higher the level of education, the more committed lecturers are to TVCs in Iran.

4.6.6 Organizational Commitment by Teaching Experience

Table 4.24 reveals the results of one-way ANOVA to compare affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment by teaching experiences required by research question eight as follows:

Are there significant differences in lecturers’ perception towards affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment based on teaching experience?
Table 4.24 ANOVA test of Organizational Commitment by Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>1.355</td>
<td>.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>61.01</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61.87</td>
<td>294</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2.328</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.776</td>
<td>2.512</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>89.88</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>92.21</td>
<td>294</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.578</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td>2.456</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>62.34</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63.92</td>
<td>294</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Commitment</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.658</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>2.509</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>25.43</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26.08</td>
<td>294</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note* Significance Level, $p<.05$ SD=Standard Deviation

Table 4.24 revealed no significant differences in teaching experiences among lecturers towards affective commitment ($F (3,291), p = .257$), continuance commitment ($F (3,291), p = .059$), normative commitment ($F (3,291), p = .063$) and overall organizational commitment ($F (3,291), p = .059$). It can be concluded that affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment of lecturers were not significantly different according to teaching experiences (< 5 years, 6-15 years, 16-25 years and >26 years) in TVCs in Iran.
4.6.7 Organizational Commitment by Age Groups

Table 4.25 shows the results of one-way ANOVA to compare affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment by age as required by research question nine as follows:

Are there significant differences in lecturers’ perception towards affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment based on age?
Table 4.25 ANOVA test of Organizational Commitment by Age Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Commitment</th>
<th>Age Groups</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>&lt;29</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>(.43)</td>
<td>1.269</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td>2.031</td>
<td>.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>(.45)</td>
<td>60.598</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>(.45)</td>
<td>61.868</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>(.45)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>(.45)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contiuance Commitment</td>
<td>&lt;29</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>(.54)</td>
<td>5.314</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.771</td>
<td>5.932</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>(.54)</td>
<td>86.894</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>(.54)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>(.52)</td>
<td>92.208</td>
<td>294</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>(.56)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment</td>
<td>&lt;29</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>(.45)</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>1.183</td>
<td>.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>(.45)</td>
<td>63.150</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>(.45)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>(.58)</td>
<td>63.920</td>
<td>294</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>(.46)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Commitment</td>
<td>&lt;29</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>(.29)</td>
<td>1.380</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.460</td>
<td>5.420</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>(.29)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>(.31)</td>
<td>26.088</td>
<td>294</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>(.29)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * Significance Level, p < .05, SD = Standard Deviation

Table 4.25 shows ANOVA results in means of different age groups (< 29 years, 30-39, 40-49 and > 50 years) among lecturers in their perception towards affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment. The test results show significant differences in continuance and overall organizational commitment by age groups, whereas ANOVA test revealed no significant differences in means among four age groups of lecturers on their perception towards affective commitment (F (3, 291) = 2.031, p = .110) and normative commitment (F (3, 291) = 1.183, p = .317).
### 4.6.8 Continuance Commitment by Age

Table 4.25 depicts mean scores of lecturers < 29 years (M=3.30, SD = .51), 30-39 years (M = 3.85, SD = .55), 40-49 years (M = 3.42, SD = .54) and > 50 years (M = 3.84, SD = .52) on their perceptions on continuance commitment in TVCs. The ANOVA test showed that there was a statistically significant difference in the means for continuance commitment among four age groups of lecturers (F (3,291) = 5.932, \( p = .001 \)). Tukey test as a follow up-test was used to examine pairwise differences among mean scores of lecturers in four age groups in continuance commitment. The results of Tukey test are shown in the Table 4.26.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>(I) Age</th>
<th>(J) Age</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Sig (p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>&lt; 29 years</td>
<td>30-39 years</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40-49 years</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 50 years</td>
<td>-.54*</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>&lt; 29 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40-49 years</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 50 years</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>&lt; 29 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30-39 years</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 50 years</td>
<td>-.42*</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;50 years</td>
<td>&lt; 29 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>.54*</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30-39 years</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40-49 years</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level
The results of the Tukey tests in Table 4.26 showed that the significant mean score differences existed between 30-39 years age group and less than 29 years age group, and between more than 50 years age group and less than 29 years age group and between more than 50 years age group and 40-49 years age group in continuance commitment. The Tukey test showed that there were no significant differences between less than 29 years age group and 40-49 years age group. Similarly, Tukey test showed that there were no significant differences between more than 50 years age group and 30-39 years age group and between 30-39 years age group and 40-49 years age group. It was revealed that age was a significant indicator in continuance commitment among lecturers in the following pairs of age groups: 30-39 and <29 years; >50 years and <29 years, and 40-49 and >50 years.

4.6.9 Overall Organizational Commitment by Age

Table 4.25 shows mean scores of lecturers <29 years (M=3.53, SD = .27), 30-39 years (M = 3.62, SD = .29), 40-49 years (M = 3.60, SD = .29) and >50 years (M = 3.86, SD = .31) on their perceptions on overall organizational commitment in TVCs. The ANOVA test showed that there was a statistically significant difference in the means for overall organizational commitment among four age groups of lecturers (F (3,291) = 5.420, p = .001). Tukey test of multiple comparisons confirmed statistically significant differences in means of overall organizational commitment for the following pairs: age group of >50 and <29 years, 30-39 years and >50 and 40-49 years and >50 years. Findings are shown in Table 4.27.
Table 4.27  Tukey test of Overall Organizational Commitment by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>(I) Age</th>
<th>(J) Age</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Sig (p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; 29 years</td>
<td>30-39 years</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-49 years</td>
<td>&lt; 29 years</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 50 years</td>
<td>40-49 years</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-39 years</td>
<td>&gt; 50 years</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-49 years</td>
<td>30-39 years</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 50 years</td>
<td>&gt;50 years</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;50 years</td>
<td>&lt; 29 years</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-39 years</td>
<td>40-49 years</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-49 years</td>
<td>&gt;50 years</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level

The results of Tukey test in Table 4.27 showed that the significant differences were between age group of more than 50 and age group of less than 29 years, age group of more than 50 and age group of 30-39, and age group of more than 50 and age group of 40-49 years in overall organizational commitment. The Tukey test results showed no significant differences between age group less than 29 years and 30-39 age group, age group less than 29 years and 40-49 age group and between age group 30-39 and 40-49 in overall organizational commitment in TVCs in Iran.

In conclusion, it can be concluded that age is a significant indicator in making difference between < 29 and > 50, 40-49 and > 50 age group of lecturers in continuance and overall organizational commitment in TVCs. It was also revealed that
age was not a significant indicator between 30-39 and 40-49, 40-49 and > 29 age group of lecturers in continuance and overall organizational commitment in TVCs.

4.7 Learning Organization Dimensions and Organizational Commitment Relationship

In this section, Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient ($r$) was conducted to explore the relationships between learning organization dimensions and organizational commitment. Data were checked to determine no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity and homosedasticity. The strength of relationships was analyzed using Cohen (1988) and Tian and Wilding (2008) guidelines as stated by Tseng (2010) in Table 4.28.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>Strength of Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-0.10 to -0.29 and +0.10 to + 0.29</td>
<td>Low Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.30 to -0.49 and + 0.3 to + 0.49</td>
<td>Medium Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.50 to -1.0 and +0.50 to + 1.00</td>
<td>High Correlation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Cohen (1988)

4.7.1 Learning Organization Dimensions and Affective Commitment Relationship

The relationship between continuous learning ($X_1$), dialogue and inquiry ($X_2$), collaboration ($X_3$), embedded system ($X_4$), empowerment ($X_5$), system connection
(X_6), strategic leadership (X_7), overall learning organization and affective commitment (Y) were investigated using Pearson correlation coefficients as required by research question ten as follows:

Is there a significant relationship between learning organization dimensions (continuous learning, dialogue and inquiry, collaboration, embedded system, empowerment, system connection and strategic leadership) and affective commitment?

Preliminary analysis was performed to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity. The results of analysis are shown in Table 4.29.

Table 4.29 Correlations of Learning Organization and Affective Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment (Y)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Learning (X_1)</td>
<td>.284*</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue and Inquiry (X_2)</td>
<td>.377*</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration (X_3)</td>
<td>.162*</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded System (X_4)</td>
<td>.187*</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment (X_5)</td>
<td>.175*</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System connection (X_6)</td>
<td>.194*</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Leadership (X_7)</td>
<td>.320*</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Learning Organization</td>
<td>.426*</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1. Two asterisk means correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
2. Y in parentheses signifies dependent variable
3. X in parentheses signifies independent variable
As depicted in Table 4.29, the strongest significant linear relationship was found to exist between dialogue and inquiry (X₂), and affective commitment (Y), (r = .377, p = .001). The positive, moderate correlation coefficient of .377 indicates that as the scores for dialogue and inquiry increase so do the rating for affective commitment. The second moderate, positive and linear relationship was found to exist between strategic leadership (X₇) and affective commitment (Y), (r = .320, p = .001). The results indicated that the lowest positive relationship was reported between collaboration (X₃) and affective commitment (Y), (r = .162, p = .005). The second lowest was found between empowerment (X₅) and affective commitment (Y), (r = .175, p = .003). Finally, the results indicated that there was low and positive relationship between continuous learning (X₁), embedded system (X₄), system connection (X₆) and affective commitment (Y) with [(r = .284, p = .001), (r = .187, p = .001), (r = .194, p = .001)] respectively. In general, a positive, moderate significant relationship was found to exist between overall learning organization dimensions and affective commitment (r = .426, p = .001) which indicate as the score of learning organization dimensions increase so do the affective commitment.

4.7.2 Individual, Team, Organizational Learning and Affective Commitment

Table 4.30 reveals the relationships between individual, team, organizational learning and affective commitment using Pearson product moment correlation coefficients.
As depicted in Table 4.30 the strongest linear relationship was found to exist between individual learning (X₁), and affective commitment (Y), (r = .400, p = .001), indicating as the scores for individual learning increase so do the rating for affective commitment. The second highest correlation was found between organizational learning (X₃) and affective commitment (Y) (r = .370, p = .001) and the correlation coefficient of .370 indicates moderate, positive and linear relationship between organizational learning (X₃) and affective commitment (Y). The results indicated that the lowest positive relationship was reported between team learning (X₂) and affective commitment (Y) (r = .162, p = .005). The positive correlations of individual learning, team learning and organizational learning with affective commitment signify that as the levels of individual learning, team learning and organizational learning increases so do the rating for affective commitment in TVCs. The findings show that lecturers are more committed affectively when TVCs prepare conditions of individual learning, organizational learning and team learning respectively.
4.7.3 Learning Organization Dimensions and Continuance Commitment

Relationship

Relationships between continuous learning ($X_1$), dialogue and inquiry ($X_2$), collaboration ($X_3$), embedded system ($X_4$), empowerment ($X_5$), system connection ($X_6$), strategic leadership ($X_7$) and continuance commitment ($Y$), were determined using Pearson Correlation as required by research question eleven as follows:

Is there a significant relationship between learning organization dimensions (continuous learning, dialogue and inquiry, collaboration, embedded system, empowerment, system connection and strategic leadership) and continuance commitment?

Preliminary analysis of assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity confirmed no violation. The results of analysis are shown in Table 4.31.
Table 4.31 Correlations of Learning Organization and Continuance Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment (Y)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Learning ($X_1$)</td>
<td>.209**</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue and Inquiry ($X_2$)</td>
<td>.322**</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration ($X_3$)</td>
<td>.184**</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded System ($X_4$)</td>
<td>.263**</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment ($X_5$)</td>
<td>.150**</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Connection ($X_6$)</td>
<td>.242**</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Leadership ($X_7$)</td>
<td>.250**</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Learning Organization</td>
<td>.411**</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1. Two asterisk means correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
2. Y in parentheses signifies dependent variable
3. X in parentheses signifies independent variable

Table 4.31 revealed that the strongest linear significant relationship was found to exist between dialogue and inquiry ($X_2$), and continuance commitment (Y), ($r = .322$, $p = .001$), indicating that as the scores for dialogue and inquiry increases so do the rating for continuance commitment. The second highest correlation was found between embedded system ($X_4$) and continuance commitment (Y) ($r = .263$, $p = .001$) which indicate low and positive relationship between these two variables. The results indicated that the lowest positive relationship was reported between empowerment ($X_5$) and continuance commitment (Y) ($r = .150$, $p = .010$). The second lowest was found between collaboration ($X_3$) and continuance commitment
Finally, the results indicated that there was low and positive relationship between continuous learning \((X_1)\), system connection \((X_6)\), strategic leadership \((X_7)\) and continuance commitment \((Y)\) with \([r = .209, p = .001], [r = .242, p = .001], [r = .250, p = .001]\) respectively. Overall, a positive, medium and significant relationship was found to exist between overall learning organization and continuance commitment \((r = .411, p = .001)\) which indicate as the score of learning organization dimensions increase so do the continuance commitment.

### 4.7.4 Individual, Team, Organization Learning and Continuance Commitment

Table 4.32 reveals the relationships between individual, team, organizational learning and continuance commitment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>(r)</th>
<th>(P)</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment ((Y))</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Learning ((X_1))</td>
<td>.318**</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Learning ((X_2))</td>
<td>.184**</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Learning ((X_3))</td>
<td>.368**</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1. Two asterisk means correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)  
2. \(Y\) in parentheses signifies dependent variable  
3. \(X\) in parentheses signifies independent variable

As depicted in Table 4.32 the strongest linear relationship was found to exist between organizational learning \((X_3)\), and continuance commitment \((Y)\), \((r = .368, p\)
The positive, moderate correlation coefficient of .368 indicates that as the scores for organizational learning increases so do the rating for continuance commitment. The second highest was found between individual learning (X₁) and continuance commitment (Y) (r = .318, p = .001) and the correlation coefficient of .318 indicates moderate, positive and linear relationship between individual learning (X₁) and continuance commitment (Y). The results indicated that the lowest positive relationship was reported between team learning (X₂) and continuance commitment (Y) (r = .184, p = .001). The positive correlations of individual learning, team learning and organizational learning with continuance commitment connote that as the levels of individual learning, team learning and organizational learning increase so do the rating for continuance commitment. The findings indicated that lecturers are more committed when educational leaders of TVCs supported them by providing organizational learning, individual learning and team learning opportunities respectively.

4.7.5 Learning Organization Dimensions and Normative Commitment Relationship

Table 4.33 depicts relationship between learning organization dimensions and normative commitment using Pearson Correlation (r) as required by research question twelve as follows:

Is there a significant relationship between learning organization dimensions (continuous learning, dialogue and inquiry, collaboration, embedded system, empowerment, system connection and strategic leadership) and normative commitment?
Table 4.33 Correlations of Learning Organization and Normative Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment (Y)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Learning (X₁)</td>
<td>.229**</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue and Inquiry (X₂)</td>
<td>.225**</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration (X₃)</td>
<td>.212**</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded System (X₄)</td>
<td>.271**</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment (X₅)</td>
<td>.162**</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Connection (X₆)</td>
<td>.243**</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Leadership (X₇)</td>
<td>.193**</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Learning Organization</td>
<td>.396**</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1. Two asterisk means correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
2. Y in parentheses signifies dependent variable
3. X in parentheses signifies independent variable

The results in Table 4.33 showed that the strongest linear relationship was found to exist between embedded system (X₄), and normative commitment (Y), ($r = .271, p = .001$). The positive, low correlation coefficient of .271 indicates that as the scores for embedded system increases so do the rating for normative commitment. The second highest was found between system connection (X₆) and normative commitment (Y) ($r = .243, p = .001$) and the correlation coefficient of .243 indicates low, positive and linear relationship between these two constructs. The results indicated that the lowest positive relationship existed between empowerment (X₅) and normative commitment (Y) ($r = .162, p = .001$). The second lowest was found between strategic leadership
(X₇) and normative commitment (Y) (r = .193, p = .001). Finally, the results indicated that there was low and positive relationships between continuous learning (X₁), dialogue and inquiry (X₂), collaboration (X₃) and normative commitment (Y) with [(r = .229, p = .001), (r = .225, p = .001), (r = .212, p = .001)] respectively. In general, a positive, moderate significant relationship was found to exist between overall learning organization dimensions and normative commitment (r = .396, p = .001), indicating that as the score of learning organization dimensions increases so do the normative commitment.

4.7.6 Individual, Team, Organizational Learning and Normative Commitment

Table 4.34 reveals the relationships between individual learning (X₁), team learning (X₂), organizational learning (X₃) and normative commitment (Y) using Pearson product moment correlation coefficients.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment (Y)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Learning (X₁)</td>
<td>.280**</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Learning (X₂)</td>
<td>.212**</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Learning (X₃)</td>
<td>.373**</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1. Two asterisk means correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
2. Y in parentheses signifies dependent variable
3. X in parentheses signifies independent variable
Table 4.34 revealed that the strongest linear relationship was found to exist between organizational learning ($X_3$), and normative commitment ($Y$), ($r = .373$, $p = .001$). The positive, moderate correlation coefficient of .373 indicates that as the scores for organizational learning increases so do the normative commitment. The second highest correlation was found between individual learning ($X_1$) and normative commitment ($Y$) ($r = .280$, $p = .001$) which indicates low, positive and linear relationship. The results indicated that the lowest positive relationship was reported between team learning ($X_2$) and normative commitment ($Y$) ($r = .212$, $p = .001$). The positive correlations of individual learning, team learning and organizational learning with normative commitment imply that as individual learning, team learning and organizational learning increase so do the rating for normative commitment. The findings revealed that lecturers were committed normatively when TVCs provide them organizational learning opportunities first, then individual learning and later team learning chances.

4.7.7 Learning Organization Dimensions and Overall Organizational Commitment

Table 4.35 reveals Pearson correlation ($r$) between learning organization dimensions and overall organizational commitment as required by research question thirteen as follows:

Is there a significant relationship between learning organization dimensions (continuous learning, dialogue and inquiry, collaboration, embedded system, empowerment, system connection and strategic leadership) and overall organizational commitment?
Table 4.35 Correlations of Learning Organization and Overall Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Organizational Commitment (Y)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Learning (X₁)</td>
<td>.396**</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue and Inquiry (X₂)</td>
<td>.513**</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration (X₃)</td>
<td>.309**</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded System (X₄)</td>
<td>.402**</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment (X₅)</td>
<td>.268**</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Connection (X₆)</td>
<td>.378**</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Leadership (X₇)</td>
<td>.421**</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Learning Organization Dimensions  .683** .001 High

Note: 1. Two asterisk means correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
2. Y in parentheses signifies dependent variable
3. X in parentheses signifies independent variable

As depicted in Table 4.35 the strongest linear relationship was found to exist between dialogue and inquiry (X₂), and overall organizational commitment (Y), ($r = .513, p = .001$). The positive, high correlation coefficient of .513 indicates that as the scores for dialogue and inquiry increases so do the rating for overall organizational commitment. The second highest correlation was found between strategic leadership (X₇) and overall organizational commitment (Y) ($r = .421, p = .001$) and the correlation coefficient of .421 indicates moderate, positive and linear relationship between strategic leadership (X₇) and overall organizational commitment (Y). The results indicated that the lowest positive relationship was reported between
empowerment ($X_3$) and overall organizational commitment ($Y$) ($r = .268$, $p = .001$). The second lowest correlation was found between collaboration ($X_3$) and overall organizational commitment ($Y$) ($r = .309$, $p = .001$). Finally, the results indicated that there was moderate relationship between continuous learning ($X_1$), embedded system ($X_4$), system connection ($X_6$) and overall organizational commitment ($Y$) with $[(r = .396, p = .001), (r = .402, p = .001), (r = .378, p = .001)]$ respectively. In general, a positive, high significant relationship was found to exist between overall learning organization and overall organizational commitment ($r = .683$, $p = .001$). The positive correlations of learning organization dimensions with overall organizational commitment indicate that as the score of learning organization dimensions increase so do the overall organizational commitment. This study empirically demonstrated that overall organizational commitment was increased when learning organization dimensions were practiced in TVCs in Iran.

4.7.8 Individual, Team, Organizational Learning and Overall Organizational Commitment

To determine the relationship between individual learning ($X_1$), team learning ($X_2$), organizational learning ($X_3$) and overall organizational commitment ($Y$), Pearson product moment correlation coefficients was conducted in TVCs. Table 4.36 depicts the results.
The findings in Table 4.36 revealed that the strongest linear relationship was found to exist between organizational learning (X₃), and overall organizational commitment (Y), \( r = .627, p = .001 \). The positive, high correlation coefficient of .627 indicates that as the scores for organizational learning increases so do the rating for overall organizational commitment. The second highest correlation was found between individual learning (X₁) and overall organizational commitment (Y) \( r = .551, p = .001 \) and the correlation coefficient of .551 indicates high, positive and linear relationship between individual learning (X₁) and overall organizational commitment (Y). The results indicated that the lowest positive relationship was reported between team learning (X₂) and overall organizational commitment (Y) \( r = .309, p = .001 \). The positive correlations of individual learning, team learning and organizational learning with overall organizational commitment entail that as the levels of individual learning, team learning and organizational learning increase so do the rating for overall organizational commitment. This study empirically demonstrated
that overall organizational commitment was increased when lecturers had individual, team and organizational learning opportunities.

4.8 Building Organizational Commitment Models

The findings revealed that seven learning organization dimensions were significantly related with affective, continuance, normative, and overall organizational commitment. To determine the significant predictor/s and the extent to which each predictor contributed towards the variance of affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment, Enter method was utilized as required by research question fourteen as follows:

What are the significant predictors of affective, continuance, normative, and overall organizational commitment?

The output of regression analysis is an equation and a model which represents the best prediction for the value of dependent variable based on the value of a few independent variables. The information obtained from the analysis of enter procedure can also be considered important for educational leaders and policy makers since it reveals which one of the predictors are important in developing and promoting affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment.

4.8.1 Affective Commitment Model

Building perceived affective commitment model was a part of research question fourteen. To build and determine the extent research data support the multiple linear
regression model of perceived affective commitment, Enter method was conducted. The results showed three variables out of seven including; continuous learning ($\beta = .133, p = .022$), dialogue and inquiry ($\beta = .230, p = .001$) and strategic leadership ($\beta = .177, p = .002$) were significant predictors of the perceived affective commitment with $R^2 = .221$. The $R^2$ implies that dialogue and inquiry, strategic leadership and continuous learning accounted for 22.1% of variance in affective commitment.

The multiple R ($R = .471$) revealed significant moderate relationship between independent variables (learning organization dimensions) and dependent variable (affective commitment). The significant F value ($F = 11.660, p = .001$) was the evidence that the research data fit the model. Thus, based on the findings it can be concluded that there was linear relationship between the predictors and the perceived affective commitment. To check the multicollinearity among the independent variables, VIF (variance inflation factor) was used. The results showed that all VIF values were below the commonly threshold value of 10.00. Thus, there was no multicollinearity problem between the predictor variables. Table 4.37 depicts the results.
Table 4.37 Estimates of Coefficients for Affective Commitment Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Un-ed Coefficient (B)</th>
<th>Std.Error</th>
<th>St-ed Coefficient Beta (β)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.151</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Learning (X₁)</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue and Inquiry (X₂)</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration (X₃)</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.950</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded System (X₄)</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment (X₅)</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System connection (X₆)</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td>.478</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Leadership (X₇)</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model Statistics: $R = .471, \quad R^2 = .221, \quad \text{Adj},R^2 = .202, \quad F = 11.660, \quad p=.000$

Based on regression analysis, the prediction equation of perceived affective commitment model was as follows:

$$Y = b_0 + B_2 (X_2) + B_7 (X_7) + B_1 (X_1) + e$$

$$Y = 1.151 + 0.256 \text{ (Dialogue and Inquiry)} + 0.165 \text{ (Strategic Leadership)} + 0.132 \text{ (Continuous Learning)} + e$$

The prediction equation depicts overall contribution of three out of seven learning organization dimensions including dialogue and inquiry, continuous learning and strategic leadership in predicting affective commitment in TVCs in Iran. Generally, the equation explains a unit change in these three variables is associated with a corresponding unit change in perceived affective commitment based on the value of coefficient. In fact, this equation is used to predict the value of dependent variable (affective commitment) for new cases. The perceived affective commitment model is presented in (Figure 4-1). The model indicated that the remaining dimensions
(collaboration, embedded system, system connection and empowerment) were not significant predictors of the perceived affective commitment in TVCs. The perceived affective commitment model is presented in Figure 4-1.

Figure 4-1 Perceived Affective Commitment Model

4.8.2 Continuance Commitment Model

This step was similar to steps used to develop perceived affective commitment model and was a part of research question fourteen. Enter method was conducted to determine the extent research data that support the continuance commitment model.
The results of multiple regression analysis showed four variables out of seven were significant in explaining the perceived continuance commitment. The four variables were dialogue and inquiry (β = .183, p = .003), embedded system (β = .191, p = .001), system connection (β = .118, p = .041) and strategic leadership (β = .114, p = .049) with $R^2 = .191$. The $R^2$ means that dialogue and inquiry, embedded system, system connection and strategic leadership accounted for 19.1% of variance in continuance commitment. The results indicated that dialogue and inquiry, embedded system, system connection and strategic leadership explained 18.3%, 19.1%, 11.8% and 11.4% of the variance of continuance commitment respectively.

The multiple R (R = .437) showed significant moderate relationship between independent variables (learning organization dimensions) and dependent variable (continuance commitment). The significant F value ($F = 9.67, p = .000$) was the evidence that the research data fit the model. Therefore, it can be concluded that there was linear relationship between the predictors and the perceived continuance commitment. The results of VIF (variance inflation factor) showed that all VIF value were below the commonly threshold value of 10.00. Thus, there was no multicolinearity problem between the predictor variables. Table 4.38 shows the results.
Table 4.38 Estimates of Coefficients for Continuance Commitment Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Un-ed Coefficient (B)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>St-ed Coefficient Beta (β)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.441</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Learning (X(_i))</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue and Inquiry (X(_2))</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration (X(_3))</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.586</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded System (X(_4))</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment (X(_5))</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System connection (X(_6))</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Leadership (X(_7))</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model Statistics: \(R = .437\), \(R^2 = .191\), \(\text{Adj,}R^2 = .171\), \(F = 9.67\), \(p = .000\),

Based on regression analysis, the prediction equation of perceived continuance commitment model was as follows:

\[ Y = b_0 + B_2 (X_2) + B_4 (X_4) + B_7 (X_7) + B_6 (X_6) + e \]

\[ Y = .441 + .249 \text{ (Dialogue and Inquiry)} + .193 \text{ (Embedded System)} + .130 \text{ (Strategic Leadership)} + .124 \text{ (System Connection)} + e \]

The prediction equation reveals overall contribution of four out of seven learning organization dimensions including: dialogue and inquiry, embedded system, strategic leadership and system connection in predicting continuance commitment. Generally, the equation explains a unit change in these four variables is associated with a corresponding unit change in perceived continuance commitment based on the value of coefficient. In fact, this equation is used to predict the value of dependent variable (continuance commitment) for new cases. The perceived continuance commitment model is presented in Figure 4-2.
4.8.3 Normative Commitment Model

The steps taken to construct the third significant model for perceived normative commitment were similar to the steps used to develop the previous two models as a part of research question fourteen. Enter method was conducted to determine the extent research data support the perceived normative commitment model. The analysis in Table 4.39 revealed two variables out of seven were found to be
significant in explaining the perceived normative commitment. The two variables were embedded system ($\beta = .194, p = .001$) and system connection ($\beta = .148, p = .012$) with $R^2 = .167$, indicating that 19.4% and 14.8% of variance of perceived normative commitment is explained by these two dimensions. The $R^2$ implies that embedded system and system connection accounted for 16.7% variance of normative commitment. The multiple R ($R = .408$) revealed significant moderate relationship between learning organization dimensions and normative commitment. The significant F value ($F = 8.201, p = .001$) was the evidence that the research data fit the model, indicating linear relationship between the predictors and the perceived normative commitment. Table 4.39 shows the results.

Table 4.39 Estimates of Coefficients for Normative Commitment Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Un-ed Coefficient (B)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>St-ed Coefficient Beta (β)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.157</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Learning ($X_1$)</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue and Inquiry ($X_2$)</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration ($X_3$)</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded System ($X_4$)</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment ($X_5$)</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Connection ($X_6$)</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Leadership ($X_7$)</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model Statistics: $R = .408$, $R^2 = .167$, $\text{Adj,}R^2 = .146$, $F = 8.201$, $p = .000$

Based on regression analysis, the prediction equation of perceived normative commitment model was as follows:

$$Y = b_0 + B_4 (X_4) + B_6 (X_6) + e$$

$$Y = 1.157 + .163 \text{ (Embedded System)} + .129 \text{ (System Connection)} + e$$
The prediction equation depicts overall contribution of two out of seven learning organization dimensions including embedded system and system connection in predicting normative commitment. Generally, the equation explains a unit change in these two variables is associated with a corresponding unit change in perceived normative commitment based on the value of coefficient. In fact, this equation is used to predict the value of dependent variable (normative commitment) for new cases. The perceived normative commitment model is presented in Figure 4.3.

![Figure 4-3 Perceived Normative Commitment Model](image-url)
4.8.4 Overall Organizational Commitment Model

Building the perceived overall organizational commitment model was a part of research question fourteen. To build and determine the extent research data that support the multiple linear regression model of perceived overall organizational commitment, Enter method was performed. The analysis in Table 4.40 shows six variables out of seven were significant in explaining the variance of perceived overall organizational commitment. The six variables were continuous learning ($\beta = .142$, $p = .002$), dialogue and inquiry ($\beta = .268$, $p = .001$), embedded system ($\beta = .267$, $p = .001$), empowerment ($\beta = .128$, $p = .003$), system connection ($\beta = .172$, $p = .001$) and strategic leadership ($\beta = .200$, $p = .001$) with $R^2 = .503$. The $R^2$ implies that continuous learning, dialogue and inquiry, embedded system, empowerment, system connection and strategic leadership accounted for 50.3% of variance in overall organizational commitment.

The results indicated that continuous learning, dialogue and inquiry, embedded system, empowerment, system connection and strategic leadership accounted for 14.2%, 26.8%, 26.7%, 12.8%, 17.2% and 20% variance in overall organizational commitment respectively. The multiple R ($R = .709$) revealed significant strong relationship between independent variables (learning organization dimensions) and dependent variable (overall organizational commitment). The significant F value ($F = 41.478$, $p = .001$) was the evidence that the research data fit the model. Thus, based on the findings it can be concluded that there was linear relationship between the predictors and the perceived overall organizational commitment. To check the multicolinearity among the independent variables, VIF (variance inflation factor)
was used. The results showed that all VIF value were below the commonly threshold value of 10.00. Thus, there was no multicolinearity problem between the predictor variables.

Table 4.40 Estimates of Coefficients for Overall Organizational Commitment Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Un-ed Coefficient (B)</th>
<th>Std.Error</th>
<th>St-ed Coefficient Beta (β)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.916</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Learning (X1)</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue and Inquiry (X2)</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration (X3)</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded System (X4)</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment (X5)</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System connection (X6)</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Leadership (X7)</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model Statistics: \( R = .709, \quad R^2 = .503, \quad \text{Adj.} R^2 = .491, \quad F = 41.478, \quad P = .000 \)

Based on regression analysis, the prediction equation of perceived overall organizational commitment model was as follows:

\[
Y = b_0 + B_2 (X_2) + B_4 (X_4) + B_7 (X_7) + B_6 (X_6) + B_1 (X_1) + B_5 (X_5) + e
\]

\[
Y = 0.916 + 0.194 \text{ (Dialogue and Inquiry)} + 0.143 \text{ (Embedded System)} + 0.121 \text{ (Strategic Leadership)} + 0.096 \text{ (System Connection)} + 0.092 \text{ (Continuous Learning)} + 0.072 \text{ (Empowerment)} + e
\]

The prediction equation depicts overall contribution of six out of seven learning organization dimensions including: dialogue and inquiry, continuous learning, embedded system, empowerment, system connection and strategic leadership in
predicting overall organizational commitment. Generally, the equation explains a unit change in these six variables is associated with a corresponding unit change in perceived overall organizational commitment based on the value of coefficient. In fact, this equation is used to predict the value of dependent variable for new cases. The perceived overall organizational commitment model is presented in Figure 4-4.

![Figure 4-4 Perceived Overall Organizational Commitment Model](image-url)
4.9 Discussion

In this section, the results are discussed based on the study objectives and associated questions. To discuss research objectives, five sections have been provided for each objective and associated questions. The first objective of the study was to determine the level of lecturers’ perception on learning organization dimensions in TVCs as follows.

4.9.1 Learning Organization Dimensions

Lecturers’ perception in this study was obtained from self rating and as findings indicated lecturers’ perception in continuous learning, dialogue and inquiry and strategic leadership dimensions were at high level, whereas their perception in collaboration, embedded system, system connection and empowerment were at moderate level. Also, the findings showed that lecturers’ perception in overall learning organization dimensions was at moderate level. This means that learning organization dimensions could be further improved.

The findings revealed that lecturers’ perception on continuous learning dimension was at high level with mean score (M = 3.69). This indicates that lecturers in TVCs have the opportunity of discussing mistakes, share knowledge and skills with their colleagues, help each other learn, are supported financially for learning, consider problems as opportunities for learning and are rewarded for learning. In addition, it can be concluded that in TVCs communication among staffs, feedback and active listening are encouraged and prioritized than hierarchical and status.
Similarly, with continuous learning, lecturers’ perception on dialogue and inquiry dimension was at high level with mean score \((M = 3.78)\). The high perception level of lecturers in dialogue and inquiry dimension signify that lecturers have mutual relationships, give feedback to each other honestly, listen to others’ views before speaking, behave respectfully to each other, trust each other and are confident to ask why regardless of the position in TVCs. In addition, it can be concluded that the culture of encouraging people to exchange their ideas and views and existing open and honest feedback atmosphere are cultural prominent characteristics in TVCs.

The third dimension based on Watkins and Marsick’s (1993) model is collaboration. The findings indicated a moderate perception level \((M = 3.47)\). The moderate level of items of collaboration maybe the results of lecturers’ limitations in exploring new ideas, lack of being able to break out old mental frameworks, and not having enough opportunities to use/utilize others’ views and ideas. The results of this study confirmed Bui and Baruch (2010) statement that higher education institutions do not often have a good reputation of collaborative working. In addition, Dearlove (2002) has also stated that academics display little desire for collective actions.

The findings of the study also showed that lecturers’ perception on embedded system was at moderate level with mean score of \((M = 3.43)\). According to Watkins and Marsick (1993), creating new systems will have a basic contribution towards providing continuous learning opportunities in organizations. Krishna (2008) also stated that social contacts through shared practices in organizations will create a strong bonding among organization members. In addition, Pounder (1999) as cited by Dee et al., (2006) remarked that in educational context team teaching, curriculum
development, and institution relationships are team structures that can be applied to achieve share learning. Accordingly, the moderate rank of embedded system in TVCs can be the result of not having enough tools and technology in knowledge management, limitation in paying attention to establishing knowledge networks and communities of practice, few opportunities of sharing information, inadequate systems of measurement or not having enough appropriate facilities for lecturers to use their skills and knowledge.

Correspondingly to embedded system and collaboration, lecturers’ perception was revealed to be at moderate level in empowerment dimension with mean score (M = 3.53). Kanter (1993) based on organizational empowerment theory, stated that employees’ empowerment towards a collective vision will provide opportunities for learning which in turn influence employees’ work, attitudes and behaviors. Chen and Chen (2008) also stated that employees’ empowerment can occur as a result of participating employees in decision making process. In addition, O’Nail (2003) and Watkins and Marsick (1993) have remarked that lack of necessary coordination among different parts of the organization and existence of an overcautious atmosphere that leads to conservative behaviors can affect empowering people towards a collective vision negatively.

The findings indicated that lecturers’ perception on system connection was at moderate level with mean score (M = 3.40) in TVCs. Watkins and Marsick (1993) remarked that internal and external environment of organization will affect employees’ awareness through creating new information. Dee et al., (2006) also remarked that in educational settings teachers’ scientific associations as an example
act as a linkage between school community and society. The moderate level of lecturers’ perception in system connection dimension in TVCs can be the results of not having appropriate programs to address work life balance, limitation in paying attention to global effects on lecturers’ work and learning opportunities and not involving with local communities. Therefore, it can be concluded that maybe TVCs have not linked with their local and national communities and have not prepared necessary facilities to benefit from system theories practically and theoretically.

The findings showed that lecturers perception on strategic leadership was at high level with mean score (M = 3.72). Senge (1990) stated that learning organizations require a novel vision of leadership; leaders should act as designers, stewards, and teachers. Shirbagi (2007) remarked that “leaders are responsible for developing an environment favorable to motivating faculty members and encouraging scholarship” (p.20). Accordingly, the high lecturers’ perception level in strategic leadership dimension indicate that leaders in TVCs support lecturers’ request for learning, share the latest information with lecturers, give power to lecturers to carry out colleges’ vision, guide and instruct those they direct, are in quest of opportunities of learning continuously, and ensured that colleges’ activities are in line with their values.

In addition, the findings of the study revealed that the perception level of lecturers in individual, team and organizational learning in descending order was individual, organization and team learning in TVCs. These results were similar to Zahabioun and Yousefy’s (2006) findings in Iran. Likewise, Ghadamgahi and Ahancheyan (2002) reported team learning among educational administrators and high school teachers in Mashad high schools were lower than individual and organization
learning. Moreover, the results of this study confirmed Bui and Baruch’s (2010) statement that higher education institutions do not often have a good reputation of team learning and working, and team learning is a real challenge in higher education institutions. Furthermore, Baruch and Hall (2004) stated that people with a high educational background tend to build up individual self-confidence and self-efficacy. Dearlove (2002) has also stated that academics show little desire for collective actions.

Accordingly, lecturers’ perception at the levels of high and moderate in TVCs can be the results of involving subjects such as research, teaching, learning and guiding students which cause lecturers to improve and develop their knowledge, skills and experiences continuously. Another reason is that the educational leaders of these institutions try to create appropriate conditions for developing, improving and enhancing the ability of their lecturers in all fields to be accepted as a branch of the Ministry of Higher Education (Behbahani, 2010; Asgari et al., 2011).

4.9.2 Organizational Commitment

The second objective of this study was to determine the level of lecturers’ perception on organizational commitment in TVCs. Correspondingly to the previous section, organizational commitment in this study was obtained from self rating and as findings indicated lecturers rated moderate in explaining their perception on overall organizational commitment. The findings disclosed that lecturers mostly agreed with the statements about affective commitment and then statements about normative and continuance commitment respectively. In the related literature the generally preferred
situation for organizational commitment scales is that the employees should have affective, normative, and continuance commitment respectively (Demiray and Curabay, 2008). In the present study, affective commitment (desire oriented) comes first, normative commitment (obligation oriented) comes second and continuance commitment (necessity oriented) comes last. These results indicated consistent with the organizational commitment literature.

In addition, the moderate mean average of lecturers’ overall organizational commitment in this study is due to the fact that lecturing is “one of the professions that requires high commitment and lecturers are committed to transform a person from someone who knows nothing to someone educated”, (Awang et al., 2010, p. 49). The high mean score (M = 3.86) of affective commitment indicates that lecturers in TVCs are happy to continue with colleges, consider colleges’ problems as their own, feel interest to their colleges, psychologically attached to their colleges, and the colleges are important for them. The study revealed that lecturers’ normative commitment was higher than continuance commitment. This is because lecturers commit to and remain with the colleges because of feeling of moral obligation. Lecturers think that they have to remain with their colleges because they think it is morally right to do so. Another reason could be because of studying of this concept in an Islamic country where teaching and learning are holy jobs. Lecturing, teaching, researching and providing services for students are recommended in Islam. Being a teacher, regardless of the rank, is a holy job (Mosadeghrad et al., 2008).

In general, the moderate mean score of lecturers’ continuance commitment can be related to new reforms which have taken place in TVCs due to their significant role in
providing human resources for different parts of the country. Based on a new decision all TVCs in Iran which already were supervised, managed and supported by Ministry of Education, have been transferred to be supervised under the Ministry of Higher Education. This decision has probably encouraged and motivated lecturers to continue their work in TVCs because of official, economical, societal and monetary benefits.

4.9.3 Demographics and Organizational Commitment

The third objective of the study was to establish mean differences between gender, marital status, employment type, monthly income, age, education level and teaching experiences in TVCs. Based on previous findings, demographic features have significant effects on organizational commitment (Chen, 2004; Wang, 2005). Hulpia et al., (2011) stated that teachers’ organizational commitment can be influenced by contextual variables such as demographics. Research has shown that predictors of organizational commitment are different in various cultures (Bhatnagar, 2007). Findings of the current study showed that different demographics revealed various perceptions of organizational commitment in TVCs.

For gender, previous findings indicated discrepancy in affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment. The results of the present study revealed no significant differences in affective, continuance and overall organizational commitment of male and female lecturers in TVCs. These findings concurred with Hammidi and Keshtidar’s (2004) results among board of lecturers in physical education institutions, Khatibi et al., (2009) findings in National Olympic and Paralympic Academy in Iran, Karrasch’s (2003) results between male and female
army captains in USA, Giffords’s (2009) findings among two hundred and fourteen social workers in USA, and Gormely’s (2010) results in colleges of nursing faculties. These results contradicted with Bakalis and Jonier’s (2006) findings among 72 of casual academics in Australia, Kwon’s (2004) results, Cristina’s (2009) study among 138 university teaching staffs in Spain, Salami’s (2008) findings among 320 male and female industrial workers in Nigeria, and Lim’s (2003) findings among 669 employees in a private company in Korea who found significant differences between gender in affective, continuance and overall organizational commitment. Whereas the findings of this study regarding normative commitment confirmed significant differences between male and female lecturers in TVCs. Male lecturers showed more commitment normatively than female lecturers in TVCs. One possible explanation for males being more committed to their colleges than did females was that teaching in TVCs is male dominated. The frequencies on gender indicated that the majority of lecturers (70.5%) were male and only 29.5% were female lecturers in TVCs in Iran. Regarding this, male lecturers have to show more commitment to their colleges to retain their professional status. Consequently, it can be inferred that the females working in a male-oriented condition are not as much of committed to their institution as male counterpart. Another explanation is that men play key roles in the workplace, while women play key role in their homes and their power is not popular in the workplace (Lim, 2003).

In terms of marital status, the findings of this study showed no significant differences in affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment. These findings were supported by Khatibi et al., (2009) findings in Iran among employees of National Olympic and Paralympics Academy, Chughtai and Zafar’s (2006) findings in

For full and part time lecturers, the findings revealed significant differences in organizational commitment scale and subscales in TVCs. These findings were in line with Hossaini et al., (2005) findings among 220 lecturers in physical education colleges in Iran, Giffords’s (2009) findings among two hundred and fourteen social workers in USA, Park’s (2005) results among 7198 teachers and Sabagheyan, et al., (2006) study among 339 lecturers in physical education departments of Islamic Azad University in Iran. Full time lecturers showed more commitment than part time lecturers in affective, continuance, normative, and overall organizational commitment. One possible explanation for full time lecturers being more committed to their colleges than did part time lecturers was that part time lecturers were not permanent employees, thus they were less committed to the TVCs in comparison with full time lecturers. Nevertheless, the findings of this study were inconsistent with Thomas’s (2008) findings in higher education institutions in USA between full time and part time employees.

In terms of monthly income, the findings showed significant differences between lecturers with > $ 800 and < $ 799 monthly income in affective and overall organizational commitment in TVCs. Lecturers with > $ 800 monthly income showed greater commitment than lecturers with < $ 799 monthly income. These findings supported the studies of Mosadeghrad et al., (2008) findings among 714 hospital employees in Iran, Ahamad and Abu Bakar (2003) and Poon’s (2004) results in
Malaysia among white collar workers and Malik et al., (2010) study among university teachers in Pakistan who reported significant differences in overall organizational commitment towards monthly income. The findings showed that lecturers with > $ 800 monthly income were more likely to identify with, attach to and be involved in colleges than lecturers with < $ 799 monthly income in affective and overall organizational commitment. These results also imply that high income build stronger emotion of attachment towards the organization. The findings showed no significant differences in normative commitment towards monthly income in TVCs. One possible explanation is related to the fact that this research was conducted in an Islamic country where being a teacher regardless of monthly income causes a religious obligation. Teachers working in higher education institutions are more affected by moral values and obligations than money and other incentives. Moral values and obligation norms are important factors for people teaching in higher education institutions in Iran (Mohsenpoor, 2004).

Previous findings indicated inconsistency results regarding educational level and organizational commitment scale and subscales. The results of the present study showed that those with doctoral degree exhibited high level of organizational commitment scale and subscales than master and bachelor holders. These findings support the findings of Sheikh et al., (2005), Mathieu and Zajac (1990), Bakan et al., (2011) and Salami’s (2008) findings in Nigeria among employees working in public and private organizations. Similarly, Khatibi et al., (2009) reported that there were significant differences between employees with post graduate degree and employees with graduate degrees in organizational commitment in National Olympic and Paralympics Academy in Iran. Employees with Post graduate degree showed more
commitment in affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment than employees with graduate degrees. The result of this study is inconsistent with the findings of Ahmad and Abu Bakar’s (2003) findings in Malaysia among white collar workers, Khamis’s (2002) results in Malaysia among secondary teachers, Chuhtai and Zafar’s (2006) findings in Pakistan among university lecturers, Bakalis (2008), Kwon (2004) and Lim (2003) in Korea who reported inverse relationship between education level and organizational commitment. There could be several explanations of these kinds of findings. One possible explanation is that, since the organizational position of TVCs have been upgraded to be a branch of Ministry of Sciences, Research and Technology; most of the doctorate lecturers are inclined and encouraged to continue the rest of their profession in TVCs.

In terms of age, the findings revealed that respondents in the age of 50 and more had greater overall organizational commitment than the other age groups. These results supported the findings of Tseng (2010) in Taiwan, Salami (2008) in Nigeria, Cristina’s (2009) study among university lecturers in Spain, and Wang (2005) in China. The findings of the present study in overall organizational commitment were also in line with Meyer and Allen’s (1991) statement who stated that those who are older have a strong sense of commitment towards their organizations because of the fact that they are more mature and have longer experience. Another possible explanation is that older aged groups have greater degree of commitment to the TVCs goals and values and wish to preserve relationship in their colleges. It can also be that respondents who are in 50 years age and more have less job options than respondents in the age of less than 29, 30-39 and 40-49 years. This is a fact that lecturers in 50 years age and more may hardly be chosen for other institutions or other business sectors. Another
important issue is that younger and older lecturers consider work and self variously. The early years are different in terms of establishment, whereas later years are associated with issues such as feeling, employment and life. However, Joolideh and Yeshodhara’s (2008) findings among high school teachers in India and Iran, Lim (2003) in Korea, Chughtai and Zafar’s (2006) study among university teachers in Pakistan, Gormely’s (2010) findings among nurses and Khatibi et al., (2009) findings in Iran revealed inverse relationship between aged groups and affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment.

The significant differences in continuance commitment between the age group 30-39 and less than 29 years were supported by findings of Wang (2005) in China. Also, the findings revealed that age group 50 and more were more committed than age group less than 29 years and age group 40-49 years in continuance commitment. This result was also in line with the findings of Wang (2005), and Tseng (2010) in Taiwan who found age groups more than 50 were more committed than age groups less than 30 years in continuance commitment. One probable reason to this finding is related to the fact that older age groups have much higher “have to stay” commitment to the colleges because they have a great opportunity costs if transferring to other colleges while lecturers in age group less than 29 years do not have so much time invested in the colleges (Meyer and Allen, 1991). As a result, the higher the lecturers’ age, the lower the possibility of leaving the colleges in TVCs.

For teaching experience, data showed no significant differences among four groups (< 5 years, 6-15, 16-25, and 26 years or more) in affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment. Davoodipoor et al., (2008) findings among
administrators and teachers in Mashad guidance schools in Iran support the results of the current study. Whereas this result is not in line with Koohestani and Shojaeefar’s (2007) findings among lecturers in Mashad colleges in Iran, and Mirzamohammadi and Abdolmakeki’s (2009) results among Shahed University Non-board of employees in Iran. The findings revealed that teaching experience was not an indicator of making lecturers committed to their colleges in TVCs. One possible explanation could be due to that teaching experience has not been considered as a promotion factor in transferring lecturers to the Ministry of Higher Education.

To conclude, educational institutions such as colleges, universities and schools should have teaching staffs that are committed to their organizations. In other words “the vitality of all educational organizations lies in the willingness of teachers to contribute to the development of their organizations”, (Joolideh and Yeshodhara, 2008, p. 134). Lecturers strong in organizational commitment are more interested and motivated in whatever they do and can involve themselves enthusiastically. If lecturers teaching in colleges teach and work seriously, there will be all round development of colleges.

4.9.4 Learning Organization Dimensions and Organizational Commitment Relationship

The fourth objective of this study was to determine relationships between learning organization dimensions (independent variable) and organizational commitment (dependent variable) in TVCs. Pearson correlation was employed to measure the relationships between learning organization dimensions, individual, team,
organizational learning and affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment.

In terms of affective commitment and based on Cohen (1988), Tian and Wilding (2008) guidelines as stated by Tseng (2010), a positive significant relationship was found to exist between seven learning organization dimensions and affective commitment. The earlier studies also reported positive and significant relationship between learning organization dimensions and affective commitment. The result of the current study was supported by Joo and Lim’s (2009) findings, Ahmad and Abu Bakar’s (2003) results in Malaysia and Dirani’s (2007) study who reported the relationships between learning organizational dimensions and affective commitment as positive moderate significant except dialogue and inquiry which has been reported weak relationship. One possible explanation to discrepancy of the results of the present study with Dirani’s (2007) study can be accredited to the feature of service employees’ job. Employees in banking sector are usually dealt with subjects such as loan, account number and money, whereas lecturers spend most of their times in guiding, teaching, and consultation with students in educational institutions. Another possible explanation is that the relationships among people in educational institutions is more stable, permanent, and friendly (Mohsenpoor, 2004) than non-educational organizations.

In conclusion, findings showed that to improve changes in lecturers’ affective commitment such as strong feeling of belonging to the colleges, feeling of emotionally attached to colleges and being happy to spend more time with the colleges, open talk
and communication, trust and respect, and individual level of learning (dialogue and inquiry and continuous learning) must be supported and provided in TVCs.

In terms of the relationship between learning organization dimensions and continuance commitment, all earlier studies showed positive and significant relationships which were consistent with the findings of this study, though the only difference was related to the power of the association between the variables under study. The positive weak relationships of learning organization dimensions in the current study with continuance commitment were supported by Wang’s (2005) findings in China and Hsu’s (2009) results in Taiwan who reported positive correlation among seven learning organization dimensions and continuance commitment varied from $r = .18$ to $.36$ which is weak and more or less consistent with findings of this study. Similarly to affective commitment, Ahmad and Abu Bakar’s (2003) findings regarding the association between training and organizational commitment confirmed positive moderate significant relationships between training and continuance commitment which were consistent with findings of the current study. One reason of being small relationship between learning organization dimensions and continuance commitment in this study and the other studies mentioned above is related to the nature of continuance commitment in organizations. The organizational commitment literature imply that employees in organizations have affective, normative, and continuance commitment respectively (Demiray and Curabay, 2008). In conclusion, the findings revealed that learning organization practices in TVCs impact more on “want to” or “desired oriented” than “need to” or “necessity oriented”.
Supported by the other findings, the findings of the current study revealed that there was significant positive small relationship between learning organization dimensions and normative commitment in TVCs. Similar to affective and continuance commitment, the findings of Ahmad and Abu Bakar (2003) confirmed the relationship between training and normative commitment which was consistent with the findings of this study. The findings of this study pertaining the relationship between individual, team, organizational learning and normative commitment revealed positive and small to moderate relationship, which were in line with Atak and Erturgut (2010) findings in Turkey. The organizational commitment literature showed few studies regarding the study of normative commitment. Meyer and Parfyonova (2010) also stated that among organizational commitment components, normative commitment “has received the least attention” (p. 283).

The positive, high relationship between overall learning organization dimensions and overall organizational commitment \((r = .683, p = .000)\) in this study support the findings of Ahmad and Abu Bakar’s (2003) findings in Malaysia and Joo and Lim (2009) in China. Among the seven learning organization dimensions, Pearson correlation score for “inquiry and dialogue” dimension was found to have positive, strong relationship \((r = .513, p = .000)\) with overall organizational commitment. This is followed by strategic leadership with positive moderate significant \((r = .421, p = .000)\) relationship with overall organizational commitment in TVCs. The high positive correlation of individual learning \((r = .551, p = .000)\) and organizational learning \((r = .627, p = .000)\) with overall organizational commitment were also supported by Atak and Erturgut’s (2010) results in Turkey.
As a whole, the findings show that lecturers in TVCs are committed to their colleges as a result of their emotional attachment and identification with their colleges more than their consideration of costs and moral obligation. In addition, the findings indicated that learning organization practices enhance affective commitment of lecturers more than their continuance and normative commitment in TVCs. The results implied that educational leaders in TVCs can play a fundamental role in supporting and guiding learning organization dimensions by creating a learning climate and act as coaches and mentors to improve the relationship between learning organization dimensions and lecturers’ organizational commitment.

4.9.5 Predictors of Organizational Commitment

The fifth objective of this study was to determine the significant predictor/s of affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment from seven learning organization dimensions. The regression analysis showed that three dimensions of dialogue and inquiry, strategic leadership and continuous learning accounted jointly for 22.1% of variance in affective commitment. This suggested that to improve changes and development in affective commitment in TVCs, dialogue and inquiry, strategic leadership and continuous learning dimensions must be supported. According to Watkins and Marsick (1993, 1996), continuous learning and dialogue and inquiry represent culture and organization value. Organizations with a strong culture and value will enhance organizational commitment by employees’ development (Bhatnagar, 2007) and continuous learning opportunities (Ng et al., 2006). In addition, the findings showed that lecturers were more committed affectively in TVCs where academic administrators provide and support a climate of
interaction, open communication, and respect diverse viewpoints together with charismatic, knowledgeable and trustworthy leaders who provide and support continuous learning opportunities.

The study found four variable of dialogue and inquiry, embedded system, strategic leadership and system connection jointly accounted for 19.1% of variance in continuance commitment, indicating that to develop and enhance continuance commitment these four dimensions must be supported in TVCs. The findings indicated that lecturers were more committed in TVCs where a respectful, trust, and open talk without fear was present together with conditions of knowledge sharing and the availability of resources either physical or virtual. In addition, embedded system, strategic leadership and system connection as predictors of continuance commitment imply that lecturers were more committed to a model with two-way communication system such as suggestion systems, and open meetings with balancing between work and family affairs. The existing literature on organizational commitment has not yet established the contributions of seven learning organization dimensions on continuance commitment.

Analysis showed that embedded system and system connection dimensions jointly contribute 16.7% variance of normative commitment. The findings show that to improve normative commitment these two dimensions must be supported in TVCs. Findings depicted that lecturers were committed normatively to a model where educational administrators provide knowledge networks and communications of practice, and establish opportunities of knowledge management systems. In addition, findings indicated that lecturers revealed normative commitment when their colleges
made possible reciprocal communications among various parts of the colleges in one hand and supported lecturers mutual communication and relation with other lecturers from other colleges to share their experiences on the other hand.

The perceived overall organizational commitment model revealed that continuous learning, dialogue and inquiry, embedded system, empowerment, system connection and strategic leadership jointly explain 50.3% of variance in perceived overall organizational commitment in TVCs. The findings suggested that to improve and enhance overall organizational commitment, continuous learning, dialogue and inquiry (individual learning) as well as embedded system, empowerment, system connection and strategic leadership (organizational learning) must be supported.

The findings revealed that TVCs which help lecturers to view their problems as an opportunity for learning, discuss mistakes in order to learn from them, treat each other with respect, listen to other views before speaking, and give honest feedback to each other can develop and flourish overall organizational commitment. In addition, lecturers revealed more commitment when educational administrators of colleges provide ongoing learning opportunities, provide needed information, and decentralize decision making process in TVCs. Moreover, lecturers were more committed when TVCs provided mechanisms and techniques for measuring current and previous performance to evaluate programs and provide lessons for improvement and development of students’ learning as the most important customers of colleges together.
It was revealed that collaboration as the only component of team learning did not have contribution to affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment in this study. This shows that lecturers in TVCs have given more priority for learning and development at individual and organization level of learning than team level of learning. Existing all components of individual learning level (dialogue and inquiry and continuous learning) and organization level of learning (embedded system, empowerment, system connection and strategic leadership) in predicting affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment approved that team learning is not as important as individual and organizational learning in TVCs. This finding is consistent with the learning culture governing in higher education institutions. According to White and Weathersby (2005), “academics are generally highly individualistic in their work”, “seek to reach personal development” (Bui and Baruch, 2010), and “much of their post-degree learning is informal” (Knight et al., 2006). Bui and Baruch (2010) also stated that “universities do not often have a good reputation of team learning and working”, “people with a high educational background tend to build up individual self-confidence and self-efficacy” (Baruch and Hall, 2004). Bui and Baruch (2010) also indicated that team learning is a real challenge in universities. Dearlove (2002) also stated that academics recognize no boss, choosing to see themselves as individual entrepreneurs, display little desire for collective actions. Moreover, in higher education institutions, it is the responsibilities of individuals to develop themselves professionally.

Furthermore, the roots of lack of collectivism in Iranian culture may perhaps stem from the governing educational system. In Iranian educational system, the relationship between student and teacher is like employer and employee. Educational system
follows a traditional system. In other words, people are used to having a respected figure (teacher) who expects to know everything. Thus, in such an education situation, students grow up to listen and take notes. They are not expected to participate, work cooperatively, and discuss or challenge the teachers’ ideas and views whether individually or in groups (Mohsenpoor, 2004).
4.10 Summary

This chapter presented the findings of the study. First, it was revealed that majority of respondents were male, married, part time, and had master degree in TVCs. Second, lecturers’ perception on overall learning organization dimensions showed at moderate level. Three dimensions of continuous learning, dialogue and inquiry and strategic leadership were at high level, whereas collaboration, embedded system, system connection and empowerment were found to be at moderate level. Third, lecturers’ perception on overall organizational commitment was found to be at moderate level, whereas lecturers’ affective commitment was at high level. Lecturers’ perception on normative and continuance commitment was found to be at moderate level. Fourth, no significant differences were observed in affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment by marital status and teaching experiences. Significant differences were found to be in affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment by employment type and education level. Fifth, findings showed a positive moderate and significant relationship between overall learning organization dimensions and affective, continuance and normative commitment, whereas the relationship between overall learning organization dimensions and overall organizational commitment was found to be positive and high. Sixth, the regression analysis indicated that all learning organization dimensions including; continuous learning, dialogue and inquiry, embedded system, empowerment, system connection and strategic leadership were significant predictors of overall organizational commitment except collaboration.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter begins with a summary of the study followed by conclusions based on findings of the study. Contributions of the study, implications for research, recommendations for practice and future research were also offered.

5.1 Summary

The literature review revealed few theoretical and empirical studies on the relationship between learning organization dimensions and organizational commitment. In addition, to the researcher’s knowledge there were no empirical studies to show relationship between these two models in Iranian organizational context. Therefore, to fill the gap of empirical and theoretical knowledge and to explore relationships between lecturers’ perception of learning organization dimensions with affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment to help administrators in TVCs to manage their colleges and lecturers more effectively were purposes of the current study.

Specifically, the objectives of the study were to:

1. Determine the levels of learning organization dimensions as perceived by lecturers.
2. Determine the levels of affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment as perceived by lecturers.
3. Determine significant differences in lecturers’ affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment based on selected demographic variables (age, gender, marital status, teaching experience, employment type, level of education, and monthly income).

4. Determine relationships between learning organization dimensions (continuous learning, dialogue and inquiry, collaboration, embedded system, system connection, empowerment and strategic leadership) and affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment.

5. Determine the predictors of affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment.

Watkins and Marsick’s (1993) learning organization dimensions model and organizational commitment model proposed by Allen and Meyer (1996) were used as theoretical framework of the study. Watkins and Marsick’s model of learning organization dimensions include: 1) create continuous learning opportunities (continuous learning); 2) promote dialogue and inquiry (dialogue and inquiry); 3) encourage collaboration and team learning (collaboration); 4) establish systems to capture and share learning (embedded system); 5) empower people towards a collective vision (empowerment); 6) connect the organization to its environment (system connection); 7) leaders model and support learning (strategic leadership).

Watkins and Marsick (1993) stated that in a learning organization, learning takes place at three levels: individual, team and organizational level.

The organizational commitment model proposed by Allen and Meyer (1996) include: 1) affective commitment; 2) continuance commitment; and 3) normative
commitment. A quantitative survey method was employed to collect data to answer fourteen research questions. To select the respondents, proportional random sampling method and simple random sampling method were employed. The target population was lecturers in 22 colleges in four provinces of Fars, Khouzestan, Boushehr, and Kohgiloya and Boyerahmad in Iran.

The survey instruments were adapted from Watkins and Marsick’s (1997) Learning Organization Dimensions Questionnaire and Allen and Meyer’s (1996) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire. The 310 survey questionnaires were delivered to deputy dean of the respected colleges to deliver among identified lecturers. 295 completed questionnaires were returned. To analyze data, mean, standard deviation, frequency and percent were utilized for analysis of the first two research questions. ANOVA and t-test were utilized to analyze data concerning differences in affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment by demographics. To determine the relationships between learning organization dimensions and organizational commitment, Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients was employed. The multiple regression analysis using Enter method was employed to identify the predictors of perceived affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment.

5.2 Findings

5.2.1 Demographic Factors

Demographic variables revealed that majority of the respondents were male (70.5%), married (79.3%), and had master degree (75.9%). In addition, the results indicated
that majority of lecturers were part time (58.3%), belong to age group 40-49 (42.4%), had teaching experience between 20-29 years (40.0%) and had monthly income more than $ 800 (58.6%).

5.2.2 The Perception level of Learning Organization Dimensions

From the descriptive analysis, it was revealed that lecturers’ perception on dialogue and inquiry, strategic leadership and continuous learning were in high level, whereas their perception on collaboration, embedded system, empowerment and system connection were in moderate level. Overall learning organization dimensions were found to be at moderate level. In addition, in terms of individual, team and organizational learning levels, findings revealed that lecturers’ perception on individual learning was at high level, whereas their perception on team and organizational learning were at moderate level.

5.2.3 The Perception Level of Organizational Commitment

Findings showed that lecturers’ perception on affective commitment was at high level, whereas their perception on continuance and normative commitment were at moderate level. Also, overall organizational commitment of lecturers was found to be at moderate level.
5.2.4 Organizational Commitment by Demographics

Significant differences between male and female respondents were revealed to exist in normative commitment, of which male respondents showed a higher level of normative commitment than did females. Also, there were significant differences between full and part time respondents in organizational commitment scale and subscales in which the findings showed a higher level for the former than the later. No significant differences were observed between single and married lecturers in organizational commitment scale and subscales. There were significant differences between lecturers with < $ 799 monthly income and lecturers with > $ 800 monthly income, in affective and overall organizational commitment, of which lecturers with > $ 800 monthly income showed a higher level of affective and overall organizational commitment than lecturers with < $ 799 monthly income in TVCs. There were significant differences among doctorate, master and bachelor respondents in affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment, of which doctorate respondents showed a higher level of affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment than master and bachelor respondents. Respondents with master degree also showed a higher level of continuance and overall organizational commitment than respondents with bachelor level qualification. No significant differences were observed in means of teaching experiences (< 5 years, 6-15, 16-25, and > 26 years) among lecturers in their perception towards affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment. There were significant differences among age groups in continuance and overall organizational commitment, of which respondents in age category of 30-39, and more than 50 years showed a higher level of continuance commitment than
respondents with less than 29 years and respondents in age group of 40-49 years. Age group 50 years and more showed a higher level of overall organizational commitment than the other age groups (< 29, 30-39, and 40-49 years).

5.2.5 Learning Organization Dimensions and Organizational Commitment Relationship

The findings indicated that there was a positive and significant relationship between learning organization dimensions and affective commitment. A moderate, positive and significant relationship was found to exist between dialogue and inquiry and affective commitment. Similarly, the relationship between strategic leadership dimension and affective commitment was positive, moderate and significant.

Similar to affective commitment, there was positive and significant relationship between learning organization dimensions and continuance commitment. A moderate and positive relationship was found to exist between dialogue and inquiry and continuance commitment. Likewise, the findings showed that there was a positive, small and significant relationship between learning organization dimensions and normative commitment.

The findings revealed a positive and significant relationship between learning organization dimensions and overall organizational commitment in TVCs. The findings showed a high, positive and significant correlation between dialogue and inquiry dimension and overall organizational commitment. Findings indicated
positive and significant relationships between individual, team, organizational learning levels and organizational commitment scale and subscales in TVCs.

### 5.2.6 Organizational Commitment Predictors

Using Enter regression analysis method, this study found that continuous learning, dialogue and inquiry and strategic leadership dimensions were significant predictors of affective commitment. Four dimensions of embedded system, dialogue and inquiry, strategic leadership and system connection were found to be predictors of continuance commitment. Embedded system and system connection dimensions were found to be significant predictors of normative commitment. Findings indicated that all learning organization dimensions except collaboration were significant predictors of overall organizational commitment in TVCs.

### 5.3 Conclusions

The current study, employing western concepts and instruments, explored relationships between learning organization dimensions and organizational commitment in TVCs in Iran. It yields several important results and contributes to filling an empirical and conceptual gap in the organizational literature nationally and internationally. Based on the findings, the following conclusions have been drawn:

1. Findings revealed that lecturers’ perception on continuous learning was at high level. This suggested that lecturers have the opportunity of discussing mistakes, sharing knowledge and skills with their colleagues, consider
problems as opportunities for learning and active listening are encouraged in TVCs.

2. The results indicated that lecturers’ perception in dialogue and inquiry was at high level. Therefore, it can be concluded that lecturers treat each other with respect, spend time building trust with each other, benefit from various viewpoints, and give open and honest feedback to each other.

3. Collaboration dimension was found to be at moderate level based on lecturers’ perception in TVCs. This indicates lecturers’ restriction in utilizing others’ views and ideas in discussions and decisions, and limitations of group dynamics and team building in TVCs.

4. Embedded system dimension was found to be at moderate level in TVCs. It can be the result of inadequate systems and technology of knowledge management, limitation in appropriate of sharing information in utilizing lecturers’ knowledge and skills.

5. Findings revealed that empowerment dimension was at moderate level based on lecturers’ perception in TVCs. This can be the result of not encouraging lecturers to take initiatives and design their work, great control on utilizing resources, and lack of coordination among various parts of colleges.

6. System connection dimension was revealed to be at moderate level based on lecturers’ perception in TVCs. It can be concluded that TVCs are not
involved with their local and national communities, have not prepared necessary facilities to benefit from system theories, and limitations in paying attention to global effects on lecturers’ work.

7. The findings revealed lecturers’ perception at high level in strategic leadership in TVCs. This indicates that leaders in TVCs support lecturers’ request for learning opportunities, guide and instruct those they direct, and provide learning opportunities.

8. Individual learning level was found to be at high level based on lecturers’ perception, whereas team and organizational learning were at moderate level. Therefore, it can be concluded that in TVCs lecturers had more opportunity in individual learning practices than organizational and team learning.

9. The results indicated that lecturers’ perception on affective commitment was at high level. This indicates that lecturers are psychologically attached, feel happy and have a strong sense of belonging to TVCs. In addition, they consider colleges’ problems as their own and working in TVCs has much personal meaning for them.

10. Findings revealed that lecturers’ perception on continuance commitment was at moderate level. It can be concluded that lecturers may leave the colleges if they have another option, remaining with TVCs is not a matter of necessity, and the scarcity of available alternatives may prevent them to leave their colleges.
11. The results also showed that lecturers’ perception on normative commitment was at moderate level. This indicates that lecturers do not feel strong obligation to remain with colleges, their staying in the colleges is not because of the people in colleges, and they would not feel guilty if quit their colleges.

12. Male lecturers showed more commitment normatively than female lecturers in TVCs. This can be the result of male oriented in TVCs since majority of the lecturers in TVCs are male.

13. Full time lecturers were found to be more committed in affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment than part time lecturers in TVCs. This indicates that staff category of tenure as a significant factor is influencing commitment.

14. Findings indicated that those who earn > $ 800 and more monthly income showed higher affective and overall organizational commitment than those who earn < $ 799 in TVCs. This indicates that monthly income is a significant factor in making lecturers committed to their colleges.

15. No significant differences were revealed in organizational commitment scale and subscales towards marital status and teaching experiences in TVCs. It can be concluded that teaching experience and marital status were not significant indicators of lecturers’ commitment to their colleges in TVCs.
16. Education level was found to be a significant indicator in making lecturers committed to their colleges. Those who were doctorate showed higher affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment than master and bachelor degree holders in TVCs. This indicates that education level is a significant factor in making lecturers committed to their colleges.

17. Master degree holders showed higher continuance and overall organizational commitment than bachelor lecturers in TVCs. This shows that education level is a significant factor for master lecturers not to leave colleges and be emotionally attached to their colleges.

18. Age was revealed to be a significant factor in making lecturers committed to their colleges in continuance and overall organizational commitment in TVCs. Those who were 50 years and more showed higher continuance commitment than those who were < 29 years and 40-49 years. This indicates that lecturers with 50 years age and more had inclination to remain in their colleges than the other age groups.

19. Findings indicated that lecturers in age group 50 years and more had higher overall organizational commitment than < 29 years, 30-39, and 40-49 years in TVCs. This shows that lecturers in age 50 years and more “want to”, “need to”, and “have to”, to remain with their colleges than the other age groups.
20. Demographically, the findings demonstrated that lecturers who earned $800 and more monthly income, were in age 50 years and more, had doctorate degree, and were full time, were more psychologically attached to their colleges, consider their colleges problems as their own, being happy to continue with their colleges, feel being indebted to colleges and have a sense of moral obligation to continue with TVCs.

21. Learning organization dimensions are positively and significantly correlated with organizational commitment scale and subscales, indicating that practicing learning organization dimensions improve lecturers’ organizational commitment scale and subscales in TVCs in Iran.

22. It was found that the accessibility of learning at three levels of individual, team and organization were positively and significantly organizational commitment scale and subscales. It can be concluded that practice learning at three levels of individual, team and organization will enhance lecturers’ organizational commitment empirically in TVCs.

23. Dialogue and inquiry dimension was revealed to have positive, high and significant relationship with overall organizational commitment. It can be concluded that lecturers are more committed in an environment in which people give open and honest feedback, state their views, treat each other with respect and spend time building trust with each other.
24. Empowerment dimension was found to have small, positive and significant relationship with organizational commitment scale and subscales. On the other hand, lecturers were not committed to the opinion of taking calculated risks, and they were encouraged to accept responsibility for what they decide and impact on their work.

25. The study suggested three dimensions out of seven as the predictors of affective commitment in TVCs. These dimensions were dialogue and inquiry, continuous learning and strategic leadership. It can be concluded that to commit lecturers affectively to their colleges, leaders of TVCs should provide an exchange atmosphere, continuous learning culture and training environment, share up-to-date information with lecturers pertaining mission, vision and future direction, encourage lecturers’ success, and provide easy access to electronic and non-electronic resources.

26. Findings showed four dimensions of dialogue and inquiry, embedded system, system connection and strategic leadership as the predictors of continuance commitment. This indicates that top management of TVCs should try to improve the culture of trust and respectful in colleges, support and provide internal and external communication systems, define values explicitly, look for learning opportunities continually and coach those they lead to preserve the core resources, “lecturers”.

27. The study showed two dimensions of embedded system and system connection as predictors of normative commitment. This result shows that to
commit lecturers normatively to their colleges leaders in TVCs should provide and enhance two-way communication, support lecturers to get the required information as quickly as possible, provide systems of measuring gaps between current and expected results, help lecturers balance between work and family for instance family leave profits, and considers the impacts of their decisions on lecturers’ morale.

28. Finally, the study showed that dialogue and inquiry, embedded system, strategic leadership, system connection, continuous learning and empowerment are antecedents of lecturers’ overall organizational commitment in TVCs. It can be concluded that these dimensions are critical factors in influencing emotional linkage to the colleges, moral obligation to remain in colleges, and leaving the colleges.

5.4 Contribution to the Theory

Previous studies have shown that learning organization dimensions impact organizational commitment mostly in the West. The results of this study have shown that TVCs also benefit from practicing learning organization dimensions. In addition, the findings of the study revealed that individual level of learning, team learning level and organizational level of learning are imperative in improvement of organizational commitment. Moreover, this study confirmed the applicability of Watkins and Marsick’s learning organization dimensions in influencing organizational commitment scale and subscales of lecturers in TVCs in Iran as an Eastern country. Specifically, dialogue and inquiry, embedded systems, strategic leadership, system connection,
continuous learning and empowerment were revealed as significant predictors of overall organizational commitment.

This study also supports the learning organization model by offering empirical evidence in an educational context in an eastern country. The present study is significant in exploring the relationships of learning organization dimensions with all components of organizational commitment (affective, continuance and normative) in one hand, and determining the predictors of affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment based on learning organization dimensions on the other hand for the first time. Furthermore, significant and positive relationships between learning organization dimensions and organizational commitment support commitment theories that learning in organizations can be considered as an antecedent of developing, flourishing and enhancing employees commitment. This study added to the body of organizational literature on the relationship between the concepts of learning organization applied through the learning organization dimensions and organizational commitment by empirical study in educational setting.

In summary, despite various researches in relation to determinants and predictors of organizational commitment, no research has been found to show learning organization dimensions as commitment-producing strategies in educational setting in Iran. Therefore, this study is a unique study in educational settings to show a new path of future research in relation to learning organization dimensions and organizational commitment.
5.5 Implications for Research

Many researchers and scholars believed that learning organization literature is descriptive in nature (Garvin, 2000; Wang, 2005; Dirani, 2009). This has made the theoretical nature of learning organization to be the focus of attention for the past three decades. In addition, few empirical researches regarding learning organization dimensions and organizational outcomes such as organizational commitment has been reported in the past. The lack of enough theoretical and empirical research in relation to learning organization dimensions and organizational commitment have made uncertainty and doubt among organizational developers to use and perform these two constructs and associated practices in organizations.

In addition, this study enriches the body of knowledge on human resource development in educational settings. To the researcher’s knowledge, few researches can be found in Iran exploring theoretical and empirical of both learning organization concepts and organizational commitment and their linkage. This study extends the theoretical and empirical research and offers a more inclusive empirical view on how learning organization dimensions were presented in TVCs in Iran.

The individual, team and organizational learning levels have been highlighted to determine the practices and the relationships of three levels of learning in educational setting with organizational commitment. This research can reduce concerns and doubts of some scholars and practitioners on the theoretical and empirical impact of learning organization in improving commitment among employees. The significant statistical models developed by this study may cause more interests to perform new
researches in this regard. The present study adds and provides valuable information for educational leaders and administrators and researchers in the field of organization development.

The practical results of this study afford a firm foundation for future research and commitment in organizations. Many have argued that the concept of learning organization and organizational commitment seem to be in the infant phase in the developing countries; thus, this study would develop learning research, mostly in Iranian educational institutions. The results of this study afford important findings for educational leaders to appreciate the current status and associations in learning organization dimensions and organizational commitment in organizations, particularly, the TVCs in Iran.

It is suggested that managers and administrators consider organizational commitment as additional outcomes of learning and development activities. The results also suggest that educational administrators and managers adapt a broader perspective toward learning outcomes. Furthermore, this study would contribute in creating a basic theoretical foundation for the development of learning organization in education industry, and provide a practical road map in the development of organizational commitment in educational settings. Two questionnaires of learning organization dimensions and organizational commitment can be considered as valuable managerial tools to help educational leaders and managers to diagnose problems, weaknesses, and strengths of their organizations.
5.6 Recommendations for Practice

This study provides various practical consequences. The results of this study made available important information for educational leaders, policy makers and human resource developers to design programs on how to motivate, encourage and develop standards of human resource development with the emphasis on improving, developing and increasing lecturers’ commitment to TVCs in Iran. Based on the findings and conclusions, some practical recommendations are proposed as follows:

1. Continuous learning opportunities represent culture and value of the organization (Watkins and Marsick, 1993) which provides autonomy to employees to do their work with minimal control (Nonaka, 1994). To improve continuous learning opportunities, TVCs can design various programs such as analyzing current and future needed skills through workshops, seminars and group meetings; rewarding and supporting lecturers who write books, publish articles, invent and apply new teaching-learning strategies; providing an incentive system to increase salary on the basis of developing and improving individual knowledge and skills; and establishing a minimum level of training for example 100 hours per year for promotion.

2. Educational leaders, human resource developers in TVCs should focus on the key dimension of dialogue and inquiry since this dimension was found to be in the highest rank and having the strongest positive linear relationship with organizational commitment scale and subscales. Therefore, educational leaders in TVCs should take into consideration time for reflection and
feedback, active listening, discussion, rewarding respectful behaviors, setting norms of trustworthy behavior as strategies to promote and develop more the inquiry and dialogue dimension continuously.

3. Rewarding jointly performed outcomes, encouraging lecturers to express their views, training in group dynamics, rewarding groups for achievement as teams, encouraging one-to-one communication among faculty lecturers are some strategies which can be performed in TVCs to enhance, and promote collaboration.

4. Embedded system dimension was revealed to be at moderate level based on lecturers’ perception in TVCs. Accordingly, educational leaders should establish knowledge networks, knowledge management systems, systems of measurement performance, and systems for evaluating and assessing learning to improve and develop this dimension.

5. College administrators should be aware that empowering teaching staffs need new strategies in globalized era in comparison with previous times. To empower lecturers, TVCs administrators can design programs for increasing lecturers’ professional knowledge, status (feeling respectful), and self-efficacy, by providing conditions for lecturers’ participation in decision making process regarding scheduling, and curriculum development to flourish the feeling of respectful among lecturers. Educational administrators require creating conditions for lecturers to perceive that they have a high level of capability and experience high position and self-respect.
6. Ministry of Higher Education should provide, support and encourage lecturers’ participation in seminars, and programs with the aim of increasing their professional knowledge and skills. It is supposed that as lecturers experience opportunities of professional development and acquire much confidence in their abilities to accomplish high goals, their status will raise as well. In addition, feeling empowerment and self-efficacy give lecturers a sense of attachment to the colleges psychologically. Moreover, administrators can decentralize decision making process, give control over the resources that lecturers require to do for their work, creating alignment of visions among work groups and emphasizing a culture of experiment not a culture that leads to conservative behaviors.

7. One basic responsibility of educational leaders in globalization era is to provide conditions of internal and external communication in their institutions. Connections with communities necessitate global thinking. According to Senge (1990), system thinking “moves people from seeing parts to seeing whole” (p. 135). This dimension can be promoted through programs such as balancing work and family by family leave benefits strategy and thinking globally by providing global information resources such as internet, intranet and teleconference. In addition, employing the mechanisms of information sharing between departments, bulletin boards, regular meetings and creating linkage between colleges and the local community are recommended.
8. Leadership dimension was found to be at high level based on lecturers’ perception in TVCs. Therefore, leaders and educational administrators should try to preserve and improve this dimension by performing strategies such as providing appropriate resources for development, making easy access to needed information, make leadership resources accessible on line, encourage continuous learning and empower lecturers to carry out the colleges’ vision.

9. Individual learning level showed to be at high level based on lecturers’ perception in TVCs. Accordingly, to improve and preserve the condition of high learning level at individual learning, TVCs leaders can provide sabbatical leave for lecturers to develop their knowledge and skills.

10. Lecturers’ affective commitment was revealed to be at high level. In addition, it was found that practicing learning organization dimensions in TVCs has positive relationship with lecturers’ affective commitment. Therefore, academic administrators can provide continuous learning opportunities through internet and intranet, workshops, seminars, group projects and support them financially to preserve and promote their affective commitment to colleges.

11. It was found that lecturers’ continuance commitment was at moderate level. Also, it was revealed that dialogue and inquiry, embedded system and strategic leadership had the most correlation with continuance commitment. Accordingly, TVCs administrators can perform strategies such as training in dialogue, rewarding respectful behavior, establishing knowledge management
systems, providing resources available for learning, mentoring and coaching to further lecturers’ continuance commitment.

12. Lecturers’ normative commitment was at moderate level. In addition, it was found that its relationships with learning organization dimensions were positive. Thus, TVCs academic administrators can conduct strategies such as on the job training programs, supporting requests for learning, and align values of work environment with family values to promote lecturers’ normative commitment.

13. The findings indicated that male had higher normative commitment than females. So, educational administrators ought to try to enhance females’ normative commitment level by building a proper learning environment, creating incentive opportunities for encouragement and training without having gender bias. Administrators can design plans for women to expand their management ability and leadership to promote their normative commitment.

14. Full time lecturers showed higher level than part time lecturers in organizational commitment scale and subscales in TVCs. One possible reason for part time lecturers being less committed than full time lecturers is maybe because of being temporary. Therefore, educational administrators should provide training programs and necessary facilities for part time lecturers to be promoted from part time to full time.
15. The findings showed no significant differences by teaching experiences and marital status in organizational commitment scale and subscales. Therefore, administrators of TVCs should provide and support improvement of learning organization dimensions culture by providing systems for instance on the job learning programs, internet and intranet, desktop learning, sharing information, mentoring and coaching those they lead, without bias and based on teaching experiences and marital status.

16. Educational level showed to be significant in organizational commitment scale and subscales. Doctorate degree holders indicated higher level of organizational commitment scale and subscales than master and bachelor lecturers. Therefore, administrators should build individual development plans, reward learning and tying pay to knowledge and educational level for master and bachelor lecturers.

17. Master degree holders indicated higher level in affective and normative commitment than bachelor degree holders. So, educational leaders in TVCs should try to enhance bachelors’ affective and normative commitment by creating on the job training programs, learning centers, and rewarding individual learning.

18. Lecturers in the age group 50 and more showed higher continuance commitment than lecturers in less than 29 years and lecturers between 40-49 years. This means that by designing and performing programs with the focus on < 29, and 40-49 age groups, educational leaders should try to foster their
inclination to remain in TVCs more. Educational leaders can provide a learning culture together with incentive programs, providing electronic learning and conditions of lecturers’ participation in decision making process to promote commitment among these two age groups.

19. Findings revealed lecturers in age group 50 and more had higher overall organizational commitment than lecturers < 29 years, 30-39, 40-49 years in TVCs. Therefore, educational leaders should support, encourage and pay attention to the lecturers in age groups below 50 years by providing various programs such as team learning, individual learning, and continuous learning opportunities to improve their commitment to the colleges.

20. Despite positive and significant relationship, collaboration revealed moderate correlation with overall organizational commitment. This implies that improving and promoting collaboration is necessary in TVCs. Thus, TVCs administrators require providing an adequate structural support and strategy to embed collaboration into daily life of colleges systematically. This can be achieved by helping lecturers to develop procedure in accordance with the purpose of teamwork and the results which can be made as a consequence of lecturers working together. Building educational, scientific and research teams based on lecturers’ field of teaching and interest can be efficient ways to share knowledge, experience, and skills on the view that a better outcome will be accomplished by functioning together than working individually.
21. Moreover, providing conditions of exchange ideas in a national environment through teleconferences, conferences, meetings, project teams, and symposiums to bring internal and external groups together are strategies that can be performed in building the culture of team learning/collaboration in TVCs.

22. Empowerment dimension was revealed to have positive and small relationship with organizational commitment scale and subscales in TVCs. This indicates that lecturers should be participated in decision making process, be encouraged to collaborate in designing and conducting the vision of the colleges and be motivated to explore new ideas and work on group projects.

23. This study shows the importance of learning in organizations in the process of development of organizational commitment scale and subscales. Moreover, the results of this research showed that lecturers’ perception of learning organization dimensions can cultivate a feeling of belongingness, identification, and obligation with the TVCs in Iran. Therefore, educational institutions, universities and schools that would like to create higher level of commitment should try to build a culture that enhance learning in their institutions through seven learning organization dimensions.

24. The findings that show learning organization dimensions have positive relationship with and contribution in affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment have great practical importance for
human resource developers. Accordingly, a human resource development system based on these findings and the structure of TVCs should be created to promote a learning culture that the result will be a higher level of organizational commitment scale and subscales. Likewise, educational leaders together with human resource developers in colleges, and higher education institutions can use learning organization dimensions as strategies to develop lecturers’ organizational commitment.

25. The results revealed that embedded system dimension had the most correlation with and contribution in explaining the variance of continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment. Regarding this Watkins and Marsick (1993) remarked that to develop systems to share learning, key characteristics are information collection, extensive access to the information and widespread sharing of what is learned collectively and constantly. O’Nail (2003) also suggested employing suggestion systems, intranet, bulletin boards, e-mail, telephone and video conferencing as strategies to capture and share learning. Therefore, administrators of TVCs can utilize and perform high and low technology, information collection systems, reward and recognition, two way communication, and up-to-date data base of lecturers’ skills as strategies of improving this dimension.

26. Moreover, strategic leadership was found to have more association with affective and overall organizational commitment after dialogue and inquiry and have more contribution in building models than the other dimensions. Therefore, TVCs leaders and educational administrators can coach and
mentor those they lead to recognize the significant issues and come up with their own solutions. They should provide resources for learning, encourage lecturers to choose actions associated with their work and modeling the value of the institutions.

5.7 Recommendations for Future Research

This study provided the foundations for future studies to increase the understanding of the roles of learning organization dimensions in globalization era in organizational successes. In addition, this study is important because the two constructs of learning organization and organizational commitment were compared for the first time in such a context in Iran. Based on the results and conclusions of this study, several commendations can be proposed for future research in organizations generally and in education sector particularly as follows:

1. Replications of this study with other samples of lecturers from other provinces and colleges in Iran to confirm the results of this study or detect factors of organizational commitment are recommended.

2. This research studied the association of learning organization dimensions with organizational commitment in educational context. More study is required to examine in depth the relations of these two constructs in other organizations and educational centers.
3. In order to support the four commitment models created in this study, future researchers are recommended to duplicate this study to entail other educational centers, universities and colleges to generalize the applicability of learning organization dimensions in Iranian contexts.

4. It is highly recommended that the relationships between these two constructs ought to be studied in other Asian countries. Maybe research done in other cultures can reveal other features of learning in organizations that are important towards commitment which have not been the focus of attention yet.

5. This study merely examined relationships between learning organization dimensions and organizational commitment without including consequences of organizational commitment. It would be worthwhile to study predictors and consequences of organizational commitment in the same manner of considering relationships between learning organization dimensions and organizational commitment for lecturers in TVCs in Iran.

6. This study showed that collaboration does not predict organizational commitment. Further research is required to investigate why this dimension of learning organization was not important in predicting organizational commitment.

7. This study has explored relationships of some demographics on organizational commitment. It would be worthwhile to examine the
relationships of other personal variables such as trust in management on organizational commitment.

8. Using factors such as organizational culture as mediator or moderator would provide more comprehensive understanding about the relationships between learning organization dimensions and organizational commitment.

9. Employing a survey instrument, data were collected using lecturers’ perception in TVCs. To provide more information, a study that could utilize different methodologies, for instance individual case studies and in-depth interviews with administrators, leaders and lecturers are recommended for comparative purposes.

10. This study was based on self-reporting data, determining lecturers’ perception in TVCs. To minimize the limitation of self-reporting data, further study is required to take into account administrators, staffs and students of TVCs.

Employees’ commitment in higher education institutions is more important than other organizations. This is because when transferring to other universities or organizations, lecturers take with them knowledge, experience and skills regarding teaching, research and learning. In addition, it has been approved that lecturers who are committed to their organizations incline to stay longer, protect organization assets and try to achieve organization goals more than who are not committed. Therefore, by providing adequate and necessary facilities in employing seven learning organization dimensions, educational leaders can improve lecturers’
affective, continuance, normative and overall organizational commitment in TVCs in Iran.
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Appendix A

Research Questionnaire

*Relationships Between learning Organization Dimensions and Organizational Commitment as perceived by lecturers in Technical and Vocational colleges in Iran*

Dear Lecturers;
I am a PhD candidate studying educational administration at the University Putra Malaysia. You are invited to participate in a research study to assess your perception on learning organization dimensions and organizational commitment in Technical and Vocational Colleges. This questionnaire consists of three parts, namely:

**Part A: Demographic Information**  
**Part B: Learning Organization Dimensions**  
**Part C: Organizational Commitment Factors**

Spare approximately 20 minutes to complete the questionnaire as best as you can. This survey will help policy makers and administrators to understand more about the relationships between learning organization dimensions and organizational commitment and design effective human resource policies. Your responses are strictly confidential. There is no right or wrong answers. Please circle (O) one of the numbers that reflects your perception best. Thank you for your kind cooperation and support.

Sincerely,

Khosrow Nazari   University Putra Malaysia  
E- mail m3.nr12@yahoo.com
**Part A: Demographic Characteristics**

Please tick (✓) the items that best describe you.

1- **Gender:**
   - Male
   - Female

2- **Marital Status:**
   - Single
   - Married

3- **Level of Education:**
   - Doctorate
   - Master
   - Bachelor

4- **Type of Employment:**
   - Full Time
   - Part Time

5- **Age:** ........... Years

6- **Total years of teaching experience:**
   ............. Years

7- **Monthly approximately income:**
   ..............
**Part B: Learning Organization Dimensions**

In this section, you are asked to think about how your college supports and uses learning at individual, team and organizational level.

Directions: Please respond to each of the following items by circling the appropriate number correspond to the right of each one. For each item, determine the degree to which this is something that is or is not true of your college. If the item refers to a practice, which rarely or never occurs, score it a [1]. If the practice is almost always true of your college or work group, score the item a five [5]. Circle the number (1 to 5) that you think is the best of your perception.

Use the following rating scale:

**Almost never** = 1  
**Seldom** = 2  
**Sometimes** = 3  
**Often** = 4  
**Almost always** = 5

### Individual Learning Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Almost never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Almost always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. In my college, lecturers openly discuss mistakes in order to learn from them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In my college, lecturers identify skills they need for future work tasks.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In my college, lecturers help each other learn.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In my college, lecturers can get money and other resources to support their learning.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In my college, lecturers are given time to support learning.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. In my college, lecturers view problems in their work as an opportunity to learn.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. In my college, lecturers are rewarded for learning. 1 2 3 4 5
8. In my college, lecturers give open and honest feedback to each other. 1 2 3 4 5
9. In my college, lecturers listen to others’ views before speaking. 1 2 3 4 5
10. In my college, lecturers are encouraged to ask "why" regardless of rank. 1 2 3 4 5
11. In my college, whenever lecturers state their view, they also ask what others think. 1 2 3 4 5
12. In my college, lecturers treat each other with respect. 1 2 3 4 5
13. In my college, lecturers spend time building trust with each other. 1 2 3 4 5

**Team Learning Levels**

14. In my college, teams/groups have the freedom to adapt their goals as needed. 1 2 3 4 5
15. In my college, teams/groups treat members as equals, regardless of rank, culture, or other differences. 1 2 3 4 5
16. In my college, teams/groups focus both on the group's task and on how well the group is working. 1 2 3 4 5
17. In my college, teams/groups revise their thinking as a result of group discussions or information collected. 1 2 3 4 5
18. In my college, teams/groups are rewarded for their achievement as a team/group. 1 2 3 4 5
19. In my college, teams/groups are confident that the college will act on their recommendations. 1 2 3 4 5

**Organizational Learning Levels**

20. My college uses two-way communication on a
regular basis, such as suggestion systems, electronic bulletin boards and open meetings.

21. My college enables lecturers to get needed information at any time quickly and easily.

22. My college maintains an up-to-date data base of lecturers’ skills.

23. My college creates systems to measure gaps between current and expected performance.

24. My college makes its lessons learned available to all lecturers.

25. My college measures the results of the time and resources spent on training.


27. My college gives lecturers choices in their work assignments.

28. My college invites lecturers to contribute to the college's vision.

29. My college gives lecturers control over the resources they need to accomplish their work.

30. My college supports lecturers who take calculated risks.

31. My college builds alignment of visions across different levels and work groups.

32. My college helps lecturers balance between work and family lives appropriately.

33. My college encourages lecturers to think from a global perspective.

34. My college encourages everyone to bring the students' views into the decision making process.

35. My college considers the impact of decisions on
lecturers’ morale.

36. My college works together with the outside community to meet mutual needs.

37. My college encourages lecturers to get answers from across the organization when solving problems.

38. In my college, leaders generally support requests for learning opportunities and training.

39. In my college, leaders share up to date information with employees about competitors, industry trends and organizational directions.

40. In my college, leaders empower others to help carry out the organization's vision.

41. In my college, leaders mentor and coach those they lead.

42. In my college, leaders continually look for opportunities to learn.

43. In my college, leaders ensure that the organization's actions are consistent with its values.
Part C: Organizational Commitment

In this section, you are asked to reflect your feeling that you might have about your college. Direction: please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by checking one of the five alternatives next to each statement. Use the following rating scale:

1 = Strongly Disagree  
2 = Disagree  
3 = Undecided  
4 = Agree  
5 = Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this college.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. I really feel as if this college’s problems are my own.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. I do not feel a strong sense of &quot;belonging&quot; to my college.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. I do not feel &quot;emotionally attached&quot; to this college.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. I do not feel like &quot;part of the family&quot; at my college.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. This college has a great deal of personal meaning for me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Staying with my college is a matter of necessity as much as a desire.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. It would be very hard for me to leave my college, even if I wanted to.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I wanted to leave my college.

53. I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this college.  
   1 2 3 4 5

54. If I had not already put so much of myself into this college, I might consider working elsewhere.  
   1 2 3 4 5

55. One of the few negative consequences of leaving this college would be the scarcity of available alternatives.  
   1 2 3 4 5

**Normative commitment:**

56. I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current employer.  
   1 2 3 4 5

57. Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my college.  
   1 2 3 4 5

58. I would feel guilty if I left my college.  
   1 2 3 4 5

59. This college deserves my loyalty.  
   1 2 3 4 5

60. I would not leave my college because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.  
   1 2 3 4 5

61. I owe a great deal to my college.  
   1 2 3 4 5
## Appendix B

### List of the panels that validated English and Persian version of Learning Organization Dimensions Questionnaire (LODQ) and Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) in Malaysia and Iran

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Azizan bin Asmuni</td>
<td>University Putra Malaysia</td>
<td>Ph.d, Agricultural Extension, Japan M.s, Agriculture, Japan B.s, agriculture, UPM</td>
<td>Adult and extension education</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rusnani bte Abd. Kadir</td>
<td>University Putra Malaysia</td>
<td>B.S., M. Sc. (Indiana), Ph.D. (Kansas State)</td>
<td>Counselor Education</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ismi Aref Bin Ismail</td>
<td>University Putra Malaysia</td>
<td>B. Ed (TESL), (Hons), (UKM), M.S, Edtention Education, (UPM), Ph.D. Continuing Education, (University of Warwick, U.K,</td>
<td>Extension and Continuing Education.</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shapour Aminshayan</td>
<td>Islamic Azad University of Shiraz</td>
<td>Ph.d, in leadership and human behavior, USIU (Alliant University) USA, MBA National University of Santiago CA, USA, BA, Economic science from Babolsar, Iran, 1979</td>
<td>Industrial Management Human Resource Development</td>
<td>Iran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jafar Jahani</td>
<td>Shiraz University</td>
<td>Ph.d. in Curriculum Development, Tehran Msc, Educational Administration, Tehran B.S. Educational Administration, Tehran University</td>
<td>Educational Planning, Curriculum Planning</td>
<td>Iran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fariborz Nikdel</td>
<td>Yasouj University</td>
<td>Ph.d, Educational Psychology, Tarbeyat Modares Tehran Msc, Educational Psychology, Tarbeyat Moalem University, Tehran B.S. Counseling, Tehran University</td>
<td>Educational Psychology,</td>
<td>Iran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goudarz Alibakhshi</td>
<td>Yasouj University</td>
<td>Ph.d in TEFL, Tarbeyat Modares University, Tehran M.A, in TEFL, Azad University, Shiraz B.A, in TEFL, Shahid Chamran University, Ahvaz</td>
<td>Testing ESP, EAP Assessment, Research Methodology, Teaching Methodology</td>
<td>Iran</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Normal P-P plot of the Regression Standardized Residuals of Affective, Continuance, Normative and Overall Organizational Commitment
Appendix D

The Scatter plots of Standardized Residual of Affective, Continuance, Normative and Overall Organizational Commitment
Appendix E

Letter of Permission to conduct the study in TVCs
Re: Permission to use LODQ for doctoral research
From: Karen E. Watkins <kwatkins@uga.edu>
To: khosrow nazari <nazari.khosrow@yahoo.com>
Cc: vmarsick@aol.com

For sure you have our permission.

Best Regards,
Karen E. Watkins
Professor
Department of Lifelong Education, Administration & Policy
The University of Georgia
406 River's Crossing
Athens, GA 30602
W 706-542-4355
C 706-340-6791

Original message ----
Date: Sun, 28 Feb 2010 23:08:35 -0800 (PST)
From: khosrow nazari <nazari.khosrow@yahoo.com>
Subject: Permission to use LODQ for doctoral research
To: kwatkins@uga.edu

Dear. Professor. Dr. Watkins
I am a PhD student in Educational Administration
in University Putra Malaysia, being advised by
Prof. Dr. Zaidatol Akmaliah Lope Pihie.
My research proposal is on the relationships
between learning organization dimensions and
organizational commitment in Technical and Vocational Colleges in Ira.
Do I have your permission to use LODQ instrument for this purpose?

Please let me know if you have any question. Thank you

Hello
Thank you for your interest in the Three-Component Model commitment measures.
You can get information about permission to use the measures from our website:
www.employeecommitment.com

Please note that the opening page will provide you with information about the use
of the measures for commercial purposes, but if you look on "Stage of Development"
and click on "click here" (about half way down the page) it will take you to
information about the Academic Package. Currently, both student and researcher
versions of are available free of charge. They include information about the
measures, permission to use them for research purposes, a Frequently Asked
Questions section, and, of course, the measures themselves.
Good luck with your research!
Best regards, Natalie Allen

Original Message
From: khosrow nazari <nazarikhosrow@yahoo.com>
Date: Wednesday, April 7, 2010 5:34 pm
Subject: PERMISSION TO USE ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT QUESTIONNAIRE
To: nallen@uwo.ca

I am a PhD student in Educational Administration in University Putra Malaysia, being advised by Prof. Dr. Zaidatol Akmaliah Lope Pihie. My research proposal is on the relationships between learning organization dimensions and organizational commitment in Technical and Vocational Colleges in Iran. Do I have your permission to use ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT instrument for this purpose? Please let me know if you have any question. Thank you
http://uk.messenger.yahoo.com
Dr. Natalie J. Allen
Professor, Dept. of Psychology
The Teamwork Lab
University of Western Ontario
London, Ontario, CANADA N6A 5C2
(519) 661-3013
nallen@uwo.ca
http://www.teamworklab.uwo.ca
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