Effect of Learning Organization Perception to the Organizational Commitment: A Comparison between Private and Public University

Refik BALAY[a]
Harran University

Abstract

This research aims to examine the impact of faculty members' learning organization perceptions to the organizational commitment through quantitative method. The study group consists of 172 faculty members working in two universities, which are private (Zirve University) and public (Harran University) ones. The research results show that faculty members working in private university have a higher level of learning organization perceptions than faculty members in public university and feel a higher level of commitment to universities which they work. Results also indicate that private university's faculty members' perceptions of learning organization dimensions with perceptions of levels of organizational commitment (except for commitment based on compliance), in all dimensions, were more positive than those working in public university. Also, the dimension of reinforced employees from learning organization dimensions negatively predicts organizational commitment based on compliance and the dimensions of team learning and shared systems positively predict the organizational commitment based on identification. Especially, the dimension of shared systems constitutes a more powerful effect on the commitment on the level of identification. Finally it was found that none of the learning organization dimensions made a significant impact on organizational commitment based on internalization.

Key Words

Learning Organization, Organizational Commitment, Private University, Public University, Faculty Members.

Learning Organizations

Organizations, not just people, must also adapt to rapidly changing circumstances. One of the management concepts developed to increase competiti-

a   Refik BALAY, Ph.D., is an associate professor in the field of Educational Administration. Organizational commitment, learning organizations, organizational creativity, conflict management, diversity management and classroom management are among his basic fields of study. Correspondence: Şanlıurfa Harran University, Faculty of Education Department of Educational Sciences, Osmanbey Campus 63200 Şanlıurfa. E-mail: refikbalay@hotmail.com Tel: +90 414 3183659 Fax: +90 414 3183646.

veness and survival of organizations is the concept of *learning organization*. This concept is based on organizations to acquire new knowledge, to share the information produced and to use in solving the problems transforming the organization's information. In this sense, learning is an existential act which presents continuity for organizations. According to Richardson (1995), achieving effective learning by creating new markets, products, services, and processes to respond to changing environments has become the most strategic issue of recent years. So, how organizational learning will develop productivity and performance in rapidly changing and highly interactive business environment seems

to preserve the distinction of being a strategic issue not only today but also in the future.

The tendency to see learning as a lifestyle for organizations, especially, started after Senge's works in the 1990s. Establishing learning organizations include training people looking with system thinking to events, developing your own personal expertise, thinking with mental models, having a shared vision and also learning through team and collaboration (Senge, 1993). On the other hand, researchers mention the existence of seven compulsory action turning organizations into learning organizations. These are creating opportunities for continuous learning, developing research and dialogue, encouraging collaboration and team work, establishing systems which provide information and share learning, integrating people around a common vision, making the organization associated with its environment, and finally establishing supportive leadership in both individual and team and organizational level (Cullen, 1999).

Scan of the learning organization idea emphasizes the definitions of different learning organizations. According to Hitt (1995), Giriego, Geroy, and Wright (2000) learning organization is an organization looking for transformation and excellence through interrupted and continuous organizational renewal and gradually mastering in this subject. To Gold (1997), Dunphy, Turner, and Crawford (1997), learning organization is to re-shape skills and the use and share in both individual and organizational level. Learning begins with being a member of the organization. For Morrison (1998), Ho (1999) and Bennett (1999) learning organization is a skilled organization, facilitating learning to its members, revealing the information, obtaining it and making behaviors compatible in the light of new information acquired. In this sense learning organizations do not insist on rigid, out of date plans, processes and practices.

The literature on learning organizations to a large extend focus on how learning organizations can be designed to create an effective learning. Results generally point out that learning organizations relatively have a flexible administration system. These organizations emphasis on cooperation and team working to reach an extensive success. Continual training and personal improvement to facilitate the introducing of new systems is promoted adequately. Information is effectively shared among members and the units of the organization

for a constant and permanent learning. Learning organizations have powerfull cultures and effective leaders who provides learning, openness, creativity and productivity among the staff (Bennett, 1999; Cummings & Worley, 1997; Giriego et al., 2000).

Senge puts forward that organizations learn through learning individuals. Nevertheless, individual learning does not guarantee organizational learning all the time. However, organizational learning without individual learning does not occur (Senge, 1993). Starting from this point, it can be said that organizational learning occurs in three possibilities. Accordingly, in the first possibility individuals learn, in the second possibility while the organization learns, individual learn, and in the last possibility collective learning happens (Örtenblad, 2001).

Organizational Commitment

Scan of the organizational commitment studies show that commitment has a long history in organizational psychology and organizational commitment definitions basically contains three elements. These are to believe the organization's purpose and values, struggling beyond the expectations for the organization and the desire to continue working in the organization (Brockner, Tyler, & Schneider, 1992; Dubin, Champoux, & Porter, 1975; Morrow, 1983; Randall, 1987; Reichers, 1985).

Various definitions are made for the concept of organizational commitment. Most of these focus on the involvement degree of the employees with their organization. Commitment to an orgazanition requires the identification and even the internalization of the aims and values of the organization by an employee. Accordingly, employees will be integrated with their organizations at identification level when they commit to a particular style of action determined by the organization, connect their attitudes and tendencies to the corporate identity and psychologically attached to the workplace (Becker, Billings, Eveleth, & Gilbert, 1996; Biggart & Hamilton, 1984; Fukami & Larson, 1984; Kiesler, 1971; Sheldon, 1971). Moreover they will be integrated with their organizations at internalization level when they desire to stay in organization, struggle for it and accept the organization's aim and values, willing to continue to do things even if there is not a clear reward or punishment, commit to realize their roles for organization's goodness within

the scope of goals and values (DeCotiis & Summers, 1987; Morrow, 1983; Randall & Cote, 1991; Schwenk, 1986; Wiener, 1982).

There are several classifications of the literature on organizational commitment. Etzioni (1975) classifies organizational commitment as negative-alienating, middle-to-neutral, and positive moral commitment; Wiener (1982), as instrumental and normative-moral commitment; Allen and Meyer (1990) as emotional, continuance and normative commitment; Kelman (1958), O'Reilly and Chatman (1986) as commitment based on compliance, identification and internalization; Katz and Kahn (1977) as instrumental and expressive commitment; Buchanan (1974) as identification, attachment, and loyalty. Classifications related to organizational commitment has been observed in studies of Turkey (Balay, 2000, 2007; Balcı, 2000; Celep, 1996; Tekin, 2002; Uyguç & Çımrın, 2004; Ünüvar, 2006; Varoğlu, 1993; Yıldırım, 2002; Yılmaz, 2009).

Studies within the framework of organizational commitment development tools showed that the most important tools in this subject are control, strategy, vision, the work required to struggle, cooperation and teamwork, work culture, common benefits, communication, interest in people, technology, training and development, the significance of the work, job stress, sense of duty, fulfillment, appropriate learning climate, autonomy, participation, feedback, collaboration, learning opportunities and resources (Firestone & Pennel, 1993; Ulrich, 1998; Weber, 1997).

Relationship Between Learning Organization and Organizational Commitment

In recent years, organizations are confronted with an increasingly rising competitive pressure. In order to survive and increase institutions' competitiveness, one of the modern management concepts developed in is *learning organization* and another is the concept of *organizational commitment*. The concept of learning organization is predicated on organizations to create new knowledge, to share this information, to convert this information into organizational knowledge, to use on solving the problems (Garvin, 1993; DiBella & Nevis, 1998; Senge, 1993). On the other hand, it is not enough to keep people physically in the system. Employees may not integrate psychologically with the system even if they are located physically in the business

environment and they join in many activities, especially learning activities. This situation can lead to poor the system's psychological bond. According to Katz and Kahn (1977), for the effective functioning of educational institutions of which activity field is to change and transform people, most of the members must be willing to do more than most of the task definition. This requires the integration of employees with organization. Because according to Ulrich (1998), those with organizational commitment become more efficient and act with a sense of higher responsibility and loyalty.

In previous researches, organizational commitment was used as dependent variable in some studies and independent variable in other studies. In these studies, organizational commitment is closely related to absence, delay, withdrawal (Reichers, 1985), motivation (Becker et al., 1996; Randall, 1987; Wiener, 1982), desire to remain in the organization (Rozenblum, 1993; Tsui, Egan, & O'Reilly, 1992), changing jobs (Hrebiniak & Alutto, 1972); to strive for individual groups, to ensure group loyalty (Blau & Boal, 1987); promotion, loss of income, loss of job security, isolation, wearing character, change in the quality of business, the development of employees, mobility, creativity, innovation, obstacles to change, group interaction, unable to balance home and work relationships, personal alienation, to engage in illegal and unethical behaviors (Randall); job satisfaction (Chatman, 1991; Dailey & Kirk, 1992; Robbins, 1994; Tannenbaum, 1966; Tsui et al., 1992); performance (Locke, Latham, & Erez, 1988); participation (Becker et al., 1996; Handy, 1985; Parks, 1992; Randall; Wallace, 1995) and conflict (Lowery, 1994; Monchak, 1994; Vroom, 1992).

In studies carried out in Turkey, the organizational commitment was examined as both independent and the dependent variable. For example, Tuncer (1995) surveyed the levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment of the staff of Ministry of National Education and found that the staff had organizational commitment and they are generally satisfied with their jobs. Varoğlu (1993), in his study investigating the employees' attitudes, values, commitment to the organization in Turkish public sector, it is found out that most of Turkish employees in the public sector had a high level of commitment to keep continuation in working and the reasons for working and giving up the job are mostly related to the conditions of the working en-

vironment. Celep (1996) in his study related to the organizational commitment of the teachers in educational organizations, it is found that teachers are highly dedicated to their jobs and the dedication is mostly related to the teaching profession rather than school.

Balay (2000), in his study examining the organizational commitment of the teachers and the principals both in private and state high schools, it is found that teachers and principals in private high schools had a higher level of organizational commitment than teachers and principals in state high schools. Ünüvar (2006), in his study examining job-related characteristics, job satisfaction, the behaviour of the organizational citizenship and organizational commitment, it is found that organizational commitment and the behaviour of the organizational citizenship have a significant relationship. Balay (2007), in his study examining the organizational commitment of teachers in primary schools and their conflict management styles, it is found that organizational commitment based on identification and internalization is especially related to the conflict management styles of compromising and problem solving; and organizational commitment based on compliance is seen as the only predictor of conflict management strategy of fostering. Yılmaz (2009), in his study found a close relationship between organizational commitment, job satisfaction and organizational creativity. Balay and İpek (2010), in their study examining organizational culture and organizational commitment of primary school teachers found a positive correlation between compliance based of organizational commitment and the power and role culture; and a negative correlation between compliance based of organizational commitment and success and supportive culture. Organizational commitment at the level of identification and internalization showed a positive correlation especially with success and supportive culture. Turan, Karadağ and Bektaş (2011) focused on the relationship between organizational commitment and learning organization in the structure of the university. They found a positive correlation between learning organization and organizational commitment, and it is found that learning organization subscales together predicted 32 percent of organizational commitment.

On the other hand, reviewing the literature it is obviously seen that researchers such as Argyris and Schön (1978), Senge (1993) and Huber (1991)

merely focused on the learning organization issue just at thinking level, on the contrary they gave less importance to empirical studies. However, it is not enough to just have the concept of learning organization intellectually. To answer the question of how to create a learning organization there is a need to find out the relation between the concept of learning organization and the other concepts related to it in the researches. In this context there are a limited numbers of researches carried out. For example, Seymour (1992) found out a close relationship between learning organization and quality approaches. To him, in order to reveal the quality of the organization there is a need for the knowledge, desire and the energy of everyone in the organization. Çelik (1997) revealed a relationship between organizational learning and organizational change. Accordingly a successful change just depends on the successful creation of an organizational learning culture. To Kavrakoğlu (1996) the roots of the concept of learning organization are based on *system dynamics*. System dynamics is a discipline of seeing the whole. To see the whole there must be an implemented shared learning in all of the system. Fiol and Lyles (1985) suggested that factors such as environment, structure, culture and strategy, influenced the organizational learning, and organizational learning is affected in a positive way if this organization and strategies are adopted. Töremen (2001) in his study comparing private and state high schools, it is found that team working in private schools is at a more satisfactory level than it is in state schools. Also Yener (1997) found that private schools are superior to the state schools in promoting continuous learning. Basım, Şeşen, and Meydan (2009) in their study carried out on the effect of the concept of learning organization on the entrepreneurship in the organization, they found out that team learning, cross-connect systems and supportive leadership have a positive effect on entrepreneurship within the organization.

As can be seen clearly from the above information, in the literature it is seen that studies examining the impact of the faculty members' perception of learning organization to organizational commitment in higher education level is very little and in limited number of studies, the learning organization-organizational commitment relationship is not dealt at the level of private and public universities. However, the recognition of opportunities about self development and realization of employees within

the organization through learning can be effective in integration of people with organization. This situation is almost a necessity rather than a requirement for higher education institutions in which learning and research are the most basic and continuous activities. Obviously, individuals can struggle above and beyond the expectations to reinforce their organizations which support and strengthen them. This situation can provide the emergence of the common gains for both employees and the organization. In this context, this research aims to compare the impact of faculty members' perceptions of learning organization to their organizational commitment in the context of private and public universities. In this research, faculty members' perceptions of university they worked is independent variable, their organizational commitment is dependent variable.

Objectives of the Study

In this research, the impact of faculty members' learning organization perceptions to their organizational commitment has been studied. In this context, the following questions have been tried to answer:

1. Do faculty members' perceptions of learning organization and organizational commitment differ significantly depending on the type of university where they were employed?

2. Do faculty members' perceptions of learning organization dimensions and levels of organizational commitment differ significantly depending on the type of university where they were employed?

3. To what degree do faculty members' perceptions of the dimensions of the learning organization predict their different levels of organizational commitment?

Method

Model

This research is a quantitative study. In this study, descriptive and relational scanning models is used. Descriptive model is used for determining the levels of the learning organization and organizational commitment of the academic staff in both private and state universities, relational scanning model is used for determining the sizes and the levels of organizational commitment in order to examine the relationships between various variables.

Study Group

This research was conducted as a comparison of the two universities, one of them is private (Zirve University), the other is public (Harran University) because it aims to examine the impact of learning organization perceptions of faculty members working in private and public universities to their organizational commitment. The research was carried out with 172 faculty members who work in universities mentioned above in 2010-2011 academic year. Voluntary participation of faculty members is taken into account in the research. Thus, after the distribution of 380 questionnaires, 268 questionnaires returned, 172 questionnaires were suitable for data analysis by the elimination of 96 questionnaires which were determined to be defective. Accordingly, 64% of the questionnaires were used to analyze the data.

Data Collection Tools

Scale of Learning Organization Dimensions: In order to determine the faculty members' learning organization perceptions, Scale of Learning Organization Dimensions, which was developed by Watkins and Marsick (1997) and was translated to Turkish by Basım, Şeşen, and Korkmazyürek (2007), was used in this research. The scale consists of two parts. While the first part of the scale contains seven basic dimensions of learning organization properties, the second part contains two assistant dimensions including the key results. To respond to questions in this research, seven basic dimensions in the first part of the scale were used. The items in the instrument were rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from never (1) to always (5). Accordingly, Scale of Learning Organization Dimensions consists of a total of 43 items of which continuous learning dimension is 7 items, dialogue and research dimension 6, team learning dimension 6, shared systems dimension 6, reinforced employees 6, inter-systems connection dimension 6, supportive leadership dimension 6. In the past the reliability analysis of the scale was computed by Basım and Şeşen (2007). They indicated that the reliability values of the scale rangend from .84 to .92. In this study the reliability values of the scale were computed over again and found considerably high. Conducted analysis displayed that the reliability scores of the scale were ranged from .87 to.94.

Scale of Organizational Commitment: In order to determine the faculty members' organizational commitment levels, Scale of Organizational Commitment which was developed by Balay (2000) was used in this research. The items in the instrument were rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). Organizational Commitment Scale consists of 27 items of which accordance dimension is 8 items, identification dimension 8, and internalization dimension 11.

Data Analysis

Data analysis was conducted in two stages by using Mann Whitney U test and multiple regression techniques. In this study, unlike public universities, in spite of all efforts the number of participants from private university has remained as 21. This situation required the implementation of Mann Whitney U test for nonparametric t-test in order to find whether there are significant differences in the bilateral comparison to the type of university between private and public universities. In the second stage, the multiple regression technique were used to determine to what degree faculty members' perceptions of the dimensions of the learning organization predict their different sizes of organizational commitment. In the analysis α=.05 level was taken as basis.

Findings

General Perceptions of Learning Organization and Organizational Commitment to the Type of University

Mann Whitney U test was applied to determine whether faculty members' perceptions of learning organization characteristics and organizational commitment differ significantly to the type of university. Accordingly, faculty members' learning organization characteristics ($U(535.50)=.000, p<.05$) and organizational commitment ($U(661)=.000, p<.05$) perceptions vary significantly depending on the type of university which they work. According to this, learning organization and organizational commitment perceptions of faculty members working in private university was significantly higher than those working in public university.

Findings of Learning Organization Dimensions and Organizational Commitment Levels to the Type of University

Mann Whitney U test was applied to determine whether faculty members' different dimensions of learning organization and organizational commitment levels vary significantly depending on the type of university. Accordingly, faculty members' perceptions of learning organization dimensions differ significantly to the type of university they worked. According to this, faculty members' perceptions of learning organization dimensions statistically differ significantly to the type of university they worked in dimensions of *continuous learning* ($U(700.50)=.000, p<.05$), *dialogue and research* ($U(775.50)=.000, p<.05$), team learning ($U(752.50)=.000, p<.05$), *shared systems* ($U(683.50)=.000, p<.05$), *reinforced employees* ($U(570)=.000, p<.05$), *inter-systems connection* ($U(464.50)=.000, p<.05$), and *supportive leadership* ($U(606.50)=.000, p<.05$). From the findings above, learning organization perceptions of faculty members working in private university were found significantly higher than those working in public university.

On the other hand, according to findings, faculty members' perceptions of organizational commitment levels differ significantly to the type of university they work in dimensions of *compliance* ($U(949.50)=.003, p<.05$), *identification* ($U(574)=.000, p<.05$), and *internalization* ($U(826)=.000, p<.05$). Closer look at the findings, organizational commitment in identification and internalization levels of faculty members working in private university were higher than those working in public university; on the contrary in compliance dimension, organizational commitment of faculty members working in public university were found higher than those working in private university.

Estimation of Levels of Organizational Commitment from Dimensions of Learning Organization

In this research, finally, it was examined whether dimensions of learning organization predicted the different levels of organizational commitment. Multiple regression technique was used to estimate the relationship among different dimensions. According to the findings, it was observed that

reinforced employees dimension of learning organization was the only predictor of organizational commitment based on *compliance* ($\beta(-.353)=.000$, $p<.05$). At close examination of the findings, it is understood that predictive power of the model is weak. Because it was seen that independent variables explained the variance in organizational commitment based on accordance ($R=.564$, $R^2=.319$, $p<.05$).

On the other hand, it was seen that dimensions of learning organization both *team learning* ($\beta(.271)=.000$, $p<.01$) and *shared systems* ($\beta(.281)=.000$, $p<.05$) dimensions created a significant impact on *identification* level of organizational commitment. Of these, it was seen that particularly the dimension of *shared systems* had a stronger effect on the *identification*. However, it was observed that the predictive power of the model was relatively moderate and these variables meet the mid-level of the variance on organizational commitment based on *identification* ($R=.733$, $R^2=.537$, $p<.05$). Finally, it was observed that none of the dimensions of learning organization created a significant impact on organizational commitment based on *internalization* ($p>.05$).

Discussion

This research which aims to compare the impact of faculty members' perceptions of learning organization to their organizational commitment between private and public university revealed significant results. According to the first result of this research, faculty members' perceptions of learning organization characteristics and organizational commitment differ significantly to the type of university they worked. According to this result, it was found that learning organization perceptions of faculty members working in private university were higher than those working in public university. This result can be explained by the learning opportunities which private and public universities offer to their employees. To qualify any university, like other organizations, as a learning organization, first of all must be realized seven obligatory actions of learning organization. Cullen (1999) explained these seven obligatory actions, respectively, as to create continuous learning opportunities, to develop research and dialogue, to encourage collaboration and team work, to establish gaining information and sharing learning systems, to integ-

rate people around a common vision, to make the organization associated with its environment and finally, to establish a supportive leadership both individually and as a team and organizational level. It was observed that these seven obligatory actions of learning organizations were similar to the dimensions of learning organization used in the research. When an evaluation of this information is made, it can be said that faculty members working in private university evaluate their university in a better position than those working in public university and their high perceptions of learning organization is derived from this.

On the other hand, it was seen that faculty members working in private university, compared with colleagues working in public university, generally have shown more commitment to the university which they worked. This result can be explained by university administrations' efforts to create a suitable working environment for employees and to develop commitment. Firestone and Pennel's (1993) research findings support this approach. According to these authors, a fair and adequate payment for employees, career development, a series of incentive policies such as guiding and supporting programs positively affect employees' commitment to their organizations.

According to another result of the research, faculty members' perceptions of learning organization dimensions and levels of organizational commitment differ significantly to the type of university where they were employed. According to this result, learning organization perceptions of employees working in private university, in all dimensions, were more positive than those working in public university. It was observed that in studies (Gündüz & Sezik, 2005) which perceptions of learning organization between private and public schools were evaluated, the result was usually in favor of private schools.

On the other hand, in this research perceptions of organizational commitment based on compliance of faculty members working in public university were found higher than those working in private university; whereas organizational commitments of faculty members in private university were higher than those working in public university. This result can be interpreted as bureaucratic management features of the institution have an effect on organizational commitment by creating oppressive perceptions. Because bureaucratic structure of

the institution reduces the sense of organizational commitment; the feeling of intense conflicts occurs since employees' needs in such an environment are not met adequately by the managers and employees cannot participate to decision-making process so that it can be put forward that lower levels of organizational commitment (commitment based on a higher compliance) are derived from it. It is due to this reason that there is a significant relationship between low organizational commitment and bureaucratic structure of the university that creates the perception of pressure and obligation. Because poor communication, bureaucratic indolence and slowness can be estimated to negatively affect the organizational commitment on rules and regulations reducing the satisfaction. Indeed, due to the strongly centralized structure of public universities, faculty members often have bureaucratic disadvantages; they cannot participate to decisions related to their work and they cannot use their initiative; the perception of commitment based on higher-level compliance (lower identification and internalization) is derived from it to a large extent. The results of research done on this subject are in support of the above comments. According to the literature, commitment based on compliance is related to weak and superficial organizational commitment. Individual at this level of commitment comply with the organization but this compliance is not done voluntarily and wholeheartedly. In other words, this compliance is not based on convergence (identification) between individual and organization, and the purpose and value share (internalization). Unwilling compliance refers to the obligation. The obligation requires mobilizing the authority, rules and organizational procedures. Therefore, forced compliance is based on control not trust. In this way the organization assures the realization of organizational behavior without taking into consideration the interests and expectations of employees (Brockner, Tyler, & Schneider, 1992; Handy, 1985; Kelman, 1958; O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986).

Similar results were observed in studies of comparison of private and public schools on their organizational commitment. In Balay's (2000) research which was examined school commitment of administrators and teachers working in private and public high schools, it was found that administrator and teachers of private high school felt more commitment in both identification and interna-

lization dimensions than those working in public high schools; whereas it was found that administrator and teachers working in public high schools felt more commitment mainly commitment level based on compliance.

In addition, in this research it was examined to what extent faculty members' perceptions of learning organization predicted their different levels of organizational commitment. At the result of the research, it was seen that only reinforced employees dimension from learning organization dimensions predicted organizational commitment based on compliance. This result can be explained by the quality of their organizational commitment with strengthening of employees within organization. Because Brockner et al. (1992) have put forward that commitment based on compliance is related to the lowest participation and support of employees. According to them, employees at the compliance level superficially support their organizations. According to Handy (1985), the operation of the rules and procedures is usually related to commitment at the level of compliance. Compliance is based on control, not trust. As such, it does not give the right to choose to employees. As it is clear from this information, commitment based on compliance (superficial commitment) decreases in the system of strengthened employees and employees tend to volunteer activities and integrate more with the system. As long as employees' are trusted on, control on the level of organization decreases, employees participate more in decisions and finally, their organizational commitment are based on an innate adoption above and beyond a formal framework.

On the other hand, it was observed that dimensions of *team learning and shared systems* predicted positively organizational commitment based on *identification*; especially, dimension of *shared systems* had a stronger effect on commitment based on *identification*. The impact of team learning and shared systems on employees' commitment is remarkable. Studies in this subject clearly quoted that having team learning and shared systems at organizational level strongly affects employees' organizational commitment. For instance, Veisi (2010) put forward in his research that team learning created a collective discipline in organization and it left the door open to dialogue and improved the will to solve problems with high creativity. According to Veisi, team learning develops a sense of togetherness by encouraging the mutual sharing of insights in

the organization by making the best contribution to the solution, even the most complex issues. According to Veisi, the idea of shared system is related to shared vision; shared visions activate the idea of creating a common and shared future with shared images, this also creates a sense of strong commitment. Teare and Dealtry (1998) also put forward that shared visions activate the will of collective learning and there is a close relationship with sense of organizational commitment and good faith. O'Reilly and Chatman (1986) put forward in their studies that commitment based on identification is closely related to the desire to be close to others in the organization, this situation creates a high attractiveness and satisfaction on individual and employees who associate themselves with other members of the team act more responsibly.

Finally, it was found that none of dimensions of learning organization has a significant impact on organizational commitment based on internalization. This result can be interpreted that learning opportunities provided to employees in the organization are associated with especially which level of organizational commitment. The research results state that learning opportunities offered in the organization constitute of commitment based on identification by means of creating a sense of competence in employees and using and developing skills (Firestone & Pennel, 1993; Maeroff, 1988; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Rosenholtz, 1989); but this commitment does not convert to internalize if it is not based on a normative basis (Chatman, 1991; Handy, 1985; Wiener, 1982). According to these results, it can be explained that faculty members are satisfied with opportunities of learning and self development but this commitment of their institutions is not at the level of internalization which means integration with the organization's goals and values.

Implications for Administrators and Practitioners in Institutions of Higher Education

This research indicated significant results for practitioners in higher education institutions (top executives, university administrators and faculty members). In this study, faculty members who work in private universities stated that their universities have more learning organization features, according to those faculty members who work for state universities, and also faculty members who work in private universities have higher level of organizational commitment to the organization they work. This result reveals an important clue related to the difference between the traditional university structure and the learning university structure that undermines the organizational effectiveness. Universities are trying to achieve their objectives by holding the best employees in their bodies nowadays that carry the competition in higher education onto the national and international level. Experience of private universities in higher education started to become increasingly prevalent in Turkey in recent years. This situation has created a new competitive environment among the universities, particularly between private and public universities. While private universities are trying to pull the well-trained teaching staff from the state universities by creating attractive work environments for employees of public universities, public universities are not making the same effort to keep the trained teaching staff in the system. With this result the managers and practitioners in higher education should be lead to improve organizational commitment factors related to the state universities, to think on obstacles of organizational learning and to develop policies in this direction.

It was also found in the study that, perceptions of private university employees' on organizational commitment (except for commitment based on compliance) and learning organization in all dimensions are found to be more positive than public university employees'. This result shows that perceptions of learning organization of private university employees are closely related with the identification and internalization based organizational commitment with except compliance based commitment. In this respect, if a comparison is made between private and public universities, employees of private universities who have higher perceptions of learning organization have higher level of commitment perception than employees in the state university who have a lower perception of learning organization. Competition between universities continues on with the employees who are thinking free, learning continuously and becoming skillful. The university system which involves employees in the system physically, is unable to place in jeopardy the future on the other hand does not suggest applications for employees' social and psychological development. Managers and practitioners in higher education should initiate the management proces-

ses that mobilize the employee learning, research and achievement motives. For this purpose, the members working in public universities should be motivated with identification and internalization with the motives, mean higher participation rather than compliance, means the system of partial participation. It is clear that one of the most effective tools during the process of motivation is culture of learning organization, and the need to improve it.

On the other hand, this study showed one of the dimensions of the learning organization, especially reinforced employees dimension have an inverse correlation with compliance based commitment. According to this result, with the applications made to empower the employees, compliance based commitment, in other words external commitment reduces and employees provide higher level of participation to organizational system. Empowerment of employees is possible with prizing the employees, making the employees feel the prize, enfranchising and protecting their interests and needs. Empowering the employees need to link employees' emotional energy with care in the work environment. Administrators should convert the university environment more flexible, more learning-oriented and more collaborative environments to strengthen teaching staff. This situation needs the presence of employees who combine emotional, intellectual and physical energy and show high-level of commitment organizational success.

Finally, this research highlights the positive effect of team-oriented learning and shared systems dimension of learning organization on organizational commitment. It is remarkable that especially dimension of shared systems among these dimensions have more powerful effect on commitment at the level of identification. Identification means voluntary association with organization, as it was stated before. From this perspective, identification is based on being in sharing with others and integration with the system. Showing positive correlation of both teams-oriented learning and shared systems dimension significant with identification is meaningful. Because, team-oriented learning, creates a collective learning culture throughout the organization then collective learning culture feeds the shared visions through dialogue. Administrators who want to keep the employees in the system with a commitment at least at the level of identification they should start with team-oriented

learning and shared systems in higher education. Because the effective system-level problem solving, requires high level of identification with the organization and identification requires team-oriented learning and sharing what is learned.

Limitations and Proposals for Researchers

Despite the study which aims to describe by comparing the faculty memebers' perceptions of organizations and organizational commitment on one of the two universities, including private and public highlights important results, it should be evaluated with some limitations. First of all, despite the research carried out using valid and reliable scales, the working group was limited with two universities (one public, one private) and similar faculties in these universities (Faculty of Education, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences and Faculty of Engineering). It is remarkable that the participation in private university was less than expected in the study despite the efforts. This situation requires being cautious about the generalizability of the results. This research aimed to analyze the possible relationship between of learning organization and organizational commitment of faculty members. The study could be rehandled by making comparison between more private and state universities. The research additionally could be developed around other concepts (organizational creativity, diversity management, leadership, etc.) related with learning organization and organizational commitment.

References/Kaynakça

Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 63*, 1-18.

Argyris, C., & Schön, D. A. (1978). *Organizational learning II: The theory, method, and practice.* USA: Addıson- Wesley Publishng Company.

Balay, R. (2000). *Özel ve resmi liselerde yönetici ve öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılığı (Ankara ili örneği).* Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Balay, R. (2007). Predicting conflict management based on organizational commitment and selected demographic variables. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, *8* (2), 321-336.

Balay, R., & İpek, C. (2010). Teachers' perception of organizational culture and organizational commitment in Turkish primary schools. *Journal of World of Turks*, *2* (1), 363-384.

Balcı, A. (2000). *Örgütsel sosyalleşme: Kuram strateji ve taktikler.* Ankara: Pegem Yayıncılık.

Basım, N., & Şeşen, H. (2007). Transformation to a learning organization: A comparative study on textile industry in Turkey. *İktisat Işletme ve Finans, 21* (251), 114–122.

Basım, N., Şeşen, H. ve Meydan, H. C. (2009). Öğrenen örgüt algısının örgüt içi girişimciliğe etkisi: Kamuda bir araştırma. *Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi, 64* (3), 27-44.

Basım, N., Şeşen, H., & Korkmazyürek, H. (2007). A Turkish translation, validity and reliability study of the learning organization questionnaire. *World Applied Sciences Journal, 2* (4), 368–374.

Becker, T. E., Billings, R. S., Eveleth, O. M., & Gilbert, N. L. (1996). Focı and bases of employee commitment: Implications for job performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 39* (2), 464-482.

Bennett, R. (1999). *Carporate strategy* (2nd ed.). London: Financial Times Pitman Publishing.

Biggart, N. W., & Hamilton, G. G. (1984). The power of obediance. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 29,* 540-549.

Blau, G. J., & Boal, K. B. (1987). Conceptualizing how job involvement and organizational commitment affect turnover and absenteeızm. *Academy of Management Reviev, 12* (2), 288-300.

Brockner, J., Tyler, T. R., & Schneider, R. C. (1992). The influence of prior commitment to an institution on reactions to perceived unfairness: The higher they are, the harder they fall. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 37* (1-4), 241-261.

Buchanan, B. (1974). Building organizational commitment: The socialization of managers in work organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 19* (4), 533-546.

Celep, C. (1996). *Eğitim örgütlerinde öğretmenlerin örgütsel adanmışlığı.* Yayımlanmamış doçentlik tezi, Ankara.

Chatman, J. A. (1991). Matching people and organizations: Selections and socialization in public accounting firms. *Administrative Science Quarterley, 36* (1), 459-484.

Cullen, J. (1999). Socially constructed learning: A commentary on the concept of the learning organization. *The Learning Organization, 6* (1), 45-52.

Cummings, T. G., & Worley, C. (1997). *Organization development and change.* Cincinnati, Ohio: South-Western College Publishing.

Çelik, V. (1997, Mayıs). *Okulların kalitesini artırmada yeni bir yaklaşım: Örgütsel öğrenme.* 3. Verimlilik Kongresi'nde sunulan bildiri, Ankara, MPM Yayınları.

Dailey, R. C., & Kirk, D. J. (1992). Distributive and procedural justice as antecedents of job dissatisfaction and intend to turnover. *Human Relations, 45* (3), 305-317.

DeCotiis, T. A., & Summers, T. P. (1987). A path analysis of a model of the antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment. *Human Relations, 40* (7), 445-470.

DiBella, A., & Nevis, E. C. (1998). *How organizations learn?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Dubin, R., Champoux, J. E., & Porter, L. W. (1975). Central life interests and organizational commitment of blue-collar and clerical workers. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 20* (3), 411-421.

Dunphy, D., Turner, D., & Crawford, M. (1997). Organizational learning as the creation of corporate competencies. *Journal of Management Development, 16* (4), 232-244.

Etzioni, A. (1975). *A comparative analysis of complex organizations.* New York: Free Press.

Fiol, C. M., & Lyles, M. A. (1985). Organizational learning. *Academy of Management Review, 10* (4), 803-813.

Firestone, W. A., & Pennel, J. R. (1993). Teacher commitment, working conditions, and differential incentive policies. *Review of Educational Research, 63* (4), 489-525.

Fukami, C. V., & Larson, E. W. (1984) Commitment to company and union: Parallel models. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 69* (3), 367-371.

Garvin, D. A. (1993). Building a learning organization. *Harvard Business Review, 71* (4), 78-91.

Giriego, O. V., Geroy, G. D., & Wright, P. C. (2000). Predictors of learning organizations: A human resource development practitioner's perspective. *The Learning Organization, 7* (1), 5-12.

Gold, J. (1997). Learning and story telling: The next stage in the journey for the learning organization. *Journal of Workplace Learning, 9* (4), 133-141.

Gündüz, H. B. ve Sezik, S. (2005). Devlet ve özel ilköğretim okullarında örgütsel öğrenmenin değerlendirilmesi. *XIV. Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kongresi Kongre Kitabı* içinde (c. 1., s. 49-56). Denizli: Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Yayını.

Handy, C. B. (1985). *Understanding organizations.* (3rd ed.). England: Penguin Business.

Hitt, W. (1995). The learning organization: Some reflections on organizational renewal. *Leadership And Organizational Development Journal, 16* (8), 17-25.

Ho, S. K. M. (1999). Total learning organization. *The Learning Organization, 6* (3), 116-120.

Hrebiniak, L. G., & Alutto, J. A. (1972). Personel and role-relatad factors in the development of organizational commitment. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 17* (4), 555-573.

Huber, G. P. (1991). Organizational learning: The contributing processes and the literatures. *Organization Science, 2* (1), 88-112.

Katz, D. ve Kahn, R. L. (1977). *Örgütlerin toplumsal psikolojisi* (çev. H. Can, Y. Bayar). Ankara: Türkiye Ortadoğu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü Yayınları.

Kavrakoğlu, İ. (1996). *Öğrenen örgüt.* İstanbul: Kal-der Yayını.

Kelman, H. C. (1958). Compliance, identification, and internalization: Three processes of attitude change. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 2*, 51-60.

Kiesler, C. A. (1971). *The psychology of commitment: Experiments linking behavior to belief.* New York and London: Academic Press.

Locke, E. A., Latham, G. P., & Erez, M. (1988). The determinants of goal commitment. *Academy of Management Reviev, 13* (1), 23-39.

Lowery, A. (1994). Principals organizational commitment, role conflict, and role ambiguity as related to perceived conflict management styles (Ph.D.). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 54* (7), 2411-A.

Maeroff, G. I. (1988). *The empowerment of teachers: Overcoming the crisis of confidance.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents. correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin, 108* (2), 171-194.

Monchak, P. V. (1994). Relationships betwen organizational structure, conflict resolution, and organizational commitment in elementary schools (Ph.D.). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 54* (7), 2413-A.

Morrison, K. (1998). *Management theories for educational change.* London: Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd.

Morrow, P. C. (1983). Concept redundancy in organizational research: The case of work commitment. *Academy of Management Review, 8* (3), 486-500.

O'Reilly, C., & Chatman J. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification, and internalization on prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*(3), 492-499.

Örtenblad, A. (2001). On differences between organizational learning and learning organization. *The Learning Organization, 8* (3), 125-133.

Parks, M. B. (1992). Participation, commitment and organizational change: The case of the University of Maine Cooperative Extension (E.d.D.). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 53* (1), 38-A.

Randall, D. M. (1987). Commitment and organization: The organization man revisited. *Academy of Management Reviev, 12* (1), 460-471.

Randall, D. M., & Cote, J. A. (1991). Interrelationships of work commitment constructs. *Work and Occupations, 18* (2), 194-211.

Reichers, A. E. (1985). A reviev and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Review, 10* (3), 465-476.

Richardson, B. (1995). Learning contexts and roles for the learning organization leader. *The Learning Organization, 2* (1), 15-33.

Robbins, S. P. (1994). *Örgütsel davranışın temelleri* (çev. S. A. Öztürk). Prentice Hall International. Inc.

Rosenholtz, S. J. (1989). *Teachers workplace: The social organization of schools.* New York: Longman.

Rozenblum, E. F. (1993). Why teachers stay: A process of developing commitment. (Ph.D.). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 54* (4), 1188-A.

Schwenk, C. R. (1986). Information, cognitive biases, and commitment to a course of action. *Academy of Management Review, 11* (2), 298-310.

Senge, P. M. (1993). *Beşinci Disiplin* (2. bs., çev. A. İldeniz, A. Doğukan). İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Seymour, D. (1992). *Causing quality in higher education.* New York: Macmillan.

Sheldon, M. E. (1971). Investments and involvements as mechanisms pruducing commitment to the organization. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 16* (2), 143-150.

Tannenbaum, A. S. (1966). *Social psychology of the work organization,* USA: Wadsworth Publishing Company. Inc.

Teare, R., & Dealtry, R. (1998). Building and sustaining a learning organization. *The Learning Organization, 5* (1), 47-60.

Tekin, A. (2002). *İşletmelerde örgütsel bağlılık ve bir karşılaştırma: Türkiye-Pakistan Örneği.* Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Töremen, F. (2001). *Öğrenen okul.* Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

Tsui, A, S., Egan, T. D., & O'Reilly, C. A. (1992). Being diffrent: Relational demography and organizational attachment. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 37* (1-4), 549-579.

Tuncer, A. (1995). *Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Bilgisayar Eğitimi ve Hizmetleri Genel Müdürlüğü personelinin iş doyumu ve örgütsel bağlılık durumları.* Yayınlanmamış lisansüstü uzmanlık tezi, Türkiye Ortadoğu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Turan, S., Karadağ, E. ve Bektaş, F. (2011). Üniversite yapısı içerisinde öğrenen örgüt ve örgütsel bağlılık ilişkisi üzerine bir araştırma. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi, 17* (4), 627-638.

Ulrich, D. (1998). Intellectual capital = competence x commitment. *Sloan Management Review, 39* (2), 15-26.

Uyguç, N. ve Çımrın, D. (2004). Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Araştırma ve Uygulama Hastanesi Merkez Laboratuarı çalışanlarının örgüte bağlılıklarını ve işten ayrılma niyetlerini etkileyen faktörler. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, 19* (1), 91–99.

Ünüvar, T. G. (2006). *An integrative model of job characteristics, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Middle East Technical University, Social Sciences Institute, Ankara.

Varoğlu, D. (1993). *Kamu sektörü çalışanlarının işlerine ve kuruluşlarına karşı tutumları, bağlılıkları ve değerleri*. Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Veisi, H. (2010). Organizational learning in the higher education institutions: A case study of agricultural and natural recourses campus of University of Tehran. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, *2* (1), 21-36.

Vroom, P. V. (1992). Role conflict, commitment and coping and scholarly productivity and satisfaction of social work academics (Ph.D.). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 52* (7), 2433-2434-A.

Wallace, J. E. (1995). Organizational and professional Commitment in professional and nonprofessional organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 40* (1-4), 228-255.

Watkins, K., & Marsick, V. (1997), *Dimensions of the learning organization questionnaire* [survey]. Warwick, RI: Partners for the Learning Organization.

Weber, J. (1997). Leading the instructional program. In S. C. Smith & P. K. Pıele (Eds.), *School leadership handbook for excellenge* (3rd ed., pp. 253-278). University of Oregon.

Wiener, Y. (1982). Commitment in organizations: A normative view. *Academy of Management Review, 7* (3), 418-428.

Yener, L. (1997). *Learning organizations*. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Marmara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Yıldırım, F. (2002). *Çalışma yaşamında örgüte bağlılık ve örgütsel adalet ilişkisi*. Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Yılmaz, E. (2009). Examining organizational commitment of primary school teachers regarding to their job satisfaction and their school's organizational creativity. *Elementary Education Online*, *8* (2), 476-484.