4.1 Introduction

The study foundation was secured in part 1 and was preceded with ideas and definitions in section 2. Part 3 displayed relevant research issues as the significance of organizational learning and its antecedent to BSNL, and to leadership and additionally the culture in BSNL. This section builds up a structural model and develops hypotheses in view of the model. The layout of Chapter 4 is appeared in figure 4.1
4.2 Conceptual framework of organizational learning models

As OL relates to individuals and collaboration between individuals in an affiliation and moreover a solid existence and authoritative intercession (Drew and Smith 1995; Drejer 2000; Chang and Huang 2002; Burnes, Cooper et al. 2003; Chang and Lee 2007; Birkenkrahe 2008; Au, Carpenter et al. 2009; Ahlgren and Tett 2010; Cho 2010; Lam and Lambermont-Ford 2010; López Sánchez 2010), OL models need to consider authoritative social orders, TL and laborer EMP.

Past experts have proposed models to look at OL sharpens considering picked schools of thought (Bontis, Crossan et al. 2002; Lloren-Montes, Javier-Moreno et al. 2005; Garcia-Morales, Llorens-Montes et al. 2006; Aragón-Correa, García-Morales et al. 2007; García-Morales 2008; Jyothishbu, Farooq et al. 2010). The models have either endeavored to elucidate a lone piece of OL (Crossan, Lane et al. 1999; López, Peón et al. 2005) or have intended to clear up its relationship with other hierarchical parts of OE (Lloren-Montes, Javier-Moreno et al. 2005; López, Peon et al. 2005; García-Morales 2011; Santos-Vijande, López-Sánchez et al. 2011). The models have thusly shown only a lone relationship between OL and OE (López, Peón et al. 2005; Škerlavaj, Song et al. 2010; Jiménez-Jiménez and Sanz-Valle 2011) or have suited an unpredictable communication of OL with its forerunners provoking better OE (García-Morales, Moreno et al. 2006; Chang and Lee 2007; Jyothishbu, Farooq et al. 2010).

For example, López, Peón and Ordás (2005) proposed a model showing that OL with the estimations of data acquiring, course, understanding and authoritative memory will provoke hierarchical advancement, force and financial cash related results. Data getting, dispersal, interpretation, and authoritative memory formed the hierarchical estimations that made a system that helped authoritative improvement and forcefulness. OL and advancement and force were depended upon to achieve improved financial and cash related OE. The López, Peón and Ordás (2005) model is shown in figure 4-2:
In spite of the fact that the Lópeze, Peón, and Ordás (2005) model is entirely basic, the model does not clarify how information obtaining, dispersion, translation and authoritative memory happen and how these procedures impact OE. As a nonstop procedure, learning securing, conveyance, elucidation and authoritative memory need TL (Coad and Berry 1998; Lam 2002; LeBrasseur, Whissell et al. 2002; Mirkamali, Thani et al. 2011) an appropriate OC (Barrette, Lemyre et al. 2008; Imovski, Skerlavaj et al. 2008; Škerlavaj, Song et al. 2010), and engaged employees (Scott-Ladd and Chan 2004; Berkhout, Hertin et al. 2006) keeping in mind the end goal to accomplish better viability.

Another model that grasped OL and its predecessors was proposed by Jyothibabu, Farooq, and Pradan (2010). In their model, OL existed at two levels, a people level and an auxiliary level. The general population level comprised of four measurements, ceaseless learning (CL), discourse request (DI), group learning (TL), and worker EMP (EE). Consistent learning identified with the event of backing and remunerate for figuring out how to increase required abilities to adapt to the adjustments in the workplace. Discourse request identified with the openness of every authoritative part in conveying all viewpoints in connection to their association. Group learning identified with the flexibility of a group to finish errands and prize group effectiveness.

The fundamental level involved three estimations, TL learning (LL),
framework Connection (SC) and installed framework (ES). Power learning related to a leader's perspective to supporting the constant tries of each hierarchical part. Structure affiliation related to the authoritative conditions that allow hierarchical people to interface with their surroundings to get learning, while introduced system related to the combination of picked up data into a hierarchical system.

The aftereffects of the learning were particular level adjusting or Individual level learning (ILL), group level learning (GLL) and organizational level learning (OLL) which all provoked organizational effectiveness (OE). ILL related to agents' abilities creating as a delayed consequence of a steady learning process. GLL related to social event sufficiency in sharing and completing pack errands while OLL related to authoritative strategy and structure that considered the creativity and reasonability of the affiliation. It was suggested that individual, group and organizational level learning may promote OE.
Figure 4-3: Jyothibabu, Farroq and Pradan model (2010)
The Jyothibabu, Farroq and Pradan (2010) model was expected to grasp the greater part of the measurements of OL. While the model appears to be exhaustive, it stirred up the measurements of OL empowering agents and forerunners and OC, TL and EMP in OL, as a process (Aycan, Kanungo et al. 1999; Bushardt, Lambert et al. 2007; Baek-Kyoo and Ji Hyun 2010; Hung, Yang et al. 2010; Škerlavaj, Song et al. 2010). OC, implanted in an arrangement of association at the auxiliary level (Devi, Chong et al. 2007; Yiing and Ahmad 2009), TL and worker EMP are three measurements which empower procedures of OL (Chang and Lee 2007; Zhang and Bartol 2010).

Utilizing TL and OC to operationalize learning as two forerunners of OL, Chang and Lee (2007) proposed another integrative model. TL and OC were proposed to impact the job fulfillment of employees specifically and by implication through the operation of a learning association. Their model is displayed in Figure 4.4:

**Figure 4-4: Chang and Lee model**

The Chang and Lee (2007) model had facilitated TL and organizational culture as an ancestor or precursor of OL. Authoritative adjusting, regardless, needs self-overseeing and empowered agents to adjust to steady changes that are required in the process (Scott-Ladd and Chan 2004; Zhang and Bartol 2010; van Grinsven and Visser 2011) of acquiring, scattering and abusing data. OL happens when laborers...
have singular abilities (Dimitriades 2005; Donnison 2008) and are maintained by a fitting authoritative environment (Zhang and Bartol 2010). Power arrangement (López, Peón et al. 2006), self-sufficiency (nook Hartog and de Hoogh 2009), work Innovation (Lopéz, Peon et al., 2006) and participative TL (Ahmad and Oranye 2010) (and overwhelmingly TL) are a segment of the focal segments amid the time spent OL. Agents are allowed to take an enthusiasm for fundamental authority (Castro, Perinan et al. 2008) and express their points of view and concerns (Stewart, McNulty et al. 2008). Besides, are reinforced to develop their capacities (Amy 2008) and opportunities are obliged change (Vakola and Nikolaou 2006). Considering everything, consolidating EMP as an antecedent of OL is essential for the method of OL and to update viability.

4.3 Model Development for the study

The past territory has shown three principal models of OL and OE. The López, Peón and Ordás' (2005b) model demonstrates that how OL is required to affect hierarchical progression and OE either director roundabout through advancement. Jyothisbabu, Farroq and Pradan (2010) have included EMP at the overall public level on an individual level while activity at an essential level that affects individuals, packs and organizational level learning, through which better OE is depended upon to be refined. Chang and Lea' (2007) model puts TL and OC as forerunners of OL.

These three models were utilized as a structure to build up a model for this study. The models give a clarification of the connections between learning measurements and results or forerunners and additionally hierarchical results. The models indicate how information procurement – intuiting, deciphering, incorporating and standardizing, can impact hierarchical results and authoritative conditions and TL backing for its continuation. In this manner, the models build up the ‘4I’s of the Crossan, Lane and White (1999) system by including empowering influences and result perspectives. As OL is socially built and dictated by the framework of social relations inside the association and the employee's abilities, the procedure of OL contains four related procedures of intuiting, translating, coordinating and systematizing that happen on an individual, bunch and organizational level (Crossan, Lane et al. 1999; 2011). The procedure is accepted to be affected by OC, TL and employeeEMP.
At the individual level, authoritative individuals get boosts either from sources that are outside or inner to the association. An individual procedure the jolts taking into account a particular casing of theory or intellectual guide. As intellectual maps advance from various foundation encounters and cultures of people, jolts might be deciphered in an unexpected way (Senge 2006). The psychological maps exist beneath an individual level of mindfulness (Crossan, Lane et al. 1999; Senge 2006). To convey the substance of Individual psychological maps must surface and be made more express. At this stage, an individual deciphers the jolts to end up express information (Berson, Nemanich et al. 2006).

Coordination happens at the gathering level and includes the sharing of individual elucidations (Vera and Crossan 2004). The sharing of individual elucidations prompts a typical comprehension among hierarchical individuals (Bontis, Crossan et al. 2002). Individual interpretational sharing may exist in narrating, exchange and individual presentations which prompt shared understandings (Di Milia and Birdi 2010).

Standardizing happens at the organizational level by which individual and gathering learning are engrained inside an association (Bontis, Crossan et al. 2002; Crossan and Bedrow 2003; Di Milia and Birdi 2010). At this stage, individual and gathering learning have been implanted inside the association’s structures, frameworks, culture, and methodology (Bontis, Crossan et al. 2002), and have been implanted into the hierarchical memory (Guido 2007).

In all levels of the procedures, OC, TL and EMP have pivotal parts. At the individual level, learning procedure and eagerness to share are impacted by qualities, standards and individual view of prize and results of learning and sharing information activities (Jansen, Vera et al. 2009; Al-Adaileh and Al-Atawdi 2010; Baek-Kyoo and Ji Hyun 2010; Duden 2011; Lee and Lan 2011). OC gives essential standards and principles to every hierarchical part and the successful advancement of OL requires TL support, permitted by organizational culture and executed by engaged individuals.

### 4.3.1 Organizational learning and OE

A causal relationship between OL and OE has been explored by numerous past scientists who found a positive relationship between OL and OE (for instance Lloren-Montes, Javier-Moreno et al. 2005; García-Morales, Lloréns-Montes et al. 2007; Garcí-Morales 2008; Jyothibabu, Farooq et al. 2010). Ceaseless information procurement, spread and misuse have been relied upon to increment hierarchical
benefit, employee’s welfare and authoritative supportability and it is normal that OL has a causal association with OE.

Bontis, Crossan and Hulland (2002) in their study based on 64 normal resource associations in Canada, showed that ILL, GLL and OL have a real direct association with OE. The systematized route coefficient of organizational level making sense of how to OE was seen no doubt, which was referred to as evidence of a causal relationship between OL and OE.

Other late correct study has reinforced the existence of a prompt path from authoritative making sense of how to OE (Garcia-Morales, Mathias-Reche et al., 2011) because in a model of OL and OE, the route coefficient from hierarchical making sense of how to OE was found to give confirmation of a positive effect of OL on OE. Quantitative experimental studies utilizing relapse connection and auxiliary condition displaying for the most part locate a positive relationship between OL measurements and OE measurements. Ponders that have utilized such quantitative strategies are appeared in Table 4-1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Region/Country</th>
<th>Findings and Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jiménez-Jiménez &amp; Sanz-Valle</td>
<td>South-east Spain</td>
<td>Knowledge acquisition, distribution, interpretation and organizational memory had a positive significant association with company image, market share, and profitability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liao and Wu (2010)</td>
<td>Taiwanese IT and financial enterprises</td>
<td>OL measured by Management commitment to learning, system perspective, openness and experimentation, knowledge transfer and integration affected organizational behaviour, quality of product, process, market and strategic innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hung, Yang, Lien, McLean, and Kuo (2010)</td>
<td>Taiwanese high-tech industry</td>
<td>OL in individual, group and organizational levels had a positive relationship with competitive advantage, productivity, profit, total sales and customers’ satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Research Area</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>García-Morales, Llorén-Montes, and Verdú-Jover (2008)</td>
<td>Manufacturing, construction and service firm in Spain</td>
<td>OL has a positive influence on OE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang &amp; Lee (2007)</td>
<td>Financial industry, manufacturing industry and service industry in Taiwan</td>
<td>OL has a positive effect on employee job satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akgün, Keskin, Byrne, and Aren (2007)</td>
<td>Turkish organizations</td>
<td>OL has a positive relationship with product innovativeness; openness and experimentation; knowledge Transfer and integration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montes, Moreno &amp; Morales (2005)</td>
<td>Chief executive of large Spanish organizations</td>
<td>OL had a significant influence on OE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>López, Peon, Ordas (2005)</td>
<td>Large Spanish organizations</td>
<td>Information acquisition and information interpretation had positive and significant effect on Return of Assets and value added per Employee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fang &amp; Wang (2006)</td>
<td>Survey on steel, machinery makers and electrical in Taiwan</td>
<td>OL has a significant influence on OE; capability of generating competitive Advantages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real, Leal, and Roldán (2006)</td>
<td>Spanish organizations</td>
<td>OL increased manufacturing product quality and capability of employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Škerlavaj, Štemberger, Škrinjar, and Dimovski (2007)</td>
<td>CEOs or senior managers of Slovenian enterprises</td>
<td>Knowledge acquisition, distribution, interpretation and organizational memory had positive relationship with innovation and competitiveness and economic financial Results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aragón-Correa, García-Morales,</td>
<td>Farming, manufacturing,</td>
<td>OL significantly influences OE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The past research disclosures have reinforced the likelihood that the existence of OL practices prompts OE. Constant learning procurement, dispersal, misuse and capacity have been recognized in different studies (Lloren-Montes, Javier-Moreno et al. 2005; López, Peon et al. 2005; Montes Peon 2006; García-Morales 2008; Hung, Yang et al. 2010; Liao and Wu 2010; Jiménez-Jiménez and Sanz-Valle 2011) as inciting better advantage, advancement, customer and delegate livelihood satisfaction. Considering these results a relationship between OL and OE is depended upon to exist as is showed up in Figure 4-5.

**Figure 4-5: Proposed Organizational Learning and OE relationship Model**

![Organizational Learning and OE relationship Model](image)

Source: Model Developed for this Research

### 4.3.2 OL and OC

In 1993, Cook and Yanow expressed that authoritative taking in techniques should be seen from a typical culture perspective. All the more starting late, Schein (2004) has maintained this point of view and has suggested that OC clearly affects the way of learning, comprehension of other’s practices, and the determination of ensuing practices. Diverse authorities have examined the association between OL and OC. Graham and Nafukho (2007) showed that OC has a basic part in building OL establishment inside an affiliation. Correspondingly, Jung & Takeuchi (2010) declared that OL had happened when OC permitted it and this exhibited a basic piece of OC in case of OL. Thusly, OC has been seen to be basic for OL sense of how to have the ability to happen.

There are three essential parts of OC which affect the existence of OL: bolster, openness, and mental security (Mumford, Scott et al. 2002; Jung and Takeuchi 2010). Agents may be more effective in their present spot of business if the hierarchical structure grants them to join in fundamental authority (Lucas and Kline 2008), if their affiliation has openness to new musings (Weldy 2009) and if they have
a mental conviction that learning and obtaining new data and elucidating it for the upside of the affiliation will be seen and will make a prevalent future for them and for their affiliation (Graham and Nafukho 2007; van Grinsven and Visser 2011).

In exhibiting the relationship between OL and organizational culture in an Israeli keeping cash business, Barkai and Samuel (2005) found a positive path from organizational culture to OL. OC is introduced in authoritative layout which can elucidate the joint effort between hierarchical people and the flood of force and commitment (Barrette, Lemyre et al. 2008; Al-Adaileh and Al-Atawdi 2010). It affects the case of hierarchical fundamental authority, the case of participations between authoritative people and the motivation of each and every hierarchical part to fulfill an unusual condition of OE (Barkai and Samuel 2005).

As a result of research that they finished, García-Morales, Lloréns-Montes and Verdú-Jover (2008 p. 304) has prescribed that "incredible hierarchical arrangement increases OL". The clarification behind this can be cleared up by qualities and case of participation between hierarchical people being seen in authoritative blueprint with information stream and case of data sharing being formally reflected in the arrangement of hierarchical structures (García-Morales, Lloréns-Montes et al. 2008).

In an Asian association, in research on worldwide non-advantage relationship in Bangkok, Thailand, Prugsamatz (2010) found that OC sways data acquirement and sharing and the dedication of musings from specialists. Correspondingly, in their study in Taiwanese endeavors, Chang and Lee (2007) found that gathering culture, mission culture and flexible culture had influenced assembling shared vision, singular power and proficient coordinated effort determinedly and on a very basic level.

As has been analyzed in chapter 4 and as by virtue of other Asian Countries, Indonesians are collectivist. Walumbwa, Lawler, and Avolio (2007) found that in collectivist social orders, TL is all the more convincing in light of the way that disciples would identify with and be drawn towards the qualities that underlined total authoritative goals and the sharing of an average workplace mission. TL was said to propel more essential enthusiasm inside collectivist social orders since supporters will most likely recognize and to identify with their leader's reasoning due to capable detachment regard and the affirmation of force (Jung, Chow et al. 2003). Besides, particular associations were imperative to develop a fantasy, set a heading and move sureness, to get preferences from biological changes and to extend salespersons'
shows Paparoidamis (2005).

Taking into account these discoveries of there being a relationship between OL and OC in vast undertakings, it is recommended that OC will likewise impact OL, the proposed relationship is appeared in Figure 4-6

**Figure 4-6: Proposed OC – Organizational Learning –OE relationship**
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Source: Model developed for this Research

### 4.3.3 OL and TL

Research into the associations between TL and OL has been driven by various European masters (for case Aragón-Correa, García-Morales et al. 2007; García-Morales, Jiménez-Barrionuevo et al. 2011) and in Asia (for occasion Jung, Chow et al. 2003; Amitay, Popper et al. 2005; Gumuslouglu and Ilsev 2009). Generally, the research results have demonstrated that TL has a positive relationship with OL, agent imaginativeness, authoritative advancement and OE. The constructive relationship has related to the piece of TL to set honest to goodness conditions for individuals, social occasion, frameworks and structure to approve emanant homes that propel learning’ (Hannah and Lester 2009 p. 35).

TL intervention in OL exists at three levels, specifically the little scale level, meso-level and full scale level (Altman and Iles 1998; Hannah and Lester 2009). In the littler scale level, leaders create developmental status with key data and concentrated on developmental learning experiences (Hannah and Lester 2009). At the meso-level, leaders make semi-self-decision learning frameworks, improve social exchange quality and venture and embed data stimuli. At the huge scale level, leaders execute creating data, evening out study and manhandle and systematize structure and advantages for diffuse, share and embed the rising learning in the affiliation’s structure (Hannah and Lester 2009).

Aragón-Correa, García-Morales, and Cordón-Pozo (2007) inspected the
relationship between transformational dominant presences in 408 broad Spanish organizations. Their finding showed that TL affected, authoritative adjusting, roundabout impacting firm progression and that hierarchical adjusting determinedly influenced OE essentially through advancement. All the more starting late, García-Morales, Jiménez-Barrionuevo, and Gutiérrez-Gutiérrez (2011) analyzed the effect of TL on OE through the dynamic limits of the OL and progression of 168 Spanish organizations. They also found that TL determinedly affected OE through OL and improvement that OL influenced OE earnestly, and both direct and roundabout through hierarchical Innovation and that hierarchical progression quite affected OE. In an Asian association, Chang and Lee (2007) considered the relationship between OL and activity in Taiwanese endeavors. They found that TL affected building shared vision, singular power and efficient investment In view of the past general finding of there being a relationship between OL and TL in extensive undertakings, the relationship amongst authority and OL out how to be inspected in this theory study is proposed to be as appeared in Figure 4-7.

![Figure 4-7: Proposed TL – OL –OC and OP Relationships](image)

Delegates with adequate capacities who can adjust to persevering change in a step by step hierarchical setting are required for authoritative making sense of how to happen (Allahyari, Shahbazi et al. 2011). Subsequently, various past researchers have included EMP as an important factor crucial fragment of OL (Ahmad and Oranye 2010; Jyothibabu, Farooq et al. 2010; Angeles 2011; Jyothibabu, Pradhan et al. 2011). In any case, distinctive pros have conceptualized EMP as a free create and not as a fragment of OL. Skerlavaj and Dimovski (2006) declared that EMP engages learning sharing, disseminating and utilization.
A causal relationship between EMP and OL in significant tries has been analyzed by past OL pros. Case in point, Bontis, Crossan and Hulland (2002) considered the OL method and EMP in the Investment Funds Institute of Canada. The result showed that EMP was firmly associated with OL in, specialists' abilities to add to their relationship in different courses and to vitalize a sentiment pride in their job.

A capacity to know east from west and a sentiment impact were in like manner saw to be unequivocally associated with both OL and authoritative Innovation and OE (Bontis, Crossan et al. 2002). In another study, Prugsamatz (2010) found that EMP as the change of creativity, arrangement of new data and time of different contemplations had a positive relationship with the occasion of OL. It is in this way considered a sound development for EMP furthermore to be required to have a relationship with OL in BSNL. Since specialists in BSNL are extensive in number and along these lines conceivably more about associated with the business, the effect of EMP on the relationship could be depended upon to be more critical by virtue of vast association than because of big organization. In view of the past discoveries, the relationship in BSNL between OL and EMP is proposed to be as appeared in Figure 4-8.

**Figure 4-8: Proposed TL-EP-OC-OL-OE relationship**

Source: Model Developed for this Research

### 4.3.5 OC and TL

Schein (2004) certified that TL makes and changes OC and agreeing to the Mirkamali, Thani, and Alami (2011) research in greater undertakings, activity chooses organizational culture. This proposition investigate thusly expect that TL effects OC in BSNL. In a constantly changing authoritative environment, leaders reliably make and set forceful qualities for each and every hierarchical part (Graham
and Nafukho (2007) and leaders create authoritative social orders to make hierarchical capacities and obligation to OE (Dull 2010).

Pers (2007) drove a study and chatted with owner and staff people from 24 open libraries in Denmark to analyze the choice of TL instruments, the OC and power in a library association. He found that movements and Innovation culture were connected with TL. His research similarly revealed that Innovation capacities and data sharing were basic. In extension, he found that transformational leaders were the essential segment in assistant and social change. The proposed relationship between TL and OC in BSNL is accordingly appeared in figure 4.9.

![Figure 4-9: Proposed TL- OC- EP - OL- OP relationship](image)

Source: Model Developed for this Research

### 4.3.6 TL and EMP

Two basic necessities for the occasion of OL are for there to be lively and incredibly enthusiastic agents why ought to sharp work and to perform well. To be energized and incredibly vigorous, laborers need there to be a task of commitment and an independence of undertaking OE (Appelbaum and Honegar 1998; Peterson and Zimmerman 2004; Ahearne, Mathie et al. 2005; Ahmad and Orange 2010). In such situation, it is suggested that TL is required (Avolio, Zhu et al. 2004; Adair 2005; Baek-Kyoo and Ji Hyun 2010; Bonias, Timothy et al. 2010). EMP incorporates the assignment of commitment to supporters, the change of their capacity to think for themselves in conveying new and innovative musings (Dvir, Eden et al. 2002) and trusting them to execute the new innovative musings (Seibert, Wang et al. 2011).
Delegates who assume that their leaders can be trusted are in like manner encouraged to develop their capacity to perform (Maranto-Vargas and Rangel 2007). In extension, TL highlights the opportunity and virtuoso activity of disciples, and favors EMP systems rather than control methods (Bass 2000; Serfontein 2006) in this way giving a bit of the necessities to the existence of OL. The precise relationship between TL and EMP in an OL association in greater associations has been inspected by various researchers (Dvir, Eden et al. 2002; Avolio, Zhu et al. 2004; García-Morales 2008; Stewart, McNulty et al. 2008). In particular, Avolio, Zhu, Koh and Bhatia (2004) found that academic affectation redesigned agent inventive vitality and inventiveness. Such taught induction could make a sentiment choice or self-determination in followers. Also, taught induction may be one course in which leaders can show supporters that they regard their dedication. This can engage assumptions of saw ability or self-ampleness and impact. Individualized thought about disciples' prerequisites for achievement and advancement can in like manner urge them to handle continuously more prominent commitments in working up their greatest limit making prepared to the subjective states of EMP (Bass 2000; Avolio, Zhu et al. 2004). The proposed relationship between TL and EMP in BSNL is in this way appeared in figure 4.10.

Figure 4-10: Proposed TL-OC-EP-OL-OP Relationship

Source: Model Developed for this Research.

4.3.7 OC and EMP

Organizational culture incorporates the feelings, qualities and case of communications inside an affiliation that "... show desired practices and results to oversee keep up goal composed tries of hierarchical people" (Peterson and
Zimmerman 2004 p. 135). Case of affiliation and fundamental TL structures have been found to choose specialist's fervor, conviction and limit and organizational culture (Fuller, Morrison et al. 1999; Jones, Jimmieson et al. 2005). Sensibility in an essential TL process engages laborers to complete their livelihood well and to focus on their OE and job accomplishment. Advantages of managing advancement make trust in experimentation and in the inventiveness of hierarchical people (Naranjo-Valencia, Jiménez-Jiménez et al. 2011).

In broad associations, various studies have dissected the case of associations amongst EMP and OC (for example McEwan and Sackett 1997; Tjosvold, Hui et al. 1998; Nyhan, Cressey et al. 2004; Wong, Tjosvold et al. 2010). McEwan and Sackett (1997) found that EMP is associated about to OC. Distinctive researchers, for instance, Tjosvold, Hui, and Law (1998); Smith and Moully (1998); Quinn and Spreitzer (1997) also found a positive relationship between OC and EMP as did Nyhan, Cressey, Tomassini, Kelleher, and Poell (2004). Taking into account the above data it is suggested that OC will likewise impact EMP in BSNL and the foreseen example of such connections are appeared in Figure 4.11.

**Figure 4-11: Proposed TL-OC-EP-OL-OP relationships**
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Source: Model Developed for this Research.

### 4.4 Comprehensive Conceptual Model

Davisand Daley (2008) has inspected which of the OL measurements have the best impact on different OE variables. Their outcomes fortify the proposed SEM
relationship model as being integrative in nature and the recommendation that hierarchical adapting should be executed at both the general population and framework levels. On a framework level, examples of communication and authoritative qualities take into consideration the event of OL, on the grounds that on an individual level, employees will feel engaged and leaders will bolster information sharing.

OL has been said to be a dynamic methodology in light of information stream, which recommends moving information and data among the differing levels of action, going from the individual to the social event level, and after that to the organizational level and back again (Huber 1991; Crossan, Lane et al. 1999; Cegarra-Navarro, Jiménez et al. 2007; Guido 2007).

This strategy starts from the data acquiring of the general population and advances through the exchange and joining of this learning until a variety of total learning is made (Hedberg and Wolff 2003), introduced in the hierarchical strategies and culture (Naranjo-Valencia, Jiménez-Jimenéz et al. 2011). This total organizational information which is secured in the authoritative memory (Walsh and Fisher 2005), influences the sort of learning acquired and the course in which it is deciphered and shared. What an individual acknowledges in an affiliation phenomenally depends on upon what is starting now known by exchange people from the affiliation - toward the day's end, on shared learning and the essential data base (Simon 1991; Simonin 1997; Bell, Mengüç et al. 2010).

Jyothibabu, Farroq, and Pradhan (2010) considered OL in fourteen Indian warm associations. They found that delegate EMP had a quick and positive relationship with individual level learning, embedded structures, system affiliations, activity, bunch learning and steady learning and a variant positive relationship with OE. Their research in like manner revealed that laborer EMP associated basically with relentless learning, talk demand, bunch learning and the embedded of systems.

Remembering the final objective to adjust to the three OL models – OC, TL and EMP, this study has proposed a model that combines a mix of the Jyotibabu Farroq, and Pradhan (2010) and the Chang and Lee (2007) models. The proposed model acknowledge that OL happens if authority reinforces its occasion (Amitay, Popper et al. 2005; García-Morales, Llorens-Montes et al., 2008; Yukl, 2009) and OC permits the occasion of OL (Chang and Lee, 2007) the length of specialists have the key capacities and abilities to show OL practices in step by step work
situation (Rankinen, Suominen et al., 2009; van Grinsven and Visser, 2011). The
picked model exhibits a broad communication between OL trailblazers – OC, TL and
EMP and the consequence of OL as measured by OE.

TL has been said to move a shared vision, values, premium, trusts and yearns
for an ordinary hierarchical future (Amy 2008); to make a learning culture and to
engage authoritative making sense of how to happen (Rebelo and Gomes 2011). TL
close by a consistent organizational culture and connected with specialists is relied
upon to redesign the occasion of hierarchical finding that prompts OE change. The
connections between the builds to be inspected in this proposal research are appeared
in Figure 4.12:

![Figure 4-12: Final Proposed Model of The Research](image)

Source: Model developed for this Research

### 4.5 Proposition and hypothesis

The previous section covered the direction and patterns of association between
the constructs. This section further identifies these proposed relationships by setting
them out in the form of eight hypotheses which will be tested in this thesis research.

#### 4.5.1 OL and OE

Various past experts have investigated the relationship between OL and
definitive OE (for case López, Peón et al. 2004; Lloréns Montes, Ruiz Moreno et al.
2005; Yeung, Lai et al. 2007; García-Morales 2008; Di Milia and Birdi 2010;
Jyothishbabu, Farooq et al. 2010; Wang, Wang et al. 2010; García-Morales, Jiménez-
Barrionuevo et al. 2011; Jiménez-Jiménez and Sanz-Valle 2011). Some studies have
offered support to the existence of a positive relationship between various OL and firm OE (Bontis, Crossan et al. 2002; López, Peón et al. 2004; Lloréns Montes, Ruiz Moreno et al. 2005; Jiménez-Jiménez and Sanz-Valle 2011).

Goh and Ryan (2008) considered the association between learning capacity and high ground, as measured by the whole deal market financial OE of a social event of learning associations. They contemplated that relationship with aOL trademark performed better than their adversaries. So likewise, in their study on Dutch and Belgian BSNL, van Gils and Zwart (2004) watched that data sharing and learning extended turnover, made higher advantages and enhanced the item go.

An equivalent study producer of stoneware generation in Spain, Alegre and Chiva (2008) found that experimentation, risk taking, and coordinated effort with the external environment, trade and participative fundamental TL, affected OE when measured as an extension in item improvement. A champion amongst the most recent study hones drove by Panagiotakopoulos (2011) in Greek BSNL found that a consistent push to get and control data in telecom affiliations affected survival and improvement. In addition, he found that various OL lessened bumbles, introduced impelled advancement, redesigned worker employability and tended to need issues in the examined organization affiliations.

Diverse researchers, regardless, found that OL in SME does not affect definitive OE. In their research on BSNL in Devon and Cornwall, in the United Kingdom, Chaston, Badger and Sadler-Smith (1999) found no relationship between OL and OE as measured by arrangements improvement. They found that a constant push to get and control learning did not have a basic association with arrangements advancement. Basically, Birdthistle (2008) in his study on family based BSNL in Ireland, simply found an inclination towards learning presentation without it having any relationship to OE. In this thesis research OL was posited as having a relationship with OE and the following null hypothesis was tested.

Hypothesis Ho1: there is no significant relationship between OL and OE.

4.5.2 OC and OL

Legitimate culture has once in a while been examined to check whether it is a key essential for progressive making sense of how to happen (for occurrence: López, Peón et al. 2004; García-Morales, Llorens-Montes et al. 2006; Boudrias, Gaudreau et
The case of associations introduced in a definitive structure and the common qualities between OM can affect how specialists share and use learning for the benefit of the whole affiliation. Qualities and conventions in the affiliation will affect learning securing, spread and mishandle (Lejeune and Vas 2009). Definitive culture sways openness to new considerations from agents, customers and the misuse of information set away as various leveled data.

Right when openness qualities are introduced in a various leveled structure, agents will be enlivened to look at messes up and to pick up from them while levels of trust between legitimate people will hoist laborer activities to alter their operational targets to environmental necessities with a particular deciding objective to meet progressive destinations. A various leveled structure as a marker of force and commitment and what's more an information stream will affect how data is shared and abused. In this thesis research OC was posited as being an influence on OL and the following null hypothesis was tested.

**Hypothesis Ho2a:** There is no significant relationship between OC and OL.

### 4.5.3 OC and EMP

It is prescribed that the work of reasonable fundamental TL and the holding of creative qualities by definitive people will make conditions for target mask, saw control and saw wellness from various leveled people (Menon 2001; Ajmal, Kekale et al. 2009; Suppiah and Sandhu 2010). A positive relationship between OC and EMP have been recognized in past studies (Smith and Mouly 1998; Tjosvold, Hui et al. 1998; Nyhan, Cresseby et al. 2004; Smith 2005; Law and Ngai 2008; Wong, Tjosvold et al. 2010).

Sharing data between legitimate people which is a basic piece of various leveled adjusting needs openness and strength of complexities in conclusions (Law and Ngai 2008) and objectivity in positive decision making. Mishandling data for the benefit of the affiliation simply happens if the measures and estimations of the OM support it (Jing, Avery et al. 2011). Openness to new contemplations and the assistant stream of the fundamental TL technique are said to be key for the OL process (Awal, Klingler et al. 2006).

Diverse parts of various OC, for instance, the impact of essential authority,
customary missions and trust are acknowledged to effect delegates' energy; focus on work and convincing jobOE. Thought about the impact of fundamental TL on delegates' may effect laborers' energy to move toward pre-chosen progressive targets. Sharing a sound judgment of mission that each various leveled part trust justifies trying to achieve can enable agents to focus on what would anyone be able to do work reasonably (Bih-Shiaw and Weining 2003; Simons, Germans et al. 2003; Wallace, Johnson et al. 2011). In this research, OC was posited as being an important influence on EMP and the following null hypothesis $H_{02b}$ tested the association between OC and EMP.

**Hypothesis $H_{02b}$: There is no significant relationship between OC and EMP**

### 4.5.4 TL and OL

OLand TL research disclosures have recommended that there is a relationship between the style of TL and the existence of various OL (Barkai and Samuel 2005; Aragón-Correa, García-Morales et al. 2007; Hannah and Lester 2009). The style of TL can set up fitting conditions for delegates, bunches and various leveled structures to realize suitable data acquisition, dispersal and abuse (Cavaleri, Seivert et al. 2005; Lloréns Montes, Ruiz Moreno et al. 2005; García-Morales 2008). Transformational leaders can enliven laborers' levels of learning, can improve pack level data sharing and can execute rising data, evening out study and mishandle and organize establishment and advantages for diffuse, share and embed the eminent data at the organizational level. TL can energize various OL by quickening trade and conditions of openness (Field 2011).

Past significant business focuses on have given evidence of a positive relationship between TL and OL (Tsui, Zhang et al. 2006; Chang and Lee 2007; Hannah and Lester 2009) and the existence of a positive relationship between TL andOL (Lloren-Montes, Javier-Moreno et al. 2005; García-Morales 2008; García-Morales, Jiménez-Barrionuevo et al. 2011). The communication of dreams, sensitivity and sharing of critical cutting edge information can affect the get ready of data and its dispersal and misuse by OM. The sharing of vital information among definitive people or partners has been delineated just like a determination of the existence of OL (Dvir, Eden et al. 2002; Patterson 2009; Menges, Walter et al. 2011). As the large business literature review provided evidence of a positive
relationship between TL and organizational learning, the following null hypothesis was tested:

**Hypothesis Ho3a: There is no significant relationship between TL and OL.**

### 4.5.5 TL and OC

As showed by Amitay, Popper and Lipshitz (2005) TL is fundamental for shaping OC. TL has been said to animate a typical vision, values, premium, trusts and dreams and an ordinary organizational future (Amy 2008) and to make a learning culture and to engage various leveled making sense of how to happen (García-Morales, Lloréns-Montes et al. 2008; García-Morales, Jiménez-Barrionuevo et al. 2011; Rebello and Gomes 2011).

TL creates an arrangement of planning for developmental learning practices (Bass 1990; Serfontein 2006; Aslan, Diken et al. 2011), and makes semi-free learning frameworks (Bass 2000), upgrades social exchange quality and backing and embeds data impulses (García-Morales, Jiménez-Barrionuevo et al. 2011). Another piece of TL is that it actualizes creating learning, equalities study and mishandle and systematizes structure and resources for diffuse, share and embed the emanate information in the affiliation structure (García-Morales, Lopez-Martín et al. 2006; Hannah and Lester 2009).

TL sets up a case of characteristics to suit relentless changes in a various leveled area and to get favorable situation from the movements (Sarin and McDermott 2003) and empties defensive timetables in the definitive structure that ruin the method of OL (Philips 2003). Jung and Takeuchi (2010) in their study amassing in Japan found that unfaltering TL had a basic association with legitimate culture. Basically, Prugsamatz (2010) in her study of non-advantage relationship in Bangkok, Thailand found a positive basic relationship between TL and social practices. In this way, noteworthy precise affirmation exists interfacing TL and various OC. As the large business literature review provided evidence of the influence of TL on OC, the following null hypothesis was tested:

**Hypothesis Ho3b: There is no significant relationship between TL and OC.**

### 4.5.6 TL and EMP

Various studies have broken down the relationship between TL and
EMP amongst supporters (for occurrence Chang and Lee 2007; Nailon, Delahaye et al. 2007; Wang and Lee 2009; Lee and Wei 2011). Estimations of TL, for instance, Individual thought, insightful induction, elevating motivation, and romanticized effect are said to effect consistent attempts to control their own work by agents (Duvall 1999; Bass, Avolio et al. 2003; Serfontein 2006; Lee and Wei 2011). Additionally, TL is said to oversee and stir a normal vision of the affiliation people and to bolster the change of good communication frameworks and a spirit of trust (Avolio, Waldman et al. 1991; Avolio, Zhu et al. 2004; Bono and Judge 2004).

Accurate studies have revealed a positive relationship between TL and EMP (for example Dvir, Eden et al. 2002; Kark, Shamir et al. 2003; Avolio, Zhu et al. 2004; García-Morales, Lloréns-Montes et al. 2008). Dvir, Eden, Avolio, and Shamir (2002) found affirmation that TL provoked EMP, self-suitability, and free considering. So additionally, Avolio, Zhu, Koh and Bhatia (2004) in like manner found that TL incited EMP and obligation. Based on the previous study results, in relation to TL and EMP, the following null hypothesis was tested.

**Hypothesis Ho: There is no significant relationship between TL and EMP.**

4.5.7 TL and OE

Individual consideration, insightful actuation, elevating motivation and respected effect as estimations of TL were required to affect OE roundabout – through OL (Lloren-Montes, Javier-Moreno et al. 2005; Aragón-Correa, García-Morales et al. 2007; Chang and Lee 2007; García-Morales, Lloréns-Montes et al. 2008). TL is said to affect various OL provoking the achievement of better OE.

Dvir, Eden, Avolio, and Shamir (2002) found that TL which was measured by individual thought, academic prompting, elevating motivation, and romanticized sway, had a positive relationship with agent obligation, and satisfaction. This resembled a finding by LeBrasseur, Whissell, and Ojha (2002) that TL upgraded the authority way of Canadian mending focuses. In any case, Brown and Arendt (2011) found that TL had no relationship to OE. In relation to the influence of TL on OE; the following null hypothesis was tested:

**Hypothesis Ho: There is no significant relationship between TL and OE.**
4.5.8 EMP and OL

Various studies have examined the associations between EMP and OL (for instance Chaston, Badger et al. 2000; Chaston, Badger et al. 2001; Bontis, Crossan et al. 2002; López, Peón et al. 2005; Michana 2009). Specialist's goal camouflage saw control and saw capacity redesigns the system of knowledge acquisition, dissimulation and exploitation. A sentiment pride in their job, capacity to know east from west and sentiment impact were seen to be quite associated with both OL and empowerment and OE (Bontis, Crossan et al. 2002).

In her study on the relationship between OL and OE in Poland, Michana (2009) found that OL associated out and out with agent EMP. Distinctive investigators have in like manner found a positive relationship between OL and EMP (Schein 1999; Chaston, Badger et al. 2000; Roche 2002; López, Peón et al. 2005; Michana 2009). As previous large business empirical studies have provided evidence of a positive influence of EMP on OL, the following null hypothesis was tested:

**Hypothesis Ho4: There is no significant relationship between EMP and OL**

### 4.6 Consolidated hypotheses of the research formulated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.7 Construct development

Having talked about a model of the connections to be analyzed in this study and the theories that are to be tried, the accompanying area traces the measurements that were distinguished as fundamental every-develop and each Construct.

#### 4.7.1 OL

Regardless of the way that research into various OL extended essentially in
the midst of the 1990s, there is still no comprehension about how to measure it and what items incorporate OL it out. With everything taken into account, past authorities have conceptualized various OL as a steady strategy to get, scatter and abuse information and data in an affiliation (Crossan, Lane et al. 1995; Bontis, Crossan et al. 2002; Crossan and Bedrow 2003; Jung, Chow et al. 2003; Bapuji and Crossan 2004; Berson, Nemanich et al. 2006; Argote 2011; Crossan, Maurer et al. 2011). This thought has been used as a piece of building up a measure of OL by different experts (Bontis, Crossan et al. 2002; López, Peón et al. 2005; Montes Peon 2006; López Sánchez 2010; López-Cabrales, Real et al. 2011; López Sánchez, Santos et al. 2011; Santos-Vijande, López-Sánchez et al. 2011).

OL is acknowledged to be a latent create and various masters have viewed it as a second order latent construct (Jerez-Gomez, Cespedes-Lorente et al. 2005; López, Peón et al. 2005; Panayides 2007; Azadegan and Dooley 2010; Škerlavaj, Song et al. 2010; Jiménez-Jiménez and Sanz-Valle 2011; Nasution, Mavondo et al. 2011). Various distinctive pros, have nevertheless, viewed OL as a first order construct (Bontis, Crossan et al. 2002; Llorens-Montes, Javier-Moreno et al. 2005; García-Morales, Llorens-Montes et al. 2006; Aragón-Correa, García-Morales et al. 2007; García-Morales 2008; García-Morales 2011).

Jerez-Gomez, Cespedes-Lorente, and Valle-Cabrera (2005) assumed that OL is a second order construct appeared by four first order construct. The primary solicitation creates were authority obligation, system perspective, openness and experimentation and data trade and mix. Moreover, Jiménez-Jiménez and Sanz-Valle (2011) assumed that various OL is a second order construct similarly exhibited by four first order construct which, regardless, for their existence where data acquiring, learning movement, learning understanding and legitimate memory. Azadegan and Dooley (2010), of course, moreover viewed OL as a second demand grow yet considered it to be one that was appeared by only two first order construct to be particular explorative learning and exploitative learning. All of the indicators of the second order OL construct that were suggested by these three studies are shown in Table 4-2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Sub Construct</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jerez-Gomez,</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Seven-</td>
<td>1. The managers frequently involve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-2: Measures of OL Used in Previous Studies (Second Order)
| Cespedes-Lorente, and Valle-Cabrera (2005) | commitment | point Likert-type scale | their staff in Important decision making processes.  
2. Employee learning is considered more of an Expense than an investment (R).  
3. The firm’s management looks favorably on carrying out changes in any area to adapt to and/or keep ahead of new environmental Situations.  
4. Employee learning capability is considered a key factor in this firm.  
5. In this firm, innovative ideas that work are rewarded. |
|------------------------------------------|-------------|------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| System perspective |                         | 1. All employees have generalized knowledge regarding this firm’s objectives.  
2. All parts that make up this firm (departments, Sections, work teams, and individuals) are well aware of how they contribute to achieving the overall objectives.  
3. All parts that make up this firm are interconnected, working together in a coordinated fashion. |
| Openness and experimentation |                         | 1. This firm promotes experimentation and innovation as a way of improving the work Processes.  
2. This firm follows up what other organizations in the sector are doing, adopting those practices and techniques it believes to be useful and Interesting.  
3. Experiences and ideas provided by external sources (advisors, customers, training organizations, |
| Knowledge transfer and integration | 1. Errors and failures are always discussed and analyzed in this firm, on all levels.  
2. Employees have the chance to talk among themselves about new ideas, programs, and activities that might be of use to the firm.  
3. In this firm, teamwork is not the usual way to work.  
4. The firm has instruments for sharing knowledge. |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Azadegan & Dooley (2010) Explorative learning Seven-point Likert-type scale | 1. Frequently experiments with important new ideas or ways of doing items  
Employees frequently come up with creative ideas that challenge conventional ideas  
3. Compared to competition, a high per cent of sales come from new products launched in the past three years |
| Exploitative learning | 1. At this supplier a strong emphasis is placed on improving efficiency  
2. This supplier excels at refining existing technologies  
3. This supplier frequently adjusts procedures, rules and policies to make items work better. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jiménez-Jiménez &amp; Sanz-Valle (2011)</th>
<th>Knowledge acquisition</th>
<th>Five-point Likert scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. The employees attend fairs and exhibitions&lt;br&gt;2. Regularly there is a consolidated and resourceful R&amp;D policy&lt;br&gt;3. New ideas and approaches to work OE are experimented continuously</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge distribution</td>
<td>1. The company has formal mechanisms to guarantee the sharing of the best practices among the different fields of the activity&lt;br&gt;2. There are individuals within the organization who take part in several teams or divisions and who also act as links between them&lt;br&gt;3. There are individuals responsible for collecting, assembling and distributing internal Employees’ suggestions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge interpretation</td>
<td>1. All members of the organization share the same aim to which they feel committed&lt;br&gt;2. Employees share knowledge and experiences by talking each other&lt;br&gt;3. Teamwork is a very common practice in the company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational memory</td>
<td>1. The company has directories or e-mail files according to the field they belong to, so as to find an expert on a concrete issue at any time&lt;br&gt;2. The company has up-to-date databases and its clients&lt;br&gt;3. There is access to the organization’s databases and documents through some kind of network (Lotus Notes, Intranet etc.)&lt;br&gt;4. Databases are always kept up-to-date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: literature review
Nonetheless, as has been specified, research that was accounted for by Jyothibabu, Farooq, and Pradan (2010) considered OL out how to be a first order construct that was shown by various measures. Bontis, Crossan, and Hulland (2002) and Jyothibabu, Farooq, and Pradhan (2010) utilized ten items while García-Morales, Moreno, and Llorens-Montes (2006) utilized five items and García-Morales, Llorens-Montes, and Verdú-Jover (2007) utilized four items to quantify OL. The way of the scales that were utilized by these specialists and the scale markers for these four studies are appeared in Table 4-3.

Table 4-3: Previous measures of OL (First order)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Number of Items Used</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Bontis, Crossan, Hulland (2002)| Seven point Likert-type Scale | 10                   | 1. Diverse views  
2. Rethink decisions  
3. Right people  
4. Understand point of view  
5. Conflict resolution  
6. Adaptable group  
7. Common understanding  
8. Share successes  
9. Share failures  
10. Idea generation |
| Garcia-Morales, Moreno, Llorens-Montes, (2006) | Seven point Likert-type Scale | 5                    | 1. There is cohesion of vision in the organization’s different units  
2. Management in the organization has a shared vision of the organization’s future  
3. Our organization agrees on what is important to the firm  
4. A high degree of the changes proposed by the shared vision are achieved  
5. Our organization has a clear vision of the objectives and mission that guide our business Strategies. |
| Garcia-Morales,                | Seven point              | 4                    | 1. The firm has acquired and used much new and                              |
As can be seen in tables 4-2 and 4-3 the OL concept has been considered to relate to how knowledge is: acquired, disseminated and shared among organizational members. It is therefore suggested that the processes of OL are being accomplished at
an individual level, and then being shared among organizational members and stored in the organizational structure and system.

OL is an affiliation's overhauled ability to get, scatter and use data with a particular finished objective to conform to a changing outside and internal environment requires openness, experimentation, trust and an acceptable data base (Adler and Zirger 1998; Abell and Simons 2000; Argote 2011; García-Morales, Jiménez-Barrionuevo et al. 2011).

As showed by Chen (2005) supporting specialists to think from an overall perspective implies that openness. Thinking from an overall perspective enables laborers to get information that is critical to their work and to extend it with a particular deciding objective to complete their job (Grinsven and Visser 2011; Jiménez-Jiménez and Sanz-Valle 2011).

It is said to enable taking in return from an external legitimate environment and the offering of the information to various agents (Schulz 2008). In like manner, as demonstrated by Garcia-Morales, Llorens-Montes, Verdú-Jover (2006) thinking from an overall perspective engages laborers to envision biological changes and to make the similarities anticipated that would complete their assignments.

Supporting delegates to analyze their slips and to pick up from them may incite more innovative and imaginative agents (Spector and Davidsen 2006). Rewarding specialist activities to handle certain creative work may lift fervor and obligation to work by the laborers. In any case, risks of fail to meet a typical goal may either ask or unsettle delegates to work creatively and feasibly yet requires there to back for specialists who put it all on the line (Spector and Davidsen 2006).

Employee’s willingness to help each other to learn makes a condition of sharing and trust. Adjusting together either in a formal gathering or in an easygoing one may be the reason for building organization knowledge (Spector and Davidsen 2006). Building trust among agents is a fundamental piece of making a concordant work environment in an affiliation (Spector and Davidsen 2006). Finally, keeping up a cutting-edge database of agent capacities engages a relationship to quickly use its specialist's aptitudes with a particular final objective to complete a particular undertaking or to upgrade their capacities.

By drawing on the majority of the items utilized as a part of past OL considers, this postulation research made a pool of 16 items that could be utilized to gauge OL. These items are appeared in Table 4-4.
Table 4-4: OL items and sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Variables Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bontis, Crossan et al. (2002); Spector &amp; Davidsen, (2006); Allegre &amp; Chiva (2008)</td>
<td>Employees are encouraged to think from a Global perspective</td>
<td>OL1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bontis, Crossan et al. (2002); Jerez-Gomez, Cespedes-Lorente et al.(2005); Skerlavaj and Dimovski (2006)</td>
<td>Employees are encouraged to bring Customers’ views into their decision-Making processes</td>
<td>OL2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bontis, Crossan et al. (2002); Jerez-Gomez, Cespedes-Lorente et al.(2005); Skerlavaj and Dimovski (2006)</td>
<td>Makes its learned lessons available to all employees</td>
<td>OL3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Templeton, Lewis et al.(2002); Jyothibabu, Farooq et al.(2010), Wong, Tjovold et al.,(2010)</td>
<td>Employees are stimulated to openly discuss mistakes in order to learn from them.</td>
<td>OL4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegre &amp; Chiva(2008); Jyothibabu, Farooq et al. (2010)</td>
<td>Supports employees who take calculated risks</td>
<td>OL6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimenez-Jimenez and Sanz-Valle (2011), López, Peón et al.(2005)</td>
<td>Employees help each other to learn</td>
<td>OL7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jyothibabu, Farooq et al.,(2010); Panayides, (2007)</td>
<td>Employees spend time building trust with each other</td>
<td>OL8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jyothibabu, Farooq et al., (2010)</td>
<td>Employees are rewarded for learning</td>
<td>OL9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spector &amp; Davidsen, (2006) Jyothibabu, Farooq et al.,(2010)</td>
<td>Employees are given time to support their learning</td>
<td>OL10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jyothibabu, Farooq et al., (2010)</td>
<td>I am free to initiate changes as needed</td>
<td>OL11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bontis, Crossan et al., (2002)</td>
<td>I am free to adapt operational goals as needed</td>
<td>OL12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spector &amp; Davidsen, (2006) Jyothibabu, Farooq et al.,</td>
<td>The owner-manager builds an alignment of vision across different structural levels</td>
<td>OL13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bontis, Crossan et al., (2002); Panayides, (2007)</td>
<td>All organizational members share similar visions and missions</td>
<td>OL14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerez-Gomez, Cespedes-</td>
<td>Enables employees to get</td>
<td>OL15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llorente (2005); Skerlavaj, Stemberger et al., (2007)</td>
<td>necessary information quickly and easily</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bontis, Crossan et al., (2002), López, Peon et al. (2005)</td>
<td>Maintains an up-to-date database of employee skills</td>
<td>OL16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.7.2 Organizational Culture (OC)

In an OL setting, OC makes the condition and arrangement of knowledge acquisition, dissimulation, exploit and capacity. As a procedure, OL exists in particular conditions and OCs (Lugosi and Bray 2008; Ahlgren and Tett 2010; Suppiah and Sandhu 2010; Zheng, Baiyun et al. 2010; Zu, Robbins et al. 2010). As indicated by Lejeune and Vas, (2009); Popper and Lipshitz, (2000); and Ryan, Windsor, Ibragimova, and Prybutok (2010), the particular conditions, standards, qualities and connections that happen between hierarchical individuals when knowledge acquisition, dissimulation, exploit learning is controlled by the stream of power and obligation implanted in the OS.

Likewise as with various OL, though various studies have inquired about the relationship of definitive culture with OL, there is still no admission to how to evaluate it and of what items it is incorporated. Some studies have viewed legitimate culture as a second order construct (Chang and Lee 2007; Lugosi and Bray 2008; Fard, Rostamy et al. 2009; Wang, Su et al. 2011) while others have viewed it as a first order construct (Bontis, Crossan et al. 2002; Jyothibabu, Farooq et al. 2010; Prugsamatz 2010; Jyothibabu, Pradhan et al. 2011).

Chang and Lee (2007) assumed that various OC was a latent variable showed by four first order constructs to be particular group culture, mission culture, adaptable culture and bureaucratic culture. Four first order constructs used to gage an organizational latent variable were moreover used as a part of a Fard, Rostamy, Taghiloo (2009) study. Fard, Rostamy, and Taghiloo (2009) named their four first order construct as bureaucratic culture, centered culture, participative culture and learning culture. A hardly various approach to manage measuring the definitive culture thought was proposed by Wang, Su, and Yang (2011). Using Hofstede's (2001) thought of culture, Wang, Su, and Yang (2011) used three first order construct to be particular freedom – group, power division and unsteadiness avoidance to gage OC in aOL setting. The first order constructs, scale types and measuring items used in these studies are shown in Table 4-5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Chang & Lee (2007) | Clan Culture       | Seven point Likert-type scale | 1. My company highly emphasizes humanity and respect to every member just like a large family  
2. My company highly emphasizes development of human resource, being kind to employees and encouraging teamwork cooperation  
3. The coherent power of my company is employees’ loyalty and devotion to my company and high emphasis on teamwork cooperation |
|                    | Mission culture    |                            | 1. The coherent power of my company is high emphasis on work OE and targeted achievement  
2. All company members can pay close attention to work OE and achievement orientation |
|                    | Adaptive culture   |                            | 1. All company members are vested with the spirit of innovation and adventure  
2. My company aggressively makes R&D effort for novel products and strategies in the hope of becoming the innovator among peering industries  |
|                    | Bureaucratic culture |                            | 1. My company is well regulated and all members severely obey work codes for daily tasks  
2. The power to enhance the coherence of my company is high emphasis of organization codes and policies and the maintenance of normal administrative operation |
| Fard, Rostamy, & Taghiloo (2009) | Bureaucratic culture | Five point Likert-type scale | 1. Inflexibility  
2. Rigid regulation  
3. High level of centralization  
4. Affirmative leadership style |
|                    | Competitive culture |                            | 1. High flexibility  
2. Low integration  
3. Contract relation between employee and the organization |
| Participative culture | 4. Low loyalty  
5. Low cultural identity |
|----------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| Learning culture     | 1. Achieving to quantitative objectives  
2. Low flexibility  
3. High integration  
4. Loyalty  
5. Personal commitment  
6. Team working  
7. High level of culture acceptance  
8. Tendency to satiability |
| Wang, Su & Yang (2011) | Individualism-collectivism  
1. Trend to change  
2. Knowledge expansion  
3. Sensitive and responsive to external changes  
4. Complex environment  
5. Competitive advantage  
6. Information about the environment  
7. Gathering environmental information and process  
8. Service development  
9. Encourage innovation, creativity and learning  
10. Organizational commitment. |
| Power Distance       | Five point Likert type scale  
1. Our firm emphasizes cooperation and collectivism  
2. Our firm encourages joint responsible for the successes and failures  
3. Close cooperation is preferred over working independently |
| Uncertainty avoidance| 1. The hierarchical line is very distinct in our firm and it is not allowed to be passed.  
2. The juniors are not allowed to argue against the superior, and they must follow the will of the superior  
3. The superior has the last word, and the juniors cannot discuss with them |
| **Source: literature review** |

As an arrangement of qualities and a fundamental presumption made and created through the duration of an association as recommended by Lahteenmaki,
Toivonen, and Mattila (2001), OC was additionally proposed to be a first order construct. However, there was no concession to what number of items spoke to it and the terms used to speak to it. Analysts who utilized a first order construct and recognized their estimation items were Jyothibabu, Farooq, and Pradhan (2010) who utilized an implanted framework to express OC, and Bontis, Crossan, and Hulland (2002). The scale types and measurement items used by these researchers are shown in Table 4-6.

Table 4-6: OC measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Number of item</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Bontis, Crossan, & Hulland (2002)| Seven point Likert-type scale | 10             | 1. Structure / strategy  
2. Structure / work  
3. Strategy/environment  
4. Vision  
5. Culture of trust  
6. Procedures  
7. Innovative culture  
8. Systems/strategy  
9. Systems  
10. Databases |
| Jyothibabu, Farooq, & Pradhan, 2010 | Six point Likert scale | 6              | 1. My organization recognizes people for taking TL  
2. My organization gives people choices in their work assignments  
3. My organization invites people to contribute to the organization’s vision  
4. My organization gives people control over resources they need to accomplish their work  
5. My organization supports employees to balance work and family  
6. My organization builds alignment of visions across different levels and work groups |

A few angles rise out of an research of the estimation items utilized as a part of the past concentrates specifically that OC grasps values and procedures of basic leadership, procedures of information sharing, a soul of development, a level of trust in the association (Lucas and Kline 2008) and knowledge management values. Different contemplations are the reasonability of the basic leadership prepares, the OE estimation framework, the arrangement of mission sharing and the arrangement of
collaboration among hierarchical offices, the structure of power and obligation and a framework that advances knowledge management (Calantone, Cavusgil et al. 2002). Drawing on these previous studies, this research identified a pool of measurement items that could be used to measure OC and these are shown in Table 4-7.

**Table 4-7: OC items and their sources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Variables title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allegre &amp; Chiva (2008); Škerlavaj, Song et al.,(2010)</td>
<td>All decision-making is made through a rational process</td>
<td>OC1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang &amp; Lee (2007); Škerlavaj, Song et al., (2007)</td>
<td>Considers the impact of decisions on employee morale</td>
<td>OC2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Škerlavaj, Song et al., (2007)</td>
<td>Creates systems to measure gaps between current and expected OE</td>
<td>OC3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bontis, Crossan et al. (2002)</td>
<td>All organizational members share a common sense of mission that most think is worth striving to achieve.</td>
<td>OC4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Škerlavaj, Song et al.,(2010)</td>
<td>Innovation is the most important goal.</td>
<td>OC6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jyothishbabu, Farooq et al., (2010);</td>
<td>The structure supports its strategic direction.</td>
<td>OC8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bontis, Crossan et al., (2002); Jyothishbabu, Farooq et al., (2010)</td>
<td>The OC is innovative.</td>
<td>OC9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jyothishbabu, Farooq et al.,(2010)</td>
<td>The organizational structure allows employees to work effectively.</td>
<td>OC10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Škerlavaj, Song et al., (2007); Jyothishbabu, Farooq et al., (2010)</td>
<td>The organization has built a culture of trust amongst employees.</td>
<td>OC11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bontis, Crossan et al., (2002); Škerlavaj, Song et al., (2007)</td>
<td>The organization has developed operational procedures to help employees to work efficiently</td>
<td>OC12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jyothishbabu, Farooq et</td>
<td>The organization has developed systems to</td>
<td>OC13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.7.3 TL

This study conceptualized TL in aOL setting and characterized it as an impacting relationship between leaders and followers who plan genuine changes and results that mirror their common purposes. In a comparative vein to OC, a few researchers have regarded TL as a second order constructs (Bass 1990; Smith 1993; Bass, Avolio et al. 2003; Brown and Arendt 2011). The first order constructs measuring TL as proposed by Brown and Arendt (2011) in their second order construct of TL are shown in Table 4-8.

**Table 4-8: Measures of TL Used in Previous studies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Brown & Arendt     | Idealized influence      |                              | 1. Power and confidence  
2. Sense of purpose  
3. Sense of mission  
4. Value and beliefs |
|                    | Inspirational motivation | Five-point Likert-type scale  | 1. Enthusiasm of goals  
2. Confidence in goals  
3. Optimism for the future  
4. Vision for the future |
|                    | Individualized consideration | Five-point Likert-type scale  | 1. Threats employees as individuals  
2. Recognizes different Needs of employees  
3. Develops strengths in employees  
4. Teaching and coaching |
|                    | Intellectual stimulation | Five-point Likert-type scale  | 1. Offers differing perspectives  
2. Employee looks at differing perspectives  
3. New methods of completing tasks  
4. Examines own beliefs |

Other studies have treated TL as a first order construct (Lloren-Montes, Javier-Moreno et al. 2005; Aragón-Correa, García-Morales et al. 2007; Chang and Lee 2007; Nailon, Delahaye et al. 2007; García-Morales 2008; García-Morales, Lloréns-Montes et al. 2008; García-Morales, Jiménez-Barrionuevo et al. 2011). The scale type and the number of items and indicators used in previous studies by such researchers are shown in Table 4-9.
Table 4-9: Measures TL used in previous studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Aragón-Correa, García-Morales,       | Seven point Likert-type   | 5               | 1. Give priority to seeking new opportunities for their organization  
2. Develop a clear common view of final aims more than short term objectives  
3. Emphasize motivating the rest of the company more than controlling  
4. Act as the organization’s leading force more than a as a supervisor  
5. Coordinate colleagues on the job |
| & Cordón-Pozo (2007)                  | Scale                     |                 |                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Chang & Lee (2007)                    | Seven point Likert-type   | 11              | 1. I believe my director has sufficient capability to overcome hardship from jobs  
2. Whenever my director pinpoints my fault, he will kindly consider my self-esteem  
3. Whenever my director is punishing me, he will definitely pose impartial attitude without personally dogmatic discretion  
4. I regard my director as the best example of success  
5. Whenever I make some faults on my job, my director will kindly communicate with me and find out the faults to take appropriate actions  
6. My director can share his delight and hardship with me  
7. My director can encourage me to have sufficient courage to face challenges  
8. My director takes care of me just like one of my family elders  
9. My director can orient me with a new director and help me solve problems  
10. My director can hand me over with the ultimate mission for customer service  
11. On the job, I cannot show my hearty respect and actually finish the instruction from my director |
| García-Morales, Lloréns-             | Seven point Likert        | 4               | 1. The firm’s management is always on the lookout for new opportunities  
2. The firm’s management has a clear                                                                                                               |
|                                      |                           |                 |                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
Both the first and second order approaches to the measurement of TL identify several main items that should be used to measure TL in an OL context namely vision sharing, empathy, fairness, willingness to help, sharing up-to-date information and continuous search for opportunities to learn. Based on the previous research, the pool of items that were identified for use in measuring TL in this research are shown in Table 4-10.

### Table 4-10: TL items and their sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bontis, Crossan et al., (2002); den Hartog &amp; de Hoogh (2009)</td>
<td>My manager communicates her/his vision to employees at every possible opportunity</td>
<td>Ld1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akgün, Keskin et al., (2007); den Hartog &amp; de Hoogh 2009)</td>
<td>Helps employees to balance their work and family</td>
<td>Ld2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang &amp; Lee (2007) Wong, Tjosvold et al., (2010)</td>
<td>My manager helps me if I have difficulty in doing my job</td>
<td>LD4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Templeton et al., (2002); Wong, Tjosvold et al., (2010)</td>
<td>My manager is willing to solve problems that occur</td>
<td>Ld5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gómez et al. (2004); Yang, Watkins et al., (2004)</td>
<td>My manager does not hold back promotion for good performers</td>
<td>Ld7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>den Hartog &amp; de Hoogh (2009);Wong, Tjosvold et al., (2010)</td>
<td>My supervisor usually tells me items before I hear them on the grapevine</td>
<td>LD9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akgün, Keskin et al., (2007); Jyothibabu, Farooq et al., (2010)</td>
<td>My manager shares relevant up-to-date Information with employees</td>
<td>Ld11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akgün, Keskin et al., (2007); Jyothibabu, Farooq et al., (2010)</td>
<td>My manager continually looks for opportunities to learn</td>
<td>Ld12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: literature review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.7.4 EMP

EMP, as characterized by Rankinen et al., (2009), is a procedure whereby the individual feels sure that he or she can effectively execute a specific activity amid authoritative change. EMP is basic for promoting OL (Bih-Shiaw and Weining 2003).
In association with OL, some studies have viewed EMP as a second order construct (Menon 2001; MacIntosh and Doherty 2007; Biron and Bamberger 2010; Zhang and Bartol 2010; Biron and Bamberger 2011), while distinctive studies have considered it to be a first order construct (Bontis, Crossan et al. 2002; Chauhan and Bontis 2004; Garcia-Morales, Moreno et al. 2006; Jyothibabu, Farooq et al. 2010; Prugsamatz 2010).

Menon (2001) assumed that EMP was a second order construct with three sub-creates to be particular target mask, saw control and saw capacity, while Zang and Bartol (2010) measured EMP as a second order construct with four first order constructs of significance, capacity, self-determination, and impact. The first order constructs, scales and measurement items used in the two studies are shown in Table 4-11.

**Table 4-11: Measures of EMP used in previous studies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Menon, (2001) | Goal internalization | Six point Likert-type scale | 1. I am inspired by what we are trying to achieve as an organization  
2. I am inspired by the goals of the organization  
3. I am enthusiastic about working toward the organization’s objectives  
4. I am keen on our doing well as an organization  
5. I am enthusiastic about the contribution my work makes to organization |
|               | Perceived Control  |                        | 1. I can influence the way work is done in my department.  
2. I can influence decisions taken in my department.  
3. I have the authority to make decisions at work.  
4. I have the authority to work effectively  
5. Important responsibilities are part of my job. |
| Menon, (2001) | Perceived Competence | Six point Likert-type scale | 1. I have the capabilities required to do my job well  
2. I have the skills and abilities to do my job well  
3. I have the competence to work effectively  
4. I can do my work efficiently |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bontis, Crossan, and Hulland (2002)</td>
<td>Seven-point Likert type scale</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1. Pride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Accomplishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Scale Type</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| García-Morales, Llorens-Montes, & Verdú-Jover (2006a) | Seven point Likert type scale   | 1. Tendency to increase in self-esteem when a job is done correctly  
2. Feel a great personal satisfaction with a well-done job  
3. Perform a job that helps employees to satisfy their personal aspirations and achieve the growth  
4. Development of employee’s competences, skills and abilities both professional and human. |
2. Creation of new knowledge  
3. Timely decision making  
4. Generation of different ideas  
5. Contribution toward organization-wide decision making |
2. My organization gives people choices in their work assignment  
3. My organization invites people to contribute to the organization vision  
4. My organization gives people control over resources they need to accomplish their work  
5. My organization supports employees who take calculated risks  
6. My organization builds alignment of visions across different levels and work groups |

Energy and enthusiasm for the job, certainty and an emphasis on meeting already set OE norms and a capacity to arrange and to actualize arrangements are a few parts of EMP that have been accepted to have an impact on OL. Based on this belief and the measurement items used in previous studies, the pool of items used to assess EMP in this thesis research is presented in Table 4-13.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bontis, Crossan et al., (2002) Jyoithibabu, Farroq et al. (2010)</td>
<td>My work is important to me</td>
<td>EP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson, Creedy et al., (2010); Jyoithibabu et al. (2010)</td>
<td>I am enthusiastic about working toward the organization’s objectives</td>
<td>EP2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akgün, Keskin et al. (2007); Wong et al. (2010)</td>
<td>I am eager for the organization to care for all of its employees</td>
<td>EP3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson, Creedy et al. (2010); Jyoithibabu, Farroq et al. (2010)</td>
<td>I am keen on doing my job well</td>
<td>EP4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bontis, Crossan et al., (2002); Henderson, Creedy et al. (2010)</td>
<td>I feel confident in being able to do my work well</td>
<td>EP5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bontis, Crossan et al., (2002); Henderson, Creedy et al. (2010)</td>
<td>I am able to focus precisely on what is to be done to execute my work effectively</td>
<td>EP6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bontis et al., (2002); Henderson, Creedy et al. (2010)</td>
<td>I know I can perform better than the pre-determined OE standard</td>
<td>EP7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bontis, Crossan et al., (2002); Uner &amp; Turan (2010)</td>
<td>I have high levels of energy at work</td>
<td>EP8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bontis, Crossan et al., (2002); Henderson, Creedy et al. (2010)</td>
<td>I feel I can influence the way work is done in my department</td>
<td>EP9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bontis, Crossan et al., (2002); Henderson, Creedy et al. (2010)</td>
<td>I feel my co-workers respect my ideas in relation to completing our jobs</td>
<td>EP10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bontis, Crossan et al., (2002); Jyoithibabu, Farroq et al. (2010)</td>
<td>I am aware of critical issues that affect my work</td>
<td>EP11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bontis, Crossan et al., (2002); Jyoithibabu, Farroq et al. (2010)</td>
<td>I am capable of analyzing the causes of problems</td>
<td>EP12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jyoithibabu, Farooq et al. (2010)</td>
<td>I have the ability to plan and to implement Solutions</td>
<td>EP13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.7.5 OE

An affiliation can create, retain and transfer knowledge and use this to improve effectiveness, efficiency and quality of work life achieving progressive improvement and survival (García-Morales, Lopez-Martín et al. 2006). However in order to assess the impact of such effects on progressive OE it is vital to evaluate it. Since there are different parts of OE, definitive OE is acknowledged to be multidimensional. Past studies in OL have viewed definitive OE as being multidimensional and as either a second order construct (Sarin and McDermott 2003; Yilmaz, Alpkan et al. 2005; Akgün, Lynn et al. 2006; Prajogo 2006; Yilmaz and Ergun 2008; Azadegan and Dooley 2010; Prajogo and McDermott 2011) or as a first order construct (Bontis, Crossan et al. 2002; Aragón-Correa, García-Morales et al. 2007; García-Morales, Lloréns-Montes et al. 2007; Panayides 2007; Panayides 2007; García-Morales 2008; García-Morales 2011). Yilmaz, Alpkan and Ergun (2005) assumed that OE involved two first order construct of cash related business area OE and subjective OE while Azadegan and Dooley (2010) and Prajogo and McDermott (2010) assumed that four first order constructs exhibited a second order of OE fabricate. The first order constructs their scales and their indicator items are shown in Table 4-14.

Table 4-14: Measures of OE used in previous studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
2. Market share  
3. Return on assets  
4. Overall profitability |
|         | Qualitative OE          |                      | 1. Quality improvement  
2. New product development capability  
3. Employee satisfaction  
4. Employee commitment |
| Azadegan & Dooley, (2010) | Cost OE                |                      | 1. Using this supplier has enhanced our ability in reaching internal manufacturing cost reduction goals  
2. Using this supplier has helped improve our manufacturing cost as compared to our competitors. |
<p>|         | Quality                 |                      | 1. Using this supplier has enhanced                                |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplier</th>
<th>Product development OE</th>
<th>OE</th>
<th>1. Using this supplier has enhanced our ability in reaching defect rate reduction goals 2. Using this supplier has helped improve our defect rate as compared to our competitors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delivery OE</td>
<td></td>
<td>OE</td>
<td>1. Using this supplier has enhanced our ability in reaching delivery speed and reliability improvement goals 2. Using this supplier has helped improve our delivery speed and reliability as compared to our competitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility OE</td>
<td></td>
<td>OE</td>
<td>1. Using this supplier has enhanced our ability in responding to customization requests 2. Using this supplier has helped improve our ability to respond to customization requests as compared to our competitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azadegan &amp; Dooley, (2010)</td>
<td>Delivery OE</td>
<td>Seven point Likert type scale</td>
<td>1. Using this supplier has enhanced our ability in reaching delivery speed and reliability improvement goals 2. Using this supplier has helped improve our delivery speed and reliability as compared to our competitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility OE</td>
<td></td>
<td>OE</td>
<td>1. Using this supplier has enhanced our ability in responding to customization requests 2. Using this supplier has helped improve our ability to respond to customization requests as compared to our competitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prajogo &amp; McDermott</td>
<td>Process quality</td>
<td>Five point Likert type</td>
<td>1. “Fool-proof” (preventive-oriented processes)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In any case, as has been in advance remembered, some studies have viewed progressive OE as a first order constructs. Despite the way that there have been these studies that have endeavored to take a gander at definitive OE as a first order construct, there has been no understanding regarding what number of items should be used. Bontis, Crossan, and Hulland (2002) utilized 10 items, Panaydes (2007) 8 items, García-Morales, Llorens-Montes, and Verdú-Jover (2007) and Hung, Yang, Lien, McLean, and Kuo (2010) utilized 6 items while Zhao, Li, Lee, and Chen (2011) utilized five items. The numbers of items, scales and indicator measures used in these studies are shown in Table 4-15.

**Table 4-15: Measure of OE used in previous study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bontis et al., (2002)</td>
<td>Seven point Likert type scale</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1. Organization is successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Employee satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Individuals happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Client needs met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Panayides (2007) | 8                                      | 1. Profitability compared to business unit objectives  
|                  |                                         | 2. Profitability compared to industry average  
|                  |                                         | 3. Market share compared to business unit objectives  
|                  |                                         | 4. Market share compared to major competitor  
|                  |                                         | 5. Sales growth compared to industry average  
|                  |                                         | 6. Sales volume compare to business unit objectives  
|                  |                                         | 7. Return on investment compared to industry average  
|                  |                                         | 8. Overall assessment of your company’s OE compared to industry average  
| GarcíaMorales, LlorensMontes, and Verdú-Jover (2007) | 6                                      | Relative to your main competitor, what is your firm’s profitability in the last 3 years in the following aspects:  
|                  |                                         | 1. The firm’s profitability measured as profits over assets (economic profitability)  
|                  |                                         | 2. The firm’s profitability measured as profits over own resources (financial profitability)  
|                  |                                         | 3. The firm’s profitability measured as profits over sales (percentage of profits over billing total)  
|                  |                                         | 4. The firm’s market share in its main products and markets  
|                  |                                         | 5. The degree of employee satisfaction  
|                  |                                         | 6. The capacity for acquiring, transmitting and using new  
<p>|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Variable items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Hung, Yang, Lien, McLean, and Kuo (2010) | 1. During the past three years, change in competitive advantage relative to your largest competitor has markedly improved  
2. During the past three years, change in market share relative to your largest competitor has markedly improved  
3. During the past three years, change in profit relative to your largest competitor has markedly improved  
4. During the past three years, change in cost (product or service) relative to your largest competitor has increased  
5. During the past three years, change in sales revenue relative to your largest competitor has greatly increased  
6. During the past three years, change in customer satisfaction relative to your largest competitor has greatly increased | knowledge learned |
| Zhao, Li, Lee, and Chen (2011) | 1. Change in market share  
2. Change in sales volume  
3. Change in firm reputation  
4. Change in operating profit  
5. Change in asset size | Seven point Likert Type scale |

Source: literature review

By merging the measures utilized as a part of these distinctive studies, this research recognized ten items to be utilized to evaluate OE and these are appeared in Table 4-16. This table records the different items that were produced as solidified measures and the diary articles from which data has been joined into the diverse items.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors and Year</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>OE Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akgün et al., (2007); Skerlavaj et al., (2007)</td>
<td>My organization has sold more than it did last year</td>
<td>OE3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bontis et al., (2002); Jyothibabu et al., (2010)</td>
<td>My organization meets its OE targets</td>
<td>OE4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bontis et al., (2002); Jyothibabu et al., (2010)</td>
<td>I believe the organization’s future is secure</td>
<td>OE6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bontis et al., (2002); Skerlavaj et al., (2007); Jyothibabu et al., (2010)</td>
<td>The customers are happy with the products that they buy</td>
<td>OE7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bontis et al., (2002); Škerlavaj (2007)</td>
<td>My organization has a strategy that positions it well for the future</td>
<td>OE8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jyothibabu et al., (2010); López et al., (2005)</td>
<td>There is continuous improvement in my organization</td>
<td>OE9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bontis et al., (2002); Jyothibabu et al., (2010)</td>
<td>My organization is successful</td>
<td>OE10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** literature Review

### 4.8 Conclusion:

There is no universally accepted model of organizational learning that has been investigated by organizational learning researchers although many studies have set out to examine it. Some studies have included relationships with organizational learning such as those with organizational culture, leadership and empowerment, as dimensions of organizational learning, while other researchers have suggested that they believed them to be independent constructs. This research has addressed the examination of organizational culture, leadership and empowerment as antecedents and indicators of organizational learning. The development of each construct and the testing of the hypotheses are set out in chapter 5.