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THE IMPACTS OF ORGANIZATIONAL LEARNING CULTURE AND PROACTIVE PERSONALITY ON ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT AND INTRINSIC MOTIVATION: THE MEDIATING ROLE OF PERCEIVED JOB COMPLEXITY

This paper investigates the impact of personal characteristics (proactive personality) and contextual characteristics (organizational learning culture and job complexity) on employees’ intrinsic motivation and organizational commitment. The results suggest that employees exhibited the highest organizational commitment, when the organization had a higher learning culture. Employees were more intrinsically motivated when they showed higher proactive personality. The perception of their job complexity partially mediated the relationships between the antecedents (i.e., organizational learning culture and proactive personality) and the consequences (i.e., organizational commitment and intrinsic motivation).
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The impact of organizational commitment on individual performance and organizational effectiveness has prompted much interest among researchers (Allen & Meyer, 1996; Beck & Wilson, 2000; Mowday, 1998). Organizational commitment refers to an individual’s feelings about the organization as a whole. It is the psychological bond that an employee has with an organization and has been found to be related to goal and value congruence, behavioral investments in the organization, and likelihood to stay with the organization (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1982). It has become more important than ever in understanding employee work-related behavior because it is identified as more stable and less subject to daily fluctuations than job satisfaction (Angle & Perry, 1983; Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1982). While the antecedents of organizational commitment include organizational characteristics, personal characteristics, group/leader relations, and job characteristics, the consequences of organizational commitment are the job performance variables including intention to leave, turnover, and output measure (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990).

People are more productive and creative, when they are motivated primarily by the passion, interest, enjoyment, satisfaction, and challenge of the work itself—not by external pressures or rewards (Amabile, 1996; Amabile & Kramer, 2007). A necessary component of intrinsic motivation is the individual’s orientation or level of enthusiasm for the activity (Amabile, 1988). While motivational orientation may be partially shaped by the environment (i.e., organizational, social, job characteristics) (Amabile, 1983), there is also evidence suggesting a stable, trait-like nature (e.g., Amabile, Hill, Hennessey, & Tighe, 1994). Thus, intrinsic motivation encompasses both contextual and personal characteristics. Because intrinsic motivation affects an employee’s decision to initiate and sustain creative effort over time (Amabile, 1988), intrinsic motivation has been cited as one of the most prominent personal qualities for the enhancement of creativity (Amabile, 1983, 1988, 1996).

Organizational commitment and intrinsic motivation are important constructs in human resources (HR) and organization behavior (OB) field. Both constructs share the personal characteristics and contextual characteristics for their antecedents. Moreover, they are two of the most frequently used variables for satisfaction, performance, change, and innovation and creativity. Although the consequences of organizational commitment and intrinsic motivation are
not in the scope of this study, they ultimately influence on employee creativity, innovation, and organizational performance and employee job/career satisfaction and turnover. While the extent of research on intrinsic motivation and organizational commitment has increased during the past two decades, little research has been conducted, focusing on the two topics simultaneously.

The purpose of this research is to investigate the impact of personal characteristics (i.e., proactive personality) and contextual characteristics (i.e., organizational learning culture and job complexity) on intrinsic motivation and organizational commitment of employees. The theoretical contributions of this study lie in its integrative approach encompassing both personal and contextual factors. Another contribution is that it links organizational commitment research with motivation research. This article is divided into four parts. The first part provides a theoretical framework and hypotheses. Then, research methods including data collection and measures are described. The next part summarizes the research findings, based on a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and structural equation model (SEM) analysis. Finally, the implications, limitations, and future research areas will be discussed.

**Theoretical Framework and Hypotheses**

As a result of a comprehensive literature review, a set of constructs was selected: proactive personality for personal characteristics and organizational learning culture and job complexity for contextual characteristics. These constructs are considered necessary for influencing intrinsic motivation and organizational commitment. The hypothesized model for this study is illustrated in Figure 1.

---

**Insert Figure 1 about here**

---

**Organizational Learning Culture**

At the organizational level, organizational learning culture is one of the key contextual components to enhance organizational commitment and intrinsic motivation. By definition, it refers to “an organization skilled at creating, acquiring, and transferring knowledge, and at modifying its behavior to reflect new knowledge and insights” (Garvin, 1993: 80). Watkins and Marsick’s (1997) framework for the learning organization served as another theoretical base for this study. They identified seven action imperatives for a learning organization: (1) create continuous learning opportunities; (2) promote inquiry and dialogue; (3) encourage collaboration and team learning; (4) establish systems to capture and share learning; (5) empower people to have a collective vision; (6) connect the organization to the environment, and (7) use leaders who model and support learning at the individual, team, and organization levels. Thus, learning organization involves an environment in which organizational learning is structured so that teamwork, collaboration, creativity, and knowledge processes have a collective meaning and value (Confessore & Kops, 1998).
Proactive Personality

People are not always passive recipients of environmental constraints on their behavior; rather, they can intentionally and directly change their current circumstances (Crant, 2000). Bateman and Crant (1993) introduced proactive disposition as a construct that identifies differences among people to the extent that they take action to influence their environments. Proactive people are likely to be those who define their role more flexibly, with ownership of longer term goals beyond their job (Parker et al., 2006). Proactive personality is defined as a belief in one’s ability to overcome constraints by situational forces and the ability to affect changes in the environment (Bateman & Crant, 1993). Thus, proactive personality is a complex, multiple-caused construct that has important personal and organizational consequences (Crant, 2000).

More specifically, Crant (2000: 436) described proactive behavior as “taking initiative in improving current circumstances or creating new one; it involves challenging the status quo rather than passively adapting to present conditions.” By definition, employees with a proactive personality are predisposed to enact their environments. Proactive individuals look for opportunities and act on them, show initiative, take action, and are persistent in successfully implementing change (Bateman & Crant, 1993; Crant, 2000). Therefore, proactive behavior is more crucial than ever because of the changing nature of work (Parker, 1998).

Perceived Job Complexity

Job design has long been considered to be an important contributor to employees’ individual motivation, attitudes, and creative performance at work (Amabile, 1988; Hackman & Oldham, 1980; Kanter, 1988; Shalley et al., 2004; West & Farr, 1989). The job characteristics model consists of five factors: variety, identity, significance, autonomy, and feedback (Hackman & Oldham, 1980; Oldham & Cummings, 1996). As Drucker (1988) put it, organizations are shifting to the information-based organization, or self-governing units of knowledge specialists. Complex jobs demand creative outcomes by encouraging employees to focus simultaneously on multiple dimensions of their work, whereas highly simple or routine jobs may inhibit such a focus (Oldham & Cummings, 1996). When jobs are complex and challenging, individuals are likely to be excited about their work activities and interested in completing these activities in the absence of external controls or constraints (Hackman & Oldham, 1980; Oldham & Cummings, 1996; Shalley & Gibson, 2004).

Organizational learning culture – Perceived job complexity. Job design will vary depending on organizational environment, business domain or industry, and job function. In this increasingly competitive environment “in which frequent changes in technologies, markets, government regulations and customers give rise to turbulence and unpredictability” (Unsworth & Parker, 2003, p. 175), organizational learning culture can significantly influence core job characteristics in many ways. As Drucker (1988) put it, organizations are shifting to information-based organizations, or self-governing units of knowledge specialists. Jobs not only in service and knowledge work, but also in manufacturing are becoming more knowledge-oriented, highlighting the importance of cognitive characteristics of work (Parker, Wall, & Cordery, 2001). By definition, knowledge work is “unpredictable, multidisciplinary, and non-repetitive tasks with evolving, long-term goals which, due to their inherent ambiguity and complexity,
require collaborative effort in order to take advantage of multiple viewpoints” (Janz, Colquitt, & Noe, 1997, pp. 882-883).

Enriched forms of job design are most appropriate where uncertainty is high (Parker et al., 2001), because autonomy has been identified to be salient for knowledge workers. It is likely that an increasingly uncertain environment requires an organizational learning culture and that knowledge workers prefer complex jobs (i.e., broadly defined jobs) to simple and routine work (i.e., narrowly defined jobs) (Parker et al., 2001). In jobs that require high levels of knowledge and creativity, job occupants’ work attitudes (i.e., the perception of job complexity) may vary directly with the level of organizational learning culture. That is, attitudes should be more favorable when environmental characteristics such as organizational learning culture complement the knowledge and creativity requirements of the work (Marsick & Watkins, 2003; Shalley, Gibson, & Blum, 2000).

**Hypothesis 1:** Organizational learning culture will be positively related to perceived job complexity.

**Proactive personality – Perceived job complexity.** Research has shown that positively disposed individuals rate characteristics of the task or the job as more enriched than do less positively disposed individuals (Judge, Bono, & Locke, 2000). Researchers have also argued that narrow role orientations can impair performance (Karasek & Theorell, 1990; Parker et al., 1997). For example, Klein (1976) found that Tayloristic job design can result in people having narrower role orientations in which they are not interested in only their immediate job, which ultimately stifles innovation (Parker et al., 2006). When employees are higher in proactive personality, they were likely to perceive higher job complexity. That is, proactive people tend to rate job characteristics as more enriched than do less positively disposed individuals (Brief, Butcher, & Roberson, 1995; James & Jones, 1980; Judge et al., 1998; Judge et al., 2000; Kraiger, Billings, & Isen, 1989; Necowitz & Roznowski, 1994; Parker et al., 2006).

**Hypothesis 2:** Proactive personality will be positively related to perceived job characteristics.

**Organizational Commitment**

Organizational commitment refers to an individual’s feelings about the organization as a whole. It is the psychological bond that an employee has with an organization and has been found to be related to goal and value congruence, behavioral investments in the organization, and likelihood to stay with the organization (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1982). Organizational commitment is conceptualized as an affective response that results from an evaluation of the work situation that links the individual to the organization. As Mowday et al. (1982) stated, organizational commitment is “the strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in an organization” (p. 27). It is the process by which the goals of the organization and those of the individual become increasingly integrated or congruent (Hall, Schneider, & Nygren, 1970).

Meyer and Allen (1966) have termed the three components as affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. Mowday et al. (1982) also identified three characteristics of organizational commitment: (a) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization’s goals and values; (b) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; and (c) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization. Therefore,
Intrinsic Motivation

organizational commitment not only indicates an affective bond between the individual and the organization but also willingness to stay with the organization. This study focuses on affective organizational commitment. To be more specific for this study, the affective component of organizational commitment is defined as “the employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization. Employees with a strong affective commitment continue employment with the organization because they want to do so” (Meyer & Allen, 1991, p. 67).

**Organizational learning culture – Organizational commitment.** While the possible close link between organizational learning culture and organizational commitment has been much said, little identified study has yet investigated the relationship between the two constructs. Organizational characteristics can enhance organizational commitment (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). Lim (2003) also reported that there were moderate but significant correlations between affective organizational commitment and sub-constructs of organizational learning, ranging from .31 to .51. Thus, it is likely that the more employees perceive that an organization provides continuous learning, dialogue and inquiry, team learning, established system, empowerment, system connection, and strategic leadership, the higher they are psychologically attached to their organization.

**Hypothesis 3:** Organizational learning culture will be positively related to organizational commitment.

**Perceived job complexity – Organizational commitment.** A meta-analysis by Mathieu and Zajac (1990) found that job characteristics and job satisfaction can enhance organizational commitment, which, in turn, affects the job performance variables (e.g., intention to leave, turnover, and output measure). In general, productivity, commitment, and collegiality also increased, when people held positive perceptions about their work context. People were more productive, committed, and collegial when they were more motivated — especially by the satisfactions of the work itself (Amabile & Kramer, 2007). In particular, task autonomy has been identified to impact employees’ organizational commitment (Dunham et al., 1994).

**Hypothesis 4:** Perceived job complexity will be positively related to organizational commitment.

**Intrinsic Motivation**

Intrinsic motivation is defined as “any motivation that arises from the individual’s positive reaction to qualities of the task itself; this reaction can be experienced as interest, involvement, curiosity, satisfaction, or positive challenge” (Amabile, 1996, p.115). A necessary component of intrinsic motivation is the individual’s orientation or level of enthusiasm for the activity (Amabile, 1988). A number of studies on individual creativity have focused on the importance of intrinsic motivation (i.e., feelings of competence and self-determination on a given task) for creativity (Amabile, 1988, 1996; Shalley, 1991; Shalley & Oldham, 1997). Regarding how people’s perceptions of their work context affected creativity, “people were more creative when people saw their organizations as collaborative, cooperative, open to new ideas, able to evaluated and develop new ideas fairly, clearly focused on an innovative vision, and willing to reward creative work” (Amabile & Kramer, 2007, p. 80).

**Perceived job complexity – Intrinsic motivation.** It has been suggested that the way jobs are structured contributes to employees’ intrinsic motivation and creative performance at work
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(e.g., Amabile, 1988). In particular, jobs that are designed to be complex and demanding (high on autonomy and complexity) are expected to foster higher levels of intrinsic motivation than will relatively simple, routine jobs (Hackman & Oldham, 1980). Complex jobs are those that provide job incumbents with independence, opportunity to use a variety of skills, information about their performance, and chance to complete an entire and significant piece of work (Baer, Oldham, & Cummings, 2003). Task-based intrinsic motivation, which is performing a task for its own sake because of enjoyment and interest in the task (i.e., flow), leads to being highly engaged in the task, which helps to spur creative behaviors rather than relying on habitual responses (Amabile, 1996; Csikszentmihalyi, 1996; Parker et al., 2001). Thus, when individuals are intrinsically involved in their work, all of their attention and effort is focused on their jobs, making them more persistent and more likely to consider different alternatives, which should lead to higher levels of creativity (Shalley et al., 2000).

Hypothesis 5: Perceived job complexity will be positively related to intrinsic motivation.

Proactive personality – Intrinsic motivation. While motivational orientation may be partially shaped by the environment (i.e., organizational, social, job characteristics) (Amabile, 1983), there is also evidence suggesting a stable, trait-like nature (e.g., Amabile, Hill, Hennessey, & Tighe, 1994). While there is an increasing research on proactivity and intrinsic motivation, no study that examined the relationship between proactive personality and intrinsic motivation has been found. As the two constructs have much commonality, a strong positive relationship is expected. This study would be a starting point for the research between them in the future.

Hypothesis 6: Proactive personality will be positively related to intrinsic motivation.

In summary, the conceptual model represents only an attempt to portray the relationships among the factors related to organizational commitment and intrinsic motivation. It is far from exhaustive. One contribution of this model is its integration of useful theory and research from related literatures, such as organizational learning, personality, job design, organizational commitment, and motivation.

Methods

Sample and data collection procedure will be described. Then, the information about four measures will be elaborated below. Finally, the analytical strategy will be briefly discussed.

Sample and Data Collection Procedure

Four Fortune Global 500 companies participated in this study, representing diverse industries: manufacturing, finance, construction, and trading. A convenience sampling approach was used to insure representation within each of the demographic characteristics of importance to this study (i.e., hierarchical level, job type, and length of LMX). A self-administered Internet-based online survey was used to obtain individual perceptions. Of the approximately 500 employees contacted by face-to-face, responses were received from 283 employees (Response rate: 57%).

The demographic variables included: (a) gender, (b) age, (c) education level, (d) hierarchical level, (e) the type of job, and (f) the length of a leader-follower relationship. Most respondents were male (88%) in their 30’s (95%) in manager or assistant manager position...
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(98%). In terms of educational level, 44% of the respondents graduated from 4 year college, and 35% from graduate school. The length of the relationships with current supervisor was evenly distributed across the categories: less than one year (21%), between one year to two years (23%), between two to three years (16%), between three to five years (20%), and over five years (20%). Classification by job types were as follows: 8% in marketing and sales, 13% in production, 9% in engineering, 36% in research and development, 18% in information technology, 6% in supporting function such as finance, HR, and legal, and 10% in others. In summary, most respondents were highly educated male managers or assistant managers in their 30’s.

Measures

All constructs used multi-item scales that have been developed and used in the United States. The instruments were prepared for use in Korea using appropriate translation-back-translation procedures. We used the survey questionnaire with a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Organizational learning culture. To measure the organizational learning culture, as suggested by Yang (2003) and Marsick and Watkins (2003), this study used seven items (i.e., OLC-15, 16, 10, 11, 15, 13, and 14) from Yang, Watkins, and Marsick’s (2004) shortened version of the dimensions of learning organization questionnaire (DLOQ), originally developed by Watkins and Marsick (1997). The seven items represent each sub-construct (i.e., continuous learning, dialogue and inquiry, team learning, empowerment, embedded system, system connection, and strategic leadership). In effect, this treats organizational learning culture as a single (uni-dimensional) construct. Coefficient alphas for the seven dimensions ranged from .68 to .83 (Yang et al., 2004). The reliability of seven items was .83 in this study. A sample item included: “In my organization, whenever people state their view, they also ask what others think.”

Proactive personality. The self-report measure of proactivity was a 10-item scale of the proactivity personality survey (PPS) (Siebert et al., 1999), a shortened version of the instrument originally developed by Bateman and Crant (1993). The correlation between the original full 17-item scale and the shortened 10-item scale was .96. The reliability coefficient of the 10-item scale was .86, which was similar to that of the full version (.88) (Siebert et al., 1993). The internal consistency reliability was .85 in this study. A sample item was: “I excel at identifying opportunities.”

Perceived job complexity. Six items from the Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS) (Hackman & Oldham, 1980) were used to assess the challenges and complexity of employees’ jobs. Originally, this instrument is composed of 15 items: three items for each of the five job characteristics (skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback). The median alpha of the job characteristics measures in Oldham and Cummings’ (1996) study was .68. Researchers in previous studies argued that the sub-constructs of job characteristics are not independent of one another (Dunham, 1976; Kulik, Oldham & Langner, 1988; Pierce & Dunham, 1978). In this study, therefore, we used only six items: task significance (3 items) and autonomy (3 items). Task significance and autonomy are considered to be more appropriate for measuring job complexity. The internal consistency reliability was .80 in this study. A sample item included, “the job gives me considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do the work.”
**Organizational commitment.** Of the three characteristics of organizational commitment (i.e., affective, continuance, and normative commitment), in this study, we used affective organizational commitment, which was measured with the 8-item affective commitment scale (Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993). Allen and Meyer (1996) reported that the median reliability of many research was .85. In this study, the internal consistency reliability was .90. A sample item was, “I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.”

**Intrinsic motivation.** Tierney, Farmer, & Graen (1999) developed a 5-item measure for employee intrinsic motivation, based on the work of Amabile (e.g., 1985). Items targeted enjoyment for activities related to generating new ideas and activities. Whereas Tierney et al., reported that the internal consistency reliability was .74, it was .84 in this study. A sample item was “I enjoy coming up with new ideas for products.”

**Results**

The results of the study are reported in four parts. First, the construct validity of each measurement model is examined by confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). Second, the descriptive statistics, correlations, and reliabilities of the reduced measurement model for the structural model analyses are reported. Third, the hypothesized structural model is tested in comparison with several alternative structural models. The best model is selected, based on both theoretical considerations and a comparison of statistical indices. Finally, the results of the hypothesis testing are addressed. All model tests (i.e., CFA and SEM) were based on the covariance matrix and used maximum likelihood estimation as implemented in LISREL 8 (Joreskog & Sorbom, 1993).

**Measurement Model Assessment**

The purpose of assessing a model’s overall fit is to determine the degree to which the model as a whole is consistent with the empirical data (Diamantopoulos & Siguaw, 2000). CFA was used to estimate convergent and discriminate validity of indicators of the five constructs: organizational learning culture, proactive personality, perceived job complexity, organizational commitment, and intrinsic motivation.

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted to estimate the quality of the factor structure and designated factor loadings by statistically testing the fit between a proposed measurement model and the data (Yang, 2005). The purpose of assessing a model’s overall fit is to determine the degree to which the model as a whole is consistent with the empirical data (Diamantopoulos & Siguaw, 2000). As a result of CFA, the overall measurement model indicated an acceptable fit to the data ($\chi^2 [584] = 2222.87; p = .00$; RMSEA = .093; NNFI = .89; CFI = .90; SRMR = .070). Table 1 shows the factor loadings of an overall CFA. All of the factor loadings were over .50.
Descriptive Statistics, Correlations, and Reliabilities

Table 2 presents the correlations among the five constructs and the reliabilities. All the correlations indicated significant relationships (p < .01) among the constructs. Overall, most correlations showed moderate and positive relationships among the five constructs. The relationship between proactive personality and internal motivation was the highest (r = .70), whereas the relationship between organizational learning culture and internal motivation was comparatively weak (r = .27). All measures demonstrated adequate levels of reliability (.80 -.90).

Structural Model Assessment

The purpose of the structural model analysis is to determine whether the theoretical relationships specified at the conceptualization stage are supported by the data (Diamantopoulos & Siguaw, 2000). The adequacy of the structural model was estimated by comparing the goodness-of-fit to the hypothesized model and the two additional nested models. The hypotheses are examined through investigating the path coefficients and the total effect sizes of the constructs in the final model.

Figure 1 illustrates the strengths of the relationships among the constructs, showing path coefficients and overall model fit of the hypothesized structural model. The hypothesized model indicated a good fit in all indices ($\chi^2 [587] = 2226.09; p = .00; RMSEA = .093; NNFI = .89; CFI = .90; SRMR = .075$). All the paths among constructs were significant (t > 1.96). Overall, 44% of the variance in organizational commitment was explained by organizational learning culture, proactive personality, and perceived job complexity. About 54% of the variance in intrinsic motivation was accounted for by organizational learning culture, proactive personality, and perceived job complexity.

In addition, an alternative model was tested, excluding two direct paths: one from organizational learning culture to organizational commitment and the other from proactive personality to turnover intention (see Figure 2). While this alternative model exhibited a marginally acceptable fit to the data ($\chi^2 [589] = 2081.13; p = .00; RMSEA = .095; NNFI = .89; CFI = .89; SRMR = .10$), the percentages of the variances in the two variables were smaller than those of hypothesized model (organizational commitment: 34%, intrinsic motivation: 32%).
In summary, the hypothesized model and the alternative model provided equivalent fits to the data. Although the alternative model was better in terms of parsimony, the hypothesized model was accepted as the final model, based on the consideration of the three criteria: (a) goodness-of-fit, (b) estimated parameters with theoretical relationships, and (c) the law of parsimony.

Hypotheses Testing

All the research hypotheses were supported, showing statistically significant path coefficients ($t < 1.96, p > .05$). Organizational learning culture was found to be significantly associated with perceived job complexity (H1: path coefficient = .21, $t = 3.13$) and organizational commitment (H3: path coefficient = .38, $t = 6.04$). Proactive personality turned out to be significantly related to job complexity (H2: path coefficient = .38, $t = 5.44$) and intrinsic motivation (H5: path coefficient = .59, $t = 8.72$). Perceived job complexity was significantly associated with organizational commitment (H4: path coefficient = .43, $t = 6.34$) and intrinsic motivation (H6: path coefficient = .25, $t = 3.99$). Total indirect effects of organizational learning culture and proactive personality on organizational commitment and intrinsic motivation mediated by perceived job complexity were .25 and .15 respectively.

Discussion

The findings of this study are discussed on the basis of the hypothesized model, comparing with previous research. Then, we will discuss the implications of this study for research and practice in the field of HR/OB. In addition, the limitations of this study and recommendations for future research are discussed. Finally, some conclusions are followed.

Findings of this Study

This study found that organizational learning culture, proactive personality, and perceived job complexity contribute to organizational commitment and intrinsic motivation. More specifically, employees exhibited the highest organizational commitment, when the organization had a higher learning culture. Employees were more intrinsically motivated, when they showed higher proactive personality. The perception of their job complexity partially mediated the relationships between the antecedents (i.e., organizational learning culture and proactive personality) and the consequences (i.e., organizational commitment and intrinsic motivation). Overall, 44% of the variance in organizational commitment was explained by organizational learning culture, proactive personality, and perceived job complexity. About 54% of the variance in intrinsic motivation was accounted for by organizational learning culture, proactive personality, and perceived job complexity.

**Organizational learning culture.** The more employees perceive that an organization provides continuous learning, dialogue and inquiry, team learning, established system, empowerment, system connection, and strategic leadership, the higher they are psychologically attached to their organization. Moreover, when employees perceive that an organization provides better organizational learning culture, they are more likely to realize job complexity, which, in turn, affects organizational commitment and intrinsic motivation. An increasingly uncertain
environment requires an organizational learning culture and knowledge workers prefer complex jobs to simple and routine work (Parker et al., 2001). Organizational learning culture can significantly influence job complexity in many ways. For instance, enriched forms of job design are most appropriate where uncertainty is high (Parker et al., 2001), and autonomy has been identified to be particularly salient for knowledge workers (Janz et al., 1997).

**Proactive personality.** This study replicated the results of the previous studies that when employees have higher in proactive personality, they tended to be highly motivated intrinsically. Employees with higher in proactive personality were likely to perceive higher job complexity. That is, proactive people tend to rate job characteristics as more enriched than do less positively disposed individuals (Brief, Butcher, & Roberson, 1995; James & Jones, 1980; Judge et al., 1998; Judge et al., 2000; Kraiger, Billings, & Isen, 1989; Necowitz & Roznowski, 1994; Parker et al., 2006). One of the new findings of this study is the strong and positive relationship between proactive personality and intrinsic motivation. While there were a lot of similarities between the two constructs, as a result of CFA, they found to be distinctive.

**Perceived job complexity.** In this study, perceived job complexity was significantly related to organizational commitment and intrinsic motivation, playing a role as a mediator. When employees perceived higher job complexity, more specifically, higher task significance and autonomy, employees are more likely to conduct their work in active and creative ways. Results of previous studies tend to be generally consistent with the above results (e.g., Amabile & Gryskiewicz, 1989; Csikszentmihalyi, 1996; Hatcher et al., 1989; Farmer, Tierney, & Kung-McIntyre, 2003; Oldham & Cummings, 1996; Shalley et al., 2004; Parker et al., 2001). Complex and demanding jobs are expected to foster higher levels of intrinsic motivation than will relatively simple, routine jobs (Hackman & Oldham, 1980; Shalley & Gibson, 2004). Thus, this study confirmed the findings of the previous research.

**Implications**

Replicating previous research and examining new findings, this study takes the multilevel efforts: organizational level (organizational learning culture) as well as job (job complexity) and individual level (proactive personality). With regard to the theoretical contributions, this study linked organizational learning, personality, job design, organizational commitment, and motivation research. To be more specific, whereas the links between job design, organizational commitment and motivation have been widely investigated, little research has explored the antecedents such as organizational learning culture and proactive personality. The practical implications for HR/OD professionals who develop relevant practices for the purpose of enhancing organizational commitment and employee motivation are suggested below.

As long as the knowledge-based economy and the war for talent continue, more and more firms will try to become employers of choice (Gubman, 2004). And firms that fail to secure a loyal base of workers constantly place an inexperience group of non-cohesive units on the front lines of their organization, much to their own detriment (Guthrie, 2001). In order effectively to attract, motivate, and retain talented employees, many firms try to become employers of choice defined as firms that are always the first choice of first-class candidates due to their status and reputation in terms of corporate culture and HR practices (Sutherland, Torricelli, & Karg, 2002). In other words, employers of choice are those organizations that outperform their competition in attracting, developing, and retaining people with business-required talent. They achieve this
reputation through innovative and compelling HR practices that benefit both employees and their organizations. Thus, it is critically important to monitor employees’ job satisfaction, motivation, and organizational commitment level. In this vein, periodical survey-feedback approach is highly recommended. If fact, research has established a direct link between employee retention rates and sales growth and companies that are cited as one of the 100 Best Companies to Work For routinely outperform their competition on many other financial indicators of performance (Fulmer, Gerhart, & Scott, 2003).

Managers and HR/OD professionals can support employees’ organizational commitment in the organizational level as well as in job and individual level by developing, improving, and delivering the relevant practices. HR/OD practitioners can support managers by providing relevant HR practices and services: changing organizational culture, enhancing organizational learning, developing transformative and supportive leadership, designing more challenging, complex, autonomous jobs, and hiring and retaining proactive employees. However, changing one factor alone (e.g., hiring proactive employees) will not help organizational commitment and intrinsic motivation, if other factors are not in place (e.g., organizational learning culture). Therefore, HR practices should not be implemented alone. Rather, each practice should be delivered and applied in a concerted way and in a holistic perspective. In other words, enhancing organizational commitment of employees will require an integrated strategy, incorporating elements of culture management, organizational structure, job redesign, and leadership development. This is by no means an easy feat, which is why organizations that are successful in building this type of organization are likely to have a sustainable competitive advantage.

Limitations and Future Research

In terms of methodology, this study has several potential limitations. First, because this study, like most creativity studies, relied on self-reported and or reflective recollection of the indicators of the constructs in this study by employees who volunteered their participation. Second, this empirical study confines itself to cross-sectional survey method, which leaves room for speculation with regard to causality among the variables. In addition, the sample of this study, consisting most of highly educated male managers, is likely restricted to a certain group with similar demographic characteristics (e.g., male of relatively high cognitive ability).

To solve the limitations above, methodologically, future research needs to be based on objective indicators and multiple sources. In addition, to increase generalizability of the present study, more studies in various industries representing diverse demographic cohorts are needed. More specifically, this study focused on knowledge workers with higher educational level. The results might vary by the cohorts in different educational levels. More research in different educational background is recommended.

Conclusion

A good workplace is believed to produce higher quality products, support more innovation, have the ability to attract more talented people, and experience less resistance to change and lower turnover costs, all of which translate directly into a better bottom line (Joo & McLean, 2006; Levering, 1996). Conversely, dissatisfied workers may be able to solve their problems by leaving the job. Thus, it is imperative to improve organizational commitment and intrinsic
motivation through positive organizational learning culture and job design. HR/OD professionals can help their employees win the race of sustained competitive advantages.
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### TABLE 1

Factor Loadings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organizational Learning Culture</th>
<th>Proactive Personality</th>
<th>Perceived Job Complexity</th>
<th>Organizational Commitment</th>
<th>Intrinsic Motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OLC-1</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLC-2</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLC-3</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLC-4</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLC-5</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLC-6</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLC-7</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP-5</td>
<td></td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP-6</td>
<td></td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP-7</td>
<td></td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP-8</td>
<td></td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP-9</td>
<td></td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP-10</td>
<td></td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJC-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJC-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJC-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJC-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJC-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJC-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOC-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOC-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOC-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOC-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOC-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOC-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOC-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOC-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note, n = 283
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Organizational Learning Culture</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>(.83)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Proactive Personality</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>(.85)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Perceived Job Complexity</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>(.80)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>(.90)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Intrinsic Motivation</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>(.84)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note, the phi matrix from CFA; * p < .05; ** p < .01;
FIGURE 1

A Conceptual (Hypothesized) Model
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FIGURE 2
Alternative (Full Mediation) Model
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significant path; * p < .05 (t > 1.96); Non-significant path