

# Designing an Organizational Learning Model for Innovation-Driven Business Environments

Ali Yazdani\*<sup>1</sup> and Sina Saberi<sup>2</sup>



**Citation:** Yazdani, A., & Saberi, S. (2024). Designing an Organizational Learning Model for Innovation-Driven Business Environments. *Business, Marketing, and Finance Open*, 1(4), 58-67.

Received: 23 April 2024


Revised: 01 June 2024

Accepted: 17 June 2024

Published: 01 July 2024



**Copyright:** © 2024 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) License.

<sup>1</sup> Master's in MBA, Department of Management and Accounting, Allameh Tabatabaee University, Tehran, Iran; 

<sup>2</sup> Department of Management and Technology, Università Bocconi, Milano, Lombardia, Italia; 

\* Correspondence: ali\_yazdani@atu.ac.ir

**Abstract:** This study aims to design an organizational learning model tailored for innovation-driven business environments. This qualitative study was conducted using semi-structured interviews with 27 participants from various innovation-intensive industries. The interviews were analyzed through open, axial, and selective coding using NVivo software to identify key themes. Theoretical saturation was achieved, and the data were systematically categorized to develop an integrated model of organizational learning and innovation. Three core themes emerged from the data analysis: Learning Culture and Leadership, Innovation-Driven Practices, and Adaptation and Knowledge Sharing. The findings highlighted the critical role of leadership in fostering a culture that encourages continuous learning, experimentation, and innovation. Collaborative knowledge sharing and cross-functional learning were found to be essential for enhancing innovation performance. Organizations that embraced adaptability and were open to experimentation and risk-taking were more likely to succeed in innovation efforts. The study demonstrates that organizational learning is a key enabler of innovation in dynamic business environments. Leadership, knowledge sharing, and a culture of experimentation are critical factors for building an organization's capacity for innovation. The proposed model offers a comprehensive framework for organizations to integrate learning processes into their innovation strategies. By fostering a learning-oriented culture and supporting collaboration and adaptability, organizations can enhance their ability to innovate and remain competitive in evolving markets.

**Keywords:** Organizational learning, innovation, leadership, knowledge sharing, learning culture, adaptability.

## 1. Introduction

Today, innovation has become a key determinant of organizational success, especially in industries driven by technological advancement and market volatility.

Organizations that consistently innovate are better positioned to maintain competitiveness, adapt to changing environments, and achieve sustained growth [1]. Innovation, however, is not a spontaneous process; it is closely linked to organizational learning and knowledge management capabilities [2, 3]. Organizational learning is the process by which organizations acquire, interpret, and respond to new information, and it is a critical mechanism through which firms can improve innovation performance [4].

Organizational learning is widely recognized as a fundamental driver of innovation. The relationship between organizational learning and innovation is based on the ability of organizations to adapt to new information, challenge existing practices, and integrate new knowledge into their operations [5-7]. Learning organizations are

typically characterized by a culture that encourages experimentation, reflection, and knowledge sharing, which are essential for developing innovative capabilities [8-10]. As organizations foster a learning-oriented culture, they build the capacity to continuously generate new ideas and solutions that can drive innovation [11].

The learning process within organizations is multi-faceted, involving not only the acquisition of knowledge but also its dissemination across the organization [12]. This process of knowledge sharing is critical for fostering an environment where innovation can thrive [13]. For example, Berndt et al. (2023) found that organizations with high organizational learning capability were more successful in achieving operational performance through frugal innovation [14]. Moreover, organizational learning enhances the ability of companies to engage in both incremental and radical innovation, thereby improving overall innovation performance [15, 16].

Knowledge management plays a critical role in facilitating organizational learning by ensuring that relevant information is accessible and applied in decision-making processes [17]. Effective knowledge management enables organizations to capture both tacit and explicit knowledge, which can then be used to develop innovative products, processes, and strategies [1, 18]. In this context, the ability of an organization to create, store, and share knowledge becomes a crucial factor in its innovation capabilities [19, 20].

The automotive industry, for example, has been highlighted as an industry where knowledge management, organizational culture, and organizational learning converge to drive innovation [11]. In such dynamic industries, knowledge is not only a resource but also a strategic asset that organizations must manage effectively to stay competitive [21]. The implementation of knowledge management practices, combined with a culture that supports learning, leads to higher levels of innovation [22].

Leadership is another key element that influences both organizational learning and innovation [6, 7]. Transformational leadership, in particular, has been shown to have a strong positive impact on innovation by fostering a learning culture within organizations [12, 23]. Leaders who are able to inspire and empower their teams to engage in continuous learning create an environment where innovation can flourish [24]. Moreover, transformational leaders promote a shared vision and encourage risk-taking, which are essential for generating new ideas and driving innovation [22].

Research by Hsiao and Chang (2011) demonstrates that leaders who actively support innovation and provide resources for learning are more likely to see improvements in organizational innovation performance [6]. This is particularly relevant in knowledge-intensive industries, where the speed of innovation can determine a company's success or failure [25]. Furthermore, leadership that encourages experimentation and supports learning from failure is vital for creating an innovative culture that is resilient to market changes and capable of adapting to new challenges [14].

Organizational culture is a critical factor that influences both organizational learning and innovation [26]. A learning-oriented culture promotes collaboration, open communication, and the continuous exchange of ideas, which are essential for fostering innovation [8]. According to Alsuwaidi and Arunprasad (2017), organizations that emphasize strategic human resource (HR) practices, such as training and development, are more likely to build a culture that supports organizational learning and, consequently, innovation [27].

The interaction between organizational culture and innovation is complex, as culture can both enable and inhibit the learning process [26]. For instance, a culture that rewards innovation and encourages creative problem-solving is more likely to see high levels of employee engagement in learning activities [28]. On the other hand, a culture that is resistant to change or does not prioritize learning may stifle innovation [24]. Therefore, organizations seeking to enhance their innovation capabilities must ensure that their culture aligns with their learning objectives.

Organizational learning is not confined to a single industry or sector; it plays a pivotal role across various contexts, from education and healthcare to manufacturing and service industries [29-31]. For example, research by Alsabbagh and Khalil (2017) on the education sector in Damascus found that organizational learning significantly contributed to innovativeness, demonstrating the universal relevance of learning in fostering innovation [24]. Similarly, in the healthcare sector, Uğurluoğlu et al. (2012) highlighted the importance of organizational learning in improving service innovation and operational performance [31].

In the context of SMEs, organizational learning has been shown to be a critical factor in driving business innovation and performance [25]. SMEs often face resource constraints, making organizational learning even more important as a way to leverage existing knowledge and capabilities to innovate and compete with larger firms [4]. In their study on Turkish manufacturing firms, Uğurlu and Kurt (2016) found that firms with higher organizational learning capabilities were more likely to achieve product innovation and improved financial performance.

Despite the significant body of research linking organizational learning to innovation, there is a need for a comprehensive model that integrates these concepts into a practical framework for business environments. Such a model would provide organizations with the tools and strategies necessary to enhance their learning capabilities and, in turn, drive innovation [13, 32]. This article explores the integration of organizational learning into business environments where innovation is a strategic priority, aiming to design a comprehensive organizational learning model for innovation-driven companies.

## **2. Methodology**

This study employed a qualitative research design to explore the development of an organizational learning model tailored to innovation-driven business environments. The research used an interpretive approach to gain deep insights into participants' experiences and perceptions of organizational learning and innovation. Theoretical saturation was the guiding principle for determining the sample size, and a total of 27 participants were included. These participants were selected based on their extensive experience in innovation-driven environments, encompassing managerial roles and thought leadership in diverse industries. Purposive sampling was used to ensure that the participants could provide rich and relevant data on organizational learning practices in the context of innovation.

Data were collected through semi-structured interviews, which allowed for flexibility in exploring key themes while maintaining a focus on the research objectives. An interview guide was developed, covering critical aspects of organizational learning, such as knowledge sharing, adaptation to change, innovation strategies, and continuous learning mechanisms. Interviews lasted between 45 and 60 minutes, and they were conducted in person or via video conferencing, depending on the participant's availability. All interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim to ensure accuracy in capturing participants' responses. The interview process continued until theoretical saturation was achieved, where no new significant themes or insights emerged from additional interviews.

The data were analyzed using NVivo software, which facilitated the organization, coding, and interpretation of the interview transcripts. Thematic analysis was employed to identify patterns and key themes related to organizational learning in innovation-driven environments. The analysis followed an iterative process: initial open coding was conducted to categorize relevant information, followed by axial coding to connect related categories. Themes were then refined and defined during the selective coding phase to develop a comprehensive

understanding of the organizational learning model. The final themes were validated through a review of the interview data to ensure consistency and coherence in the findings.

### 3. Findings

The demographic characteristics of the 27 participants in this study reflected a diverse range of backgrounds in terms of age, gender, education, and professional experience. Of the participants, 17 (63%) were male and 10 (37%) were female. The age distribution ranged from 30 to 55 years, with the majority (18 participants, 67%) between the ages of 35 and 45. In terms of educational background, 22 participants (81%) held a master's degree, while 5 participants (19%) had a doctoral degree. Regarding professional experience, 14 participants (52%) had 10 to 15 years of experience in innovation-driven environments, 8 participants (30%) had 5 to 10 years of experience, and the remaining 5 participants (18%) had more than 15 years of experience. This diversity in demographics contributed to a comprehensive understanding of organizational learning practices across various contexts.

In the initial stage of data analysis, open coding was applied to the interview transcripts, during which each line of data was examined and coded. This process involved identifying distinct concepts, phrases, and behaviors related to organizational learning and innovation-driven practices. Several open codes emerged, reflecting participants' descriptions of knowledge sharing, leadership's role in fostering a learning culture, employee engagement in innovative processes, and adaptability to change. These codes provided the foundation for understanding how organizations integrate learning mechanisms into their innovation strategies. Other open codes also highlighted challenges such as resistance to change and communication barriers within teams, shedding light on the complexities involved in cultivating an innovative environment.

In the axial coding phase, the open codes were grouped into broader categories by identifying relationships among the initial codes. This process involved linking open codes to core phenomena, such as the mechanisms through which organizational learning impacts innovation and how leadership shapes these dynamics. Categories were created around themes like "collaborative knowledge sharing," "leadership's role in fostering innovation," "employee motivation in learning," and "adapting to market changes." This phase helped in forming connections between the fragmented codes from the open coding phase, leading to a more structured understanding of how organizations develop learning practices that drive innovation.

**Table 1. Axial Coding**

Axial Codes	Open Codes
Collaborative Knowledge Sharing	Peer learning, cross-departmental collaboration, team-based problem-solving, knowledge repositories
Leadership in Fostering Innovation	Visionary leadership, mentorship, empowering teams, setting learning goals
Employee Engagement in Learning	Continuous professional development, motivation for skill enhancement, active participation
Adapting to Market Changes	Agile responses, market trend analysis, adopting new technologies, flexibility in decision-making
Communication Practices	Open dialogue, feedback loops, transparent communication, addressing conflicts
Innovation-Driven Culture	Culture of experimentation, acceptance of failure, encouraging creative risk-taking
Resistance to Change	Fear of failure, reluctance to adopt new processes, skepticism towards innovation
Knowledge Documentation	Maintaining records, creating knowledge bases, updating protocols
Learning from Failures	Reflection on mistakes, adapting from errors, iterative improvement processes
Cross-Functional Learning	Interdepartmental collaboration, learning from diverse functions, knowledge transfer
Leadership Support for Learning	Leader-driven initiatives, resource allocation, prioritization of learning
Employee Autonomy in Learning	Self-directed learning, personal growth opportunities, learning on the job
Innovation as a Strategic Objective	Aligning innovation with organizational goals, setting innovation KPIs
Learning Technologies Integration	Use of AI for learning, e-learning platforms, digital collaboration tools

Performance Feedback Mechanisms	Constructive feedback, real-time performance assessment, learning from evaluations
Market and Competitor Analysis	Competitor benchmarking, adapting strategies from competitors, market intelligence
Formal Learning Programs	Structured workshops, corporate training programs, certifications
Informal Learning Opportunities	Learning from peers, informal mentorship, experiential learning
Organizational Adaptability	Flexibility in policies, responsiveness to changes, dynamic decision-making
Rewards for Learning and Innovation	Recognition programs, incentives for creative ideas, rewards for knowledge sharing

In this phase, the open codes were condensed into 20 axial codes that represent key themes emerging from the data. For example, open codes like "peer learning" and "cross-departmental collaboration" were grouped under the axial code "Collaborative Knowledge Sharing." Similarly, open codes associated with "mentorship" and "empowering teams" were consolidated under "Leadership in Fostering Innovation." This systematic categorization helped reveal significant patterns in how organizations develop and support learning processes that are crucial for fostering an innovative culture. Each axial code draws on a combination of specific practices, attitudes, and structural mechanisms described by the participants, thus reflecting the multi-faceted nature of organizational learning in innovation-driven environments.

In the selective coding phase, the analysis shifted from focusing on individual categories to integrating these categories into core themes that form the foundation of the organizational learning model for innovation-driven business environments. The selective codes represent the main theoretical constructs that encompass the broader dimensions of the phenomenon being studied. By identifying and linking the axial codes under higher-order themes, this phase provided a coherent framework for understanding how organizational learning contributes to innovation. The selective coding process revealed three overarching categories: Learning Culture and Leadership, Innovation-Driven Practices, and Adaptation and Knowledge Sharing. These selective codes form the pillars of the organizational learning model, integrating key elements such as leadership support, collaboration, and adaptability that emerged throughout the previous coding phases.

**Table 2. Selective Coding**

Selective Codes (Main Categories)	Axial Codes	Open Codes
Learning Culture and Leadership	Leadership in Fostering Innovation	Visionary leadership, mentorship, empowering teams, setting learning goals
	Leadership Support for Learning	Leader-driven initiatives, resource allocation, prioritization of learning
	Employee Engagement in Learning	Continuous professional development, motivation for skill enhancement, active participation
	Employee Autonomy in Learning	Self-directed learning, personal growth opportunities, learning on the job
Innovation-Driven Practices	Innovation-Driven Culture	Culture of experimentation, acceptance of failure, encouraging creative risk-taking
	Innovation as a Strategic Objective	Aligning innovation with organizational goals, setting innovation KPIs
	Learning Technologies Integration	Use of AI for learning, e-learning platforms, digital collaboration tools
	Cross-Functional Learning	Interdepartmental collaboration, learning from diverse functions, knowledge transfer
Adaptation and Knowledge Sharing	Collaborative Knowledge Sharing	Peer learning, cross-departmental collaboration, team-based problem-solving, knowledge repositories
	Communication Practices	Open dialogue, feedback loops, transparent communication, addressing conflicts

---

Adapting to Market Changes	Agile responses, market trend analysis, adopting new technologies, flexibility in decision-making
Resistance to Change	Fear of failure, reluctance to adopt new processes, skepticism towards innovation
Learning from Failures	Reflection on mistakes, adapting from errors, iterative improvement processes
Knowledge Documentation	Maintaining records, creating knowledge bases, updating protocols
Market and Competitor Analysis	Competitor benchmarking, adapting strategies from competitors, market intelligence

---

In this final phase, the 20 axial codes were grouped into three selective codes that provide a comprehensive view of how organizational learning is operationalized within innovation-driven business environments. The first selective code, Learning Culture and Leadership, emphasizes the central role of leadership and a supportive learning culture in fostering innovation. This includes visionary leadership, mentoring, and empowering employees, as well as encouraging continuous development and self-directed learning. The second selective code, Innovation-Driven Practices, captures how organizations build an environment that encourages experimentation, integrates advanced learning technologies, and strategically aligns learning with innovation objectives. Finally, Adaptation and Knowledge Sharing highlights the importance of agility, effective communication, and knowledge exchange across departments to facilitate both learning and innovation. These three core themes encapsulate the dynamic interactions between leadership, learning processes, and innovative outcomes in business environments.

#### 4. Discussion and Conclusion

The findings of this study revealed several key insights into the role of organizational learning in fostering innovation within business environments driven by innovation. Through a systematic analysis of semi-structured interviews with 27 participants, three main themes emerged: Learning Culture and Leadership, Innovation-Driven Practices, and Adaptation and Knowledge Sharing. These themes highlight the importance of an integrated approach to organizational learning, where leadership plays a crucial role in shaping the learning culture, innovation practices are deeply embedded within the organizational processes, and knowledge sharing is facilitated to adapt to changing market dynamics.

The analysis showed that organizations that emphasize leadership support for learning and innovation, such as those where leaders act as mentors and empower teams, tend to have more robust innovation outcomes. This aligns with findings from Akay and Demirel (2017), who demonstrated that transformational leadership positively impacts innovation by fostering a supportive learning environment [22]. Moreover, the role of leadership in driving organizational learning was evident in practices such as the allocation of resources for learning and setting clear learning goals, which directly influenced innovation performance [6, 7].

Another significant result from the study was the emphasis on collaborative knowledge sharing and cross-functional learning as essential components of organizational learning in innovation-driven environments. Participants highlighted that peer learning, team-based problem-solving, and knowledge repositories were crucial for sustaining innovation. These findings are consistent with previous research by Sanz-Valle et al. (2011), which emphasized the critical role of knowledge sharing in fostering innovation within organizations [3]. Similarly, Gomes et al. (2021) found that knowledge exchange across organizational departments enhanced service innovation and overall performance [4].

The study also found that organizations with a culture of experimentation and acceptance of failure were more likely to drive innovation. This finding mirrors the conclusions of Alegre and Chiva (2013), who noted that a learning-oriented culture, where employees are encouraged to take risks and experiment, leads to greater innovation performance. In addition, the importance of adaptability—reflected in organizations' ability to respond to market changes and adopt new technologies—was a recurring theme, supporting previous work by Abdi et al. (2018), which highlighted the effect of organizational learning on innovation in dynamic industries like the automotive sector [11].

The study's results align with a growing body of literature that underscores the interconnectedness between organizational learning and innovation performance. For example, the importance of leadership in fostering a learning culture has been well documented in the literature. Hsiao and Chang (2011) found that transformational leadership fosters organizational innovation by encouraging a learning culture, which is consistent with the current study's findings that leadership support is a critical enabler of innovation [6]. Additionally, Ha et al. (2018) identified leadership and organizational learning as key determinants of innovation speed and quality, which parallels the role of leadership in setting learning goals and supporting innovation as found in this research [23].

The role of collaborative knowledge sharing as an essential element in promoting innovation was also a significant finding. Du et al. (2022) highlighted the importance of both internal and external collaboration in fostering technological innovation, emphasizing that knowledge sharing within organizations creates a fertile ground for innovation [15]. This study reinforces these conclusions, demonstrating that cross-functional learning and collaborative knowledge sharing are critical in driving innovation within organizations. Similarly, Ferraris et al. (2017) demonstrated that knowledge management capabilities significantly enhance innovative performance in multinational companies, further supporting the findings of this study [1].

Moreover, the finding that a culture of experimentation and risk-taking supports innovation is in line with the conclusions of Alegre and Chiva (2013), who found that an organizational learning culture characterized by creativity and experimentation significantly influences innovation performance [8]. Furthermore, organizations that embraced change and adapted to market demands were more likely to innovate, aligning with the work of Abdi et al. (2018), who identified adaptability as a key driver of innovation in knowledge-intensive industries like the automotive sector [11].

Another critical insight from the study is the role of organizational learning in mitigating resistance to change, a common barrier to innovation. Participants in this study noted that resistance to change often hampered innovation efforts. This observation is consistent with previous research by Alsuwaidi and Arunprasad (2017), who found that strategic HR practices that promote organizational learning can reduce resistance to change and enhance organizational performance. The ability to adapt to change, facilitated by continuous learning and knowledge sharing, enables organizations to remain competitive in dynamic environments [3].

While this study provides valuable insights into the role of organizational learning in innovation-driven business environments, several limitations must be acknowledged. First, the sample size was limited to 27 participants, which, while sufficient for achieving theoretical saturation, may not fully represent the diversity of perspectives across different industries. The study focused primarily on participants from innovation-intensive sectors, which could limit the generalizability of the findings to other industries where innovation may not be the primary strategic focus. Additionally, the reliance on self-reported data through interviews introduces the possibility of bias, as participants may have provided responses they believed were socially desirable or aligned with organizational

expectations. Finally, the study did not account for the potential influence of external factors, such as economic conditions or market volatility, which could also impact organizational learning and innovation outcomes.

Future research could expand on this study by exploring organizational learning and innovation across a broader range of industries, including those that are not traditionally innovation-driven. This would help determine whether the findings are generalizable to organizations with different strategic priorities. Additionally, longitudinal studies could be conducted to track the development of organizational learning and its impact on innovation over time, offering deeper insights into how these processes evolve in dynamic business environments. Future research could also investigate the role of external factors, such as market disruptions, technological advancements, and economic crises, in shaping the relationship between organizational learning and innovation. Finally, examining the interplay between organizational learning, innovation, and other organizational outcomes, such as employee engagement and retention, would provide a more comprehensive understanding of the broader implications of fostering a learning culture.

For organizations seeking to enhance their innovation capabilities, fostering a strong learning culture should be a strategic priority. Leadership plays a crucial role in setting the tone for learning and innovation, so organizations should invest in developing transformational leadership skills that encourage knowledge sharing, experimentation, and adaptability. It is also essential for organizations to create structures that facilitate cross-functional learning and collaboration, as this study highlights the importance of knowledge exchange in driving innovation. Additionally, organizations should establish a culture that embraces experimentation and accepts failure as part of the innovation process. This approach encourages employees to take risks and explore new ideas without fear of negative consequences. Finally, organizations should invest in continuous learning opportunities for employees, both through formal training programs and informal peer-to-peer learning initiatives, to ensure that knowledge is constantly updated and shared across the organization.

#### **Authors' Contributions**

Authors equally contributed to this article.

#### **Ethical Considerations**

All procedures performed in this study were under the ethical standards.

#### **Acknowledgments**

Authors thank all participants who participate in this study.

#### **Conflict of Interest**

The authors report no conflict of interest.

#### **Funding/Financial Support**

According to the authors, this article has no financial support.

#### **References**



- [1] A. Ferraris, G. Santoro, and L. Dezi, "How MNC's Subsidiaries May Improve Their Innovative Performance? The Role of External Sources and Knowledge Management Capabilities," *Journal of Knowledge Management*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 540-552, 2017, doi: 10.1108/jkm-09-2016-0411.
- [2] M. M. Migdadi, "Organizational Learning Capability, Innovation and Organizational Performance," *European Journal of Innovation Management*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 151-172, 2019, doi: 10.1108/ejim-11-2018-0246.
- [3] R. Sanz-Valle, J. C. N. Valencia, D. J. Jiménez, and L. Perez-Caballero, "Linking Organizational Learning With Technical Innovation and Organizational Culture," *Journal of Knowledge Management*, vol. 15, no. 6, pp. 997-1015, 2011, doi: 10.1108/13673271111179334.
- [4] G. Gomes, L. O. Seman, A. C. Berndt, and N. M. Bogoni, "The Role of Entrepreneurial Orientation, Organizational Learning Capability and Service Innovation in Organizational Performance," *Revista De Gestão*, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 39-54, 2021, doi: 10.1108/rege-11-2020-0103.
- [5] S. Zhou, "Organizational Learning, Knowledge Management Capability and Organizational Innovation Performance: Basis for Learning Organizational Framework," *International Journal of Research Studies in Management*, vol. 11, no. 6, 2023, doi: 10.5861/ijrsm.2023.1073.
- [6] H. C. Hsiao and J. C. Chang, "The Role of Organizational Learning in Transformational Leadership and Organizational Innovation," *Asia Pacific Education Review*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 621-631, 2011, doi: 10.1007/s12564-011-9165-x.
- [7] H. C. Hsiao, J. C. Chang, and S. C. Chen, "The Influence of Support for Innovation on Organizational Innovation: Taking Organizational Learning as a Mediator," *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 463-472, 2013, doi: 10.1007/s40299-013-0121-x.
- [8] J. n. Alegre and R. Chiva, "Linking Entrepreneurial Orientation and Firm Performance: The Role of Organizational Learning Capability and Innovation Performance," *Journal of Small Business Management*, vol. 51, no. 4, pp. 491-507, 2013, doi: 10.1111/jsbm.12005.
- [9] F. K. Sari and P. Palupiningdyah, "The Effect of Mediation Work Engagement to Procedural Justice and Organizational Learning on the Innovative Behavior," *Management Analysis Journal*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 152-160, 2020, doi: 10.15294/maj.v9i2.37011.
- [10] T. D. R. Sari and D. Sukmasari, "Does Organizational Learning and Innovation Influence Performance?," *Journal of Behavioural Economics Finance Entrepreneurship Accounting and Transport*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 22-25, 2018, doi: 10.12691/jbe-6-1-3.
- [11] K. Abdi *et al.*, "The Effect of Knowledge Management, Organizational Culture and Organizational Learning on Innovation in Automotive Industry," *Journal of Business Economics and Management*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 1-19, 2018, doi: 10.3846/jbem.2018.1477.
- [12] F. Cui, H. Lim, and J. Song, "The Influence of Leadership Style in China SMEs on Enterprise Innovation Performance: The Mediating Roles of Organizational Learning," *Sustainability*, vol. 14, no. 6, p. 3249, 2022, doi: 10.3390/su14063249.
- [13] I. Tamayo-Torres, L. Gutiérrez, F. J. L. Montes, and F. J. Martínez-López, "Organizational Learning and Innovation as Sources of Strategic Fit," *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, vol. 116, no. 8, pp. 1445-1467, 2016, doi: 10.1108/imds-12-2015-0518.
- [14] A. C. Berndt, G. Gomes, F. M. Borini, and R. C. Bernardes, "Frugal Innovation and Operational Performance: The Role of Organizational Learning Capability," *Rausp Management Journal*, vol. 58, no. 3, pp. 233-248, 2023, doi: 10.1108/rausp-12-2021-0249.
- [15] J. Du, C. Zhang, and Q. Wu, "The Influence of Organizational Learning and External Cooperation Configuration on Enterprise Technological Innovation: A Study Based on fsQCA Approach," *Plos One*, vol. 17, no. 8, p. e0271960, 2022, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0271960.
- [16] A. Martowidjojo and F. Alamsjah, "The Role of Organizational Learning on Innovation Value Chain," 2011, doi: 10.1109/apbitm.2011.5996304.
- [17] S. Ghili, S. Nazarian, M. Tavana, S. Keyvanshokouhi, and M. T. Isaai, "A Complex Systems Paradox of Organizational Learning and Knowledge Management," *International Journal of Knowledge-Based Organizations*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 53-72, 2013, doi: 10.4018/ijkbo.2013070104.
- [18] R. Singh and Z. Tantray, "MEASURING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT, ORGANIZATIONAL LEARNING, AND INNOVATION: A STUDY OF JAMMU & KASHMIR TOURISM DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, INDIA," *Enlightening Tourism a Pathmaking Journal*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 470-494, 2022, doi: 10.33776/et.v12i2.5483.
- [19] J. Zhang, H. Xu, and X. Xiao, "The Role of Organizational Learning in Mediating the Relationship Between Business Model Design and Innovation Performance," *Discrete Dynamics in Nature and Society*, vol. 2022, no. 1, 2022, doi: 10.1155/2022/1317646.
- [20] Z. Zhou, Y. Duan, J. Qiu, and Y. Li, "The Influence of Organizational Learning on Library Service Innovation," *Library Hi Tech*, vol. 42, no. 3, pp. 765-781, 2022, doi: 10.1108/lht-04-2021-0148.

- [21] F. Hakimian, H. Farid, M. N. Ismail, and P. Nair, "Importance of Commitment in Encouraging Employees' Innovative Behaviour," *Asia-Pacific Journal of Business Administration*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 70-83, 2016, doi: 10.1108/apjba-06-2015-0054.
- [22] E. Akay and A. G. Demirel, "Transformational Leadership and Innovation: An Empirical Study of Direct and Indirect Effects in HR Consulting Companies," *International Journal of Business and Management*, vol. 13, no. 1, p. 131, 2017, doi: 10.5539/ijbm.v13n1p131.
- [23] A. T. Ha, P. B. Le, and H. Lei, "Leadership and Organizational Learning: The Determinants of Innovation Speed and Innovation Quality in Vietnamese Firms," *Journal of Management and Strategy*, vol. 10, no. 1, p. 29, 2018, doi: 10.5430/jms.v10n1p29.
- [24] M. Alsabbagh and A. H. A. Khalil, "The Impact of Organizational Learning on Innovativeness (An Empirical Study on the Education Sector in Damascus City)," *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, vol. 7, no. 7, 2017, doi: 10.6007/ijarbss/v7-i7/3135.
- [25] S. U. Rehman, A. Bhatti, and N. I. Chaudhry, "Mediating Effect of Innovative Culture and Organizational Learning Between Leadership Styles at Third-Order and Organizational Performance in Malaysian SMEs," *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, vol. 9, no. 1, 2019, doi: 10.1186/s40497-019-0159-1.
- [26] M. Černe, M. Jaklič, M. Škerlavaj, A. Ü. Aydinlik, and D. D. Polat, "Organizational Learning Culture and Innovativeness in Turkish Firms," *Journal of Management & Organization*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 193-219, 2012, doi: 10.5172/jmo.2012.18.2.193.
- [27] A. S. Alsuwaidi and A. Arunprasad, "A Study on the Impact of Strategic HR Practices and Organizational Learning on Perceived Organizational Performance in Sharjah Public Sectors," *International Conference on Advances in Business Management and Law (Icabml)*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 244-265, 2017, doi: 10.30585/icabml-cp.v1i1.25.
- [28] H.-C. Lin and Y.-D. Lee, "A Study of the Influence of Organizational Learning on Employees' Innovative Behavior and Work Engagement by a Cross-Level Examination," *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics Science and Technology Education*, vol. 13, no. 7, 2017, doi: 10.12973/eurasia.2017.00738a.
- [29] G. S. Margana, S. E. Widodo, and M. Mukhtar, "A Study of the Influence of Transformational Leadership, Organizational Learning on Employees Innovative Behavior and Work Engagement at Sekolah Bahasa Polri," 2019, doi: 10.2991/icas-19.2019.44.
- [30] Ö. Y. Uğurlu and M. Kurt, "The Impact of Organizational Learning Capability on Product Innovation Performance: Evidence From the Turkish Manufacturing Sector," *Emaj Emerging Markets Journal*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 70-84, 2016, doi: 10.5195/emaj.2016.99.
- [31] Ö. Uğurluoğlu, E. U. Aldogan, and E. Dilmaç, "The Impact of Managers' Perceptions of Learning Organizations on Innovation in Healthcare: Sample of Turkey," *The International Journal of Health Planning and Management*, vol. 28, no. 2, 2012, doi: 10.1002/hpm.2143.
- [32] A. Yusron, "ENTREPRENEURSHIP ORIENTATION, ORGANIZATIONAL LEARNING AND INNOVATION PERFORMANCE (STUDIES ON SMEs IN WEST JAVA)," *Jiem*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 1-14, 2023, doi: 10.18326/jiem.v2i1.1-14.