Click to verify



```
Share — copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format for any purpose, even commercially. Adapt — remix, transform, and build upon the material for any purpose, even commercially. The licensor cannot revoke these freedoms as long as you follow the license terms. Attribution — You must give appropriate credit, provide a link to the
license, and indicate if changes were made. You may do so in any reasonable manner, but not in any way that suggests the licensor endorses you or your use. ShareAlike — If you remix, transform, or build upon the material, you must distribute your contributions under the same license as the original. No additional restrictions — You may not apply
legal terms or technological measures that legally restrict others from doing anything the license permits. You do not have to comply with the license for elements of the material in the public domain or where your use is permitted by an applicable exception or limitation. No warranties are given. The license may not give you all of the permissions
necessary for your intended use. For example, other rights such as publicity, privacy, or moral rights may limit how you use the material. In the ever-changing business world, any organization, whether in the business or service sector, must have the ability, intention, and preparation for the change in order for it to gain competitive advantages. This
requires all people in the organization to be adaptive, who need to nurture in themselves the eagerness to continually learn so they can get their behavior changed. These people would transform their organization into a learning organization into a learning organization into a learning process in the days to come to prove that a "successful organization is a
learning organization". In this article, we are going to discuss the concept of organization and all collectively share it,
organizational learning emerges. Organizational learning for environments adapt to changing environments by generating and selectively adopting organizational routines". That means that
organizational learning has as a consequence an increased level of organizational knowledge, which is able to generate new changes in the organizational learning as 'the process of improving actions through better knowledge and understanding.' Chris Argyris defined Organizational learning as a process of improving actions through better knowledge and understanding.'
detecting an error and correcting it. Organizational learning is the ability of an organization to gain insight and understanding from experience through four formal learning can be thought of as the process of moving through four
stages of learning: Unconscious incompetence: You didn't know. Conscious competence: You dearn to do, but with conscious competence: You learn to do, but with conscious competence: You learn to do, but with conscious competence: You realize that you don't know. Conscious competence: Yo
knowledge acquisition, information dissemination, information interpretation, and organization memory. Based on the ideas above, we attempt to define organization, leading to change in behaviors that result in improved problem-
solving ability and capacity for action. Organizational learning and continuous improvement are just like the two sides of a coin. Therefore, they need to be a regular part of daily work. Meaning and Nature of Learning organization as "a group
of people continually enhancing their capacity to create what they want to create what they want to create what they want to create who work together, create and disseminate new ideas and information collectively, use new knowledge and operational processes to achieve organizational goals, have a collective philosophy of predicting and responding to
environmental change, and create a culture of collective learning and learning organization is the context (framework) where learning takes place. In order to continue enjoying our site, we
ask that you confirm your identity as a human. Thank you very much for your cooperation, whether in the business or service sector, must have the ability, intention, and preparation for the change in order for it to gain competitive advantages. This requires all people in the organization to be
adaptive, who need to nurture in themselves the eagerness to continually learn so they can get their behavior changed. These people would transform their organization into a learning organization into a learning organization into a learning organization. In this article, we
are going to discuss the concept of organizational learning, its meaning, and the nature of learning organization. Figure: Concept of Organization and all collectively share it, organizational learning emerges.
Organizational learning can be defined as a learning myhole organizational learning forcess through organizational learning myhole organizational learning has as a
consequence an increased level of organizational knowledge, which is able to generate new changes in the organization. Fiol & Lyles defined organizational learning as 'the process of improving actions through better knowledge and understanding.' Chris Argyris defined Organizational learning as a process of detecting an error and correcting it.
Organizational learning is the ability of an organization to gain insight and understanding from experimentation, observation, analysis, and a willingness to examine both successes and failures. The concept of organizational learning can be thought of as the process of moving through four stages of learning: Unconscious
incompetence: You didn't know that you don't know. Conscious incompetence: You learn to do, but with conscious effort. Unconscious effort. Unconscious effort know. Conscious effort. Unconscious effort. Unco
dissemination, information interpretation, and organization memory. Based on the ideas above, we attempt to define organizational learning as the process of acquiring new knowledge and values, commonly shared by all members of the organization, leading to change in behaviors that result in improved problem-solving ability and capacity for
action. Organizational learning and continuous improvement are just like the two sides of a coin. Therefore, they need to be a regular part of daily work. Meaning and Nature of Learning organization as "a group of people continually
enhancing their capacity to create what they want to create what they want to create and disseminate new ideas and information collective philosophy of predicting and responding to environmental change,
and create a culture of collective learning takes place. By Hanna Liimatainen 17. December 2020 Many organizations aim
to become "learning organizations" - those with a natural ability to learn and adapt quickly. Harvard Business Review defines a learning organization as one that excels at acquiring, creating, and sharing knowledge, and adjusts its behavior based on new insights. By doing so, these organizations outperform their competitors in talent retention
innovation, and staying ahead of the curve. Here are some examples of how organizational learning is easier said than done, as failures often outweigh successfully implementing programs being organizational learning is easier said than done, as failures often outweigh successfully implementing organizational learning is easier said than done, as failures often outweigh successfully implementing organizational learning is easier said than done, as failures often outweigh successfully implementing organizational learning is easier said than done, as failures often outweigh successfully implementing organizational learning is easier said than done, as failures often outweigh successfully implementing organizational learning is easier said than done, as failures often outweigh successfully implementing organizational learning is easier said than done, as failures often outweigh successfully implementing organizational learning is easier said than done, as failures often outweigh successfully implementing organizational learning is easier said than done, as failures often outweigh successfully implementing organization orga
learning is not just a program, but a continuous culture that needs to be integrated into daily work to be effective. Otherwise, it will be forgotten as soon as the program ends. To truly embed this culture of learning, there are various approaches organizations can take. In this article, we'll explore three expert examples of how to approach
organizational learning from a cultural perspective, along with some practical tips. These organizational learning environment that drives innovation and success. Because of the various drivers of change currently transforming the world, organizational learning is even more crucial
than it was before. Thus, we listed three excellent examples of organizational learning: 1. Encourage people to look for learning moments in their work Lisandro Morón works as a Learning and Organizational learning: 1. Encourage people to look for learning moments in their work Lisandro Morón works as a Learning and Organizational learning: 1.
leadership program for an L&D company, with the end client often from industries such as banking and finance, engineering, FMCG, or retail. He says that the key to facilitating organizational learning is to really appreciate the fact that 70% of learning happens at daily work. "You learn through getting better at your work and actually implementing
what you have learned," he explains. How to do this in practice? Lisandro breaks it down into three parts: structural, technical perspective is the learning program itself: making sure to align the skills and capabilities the organization wants to gain with its strategy. The technical perspective is the technical perspective is the learning program itself: making sure to align the skills and capabilities the organization wants to gain with its strategy. The technical perspective is the technical perspect
facilitate a continuous learning process. But the cultural perspective is what is the most overlooked aspect of this is time. We once did a large
survey for one of our big retail clients regarding barriers to learning, and as much as 75-80% of respondents said the biggest obstacle to learning what you have learned." 2. Ensure management is aligned with the learning objectives Chris
Evans is the Executive Vice President of Marketing and Business Development at Eagle's Flight, an organizational training & development company specializing in Experiential Learning. Eagle's Flight has a global clientele of varying sizes, ranging from Fortune 50 to middle market companies, and also includes the public sector. The company
specializes in driving organizational learning on a specific topic such as leadership, inclusion, sales transformation, or Safety Culture. According to Chris, this usually happens in five steps: "First we get the senior team aligned on what needs to happen and what it will look like when that has been achieved. The second part is what I call an inclusive
discovery and customization approach: get people involved in co-creating the learning journey, so there will have a high level of ownership in learning deployment - usually a mix of virtual and classroom-based sessions where participants engage in fun and
interactive experiences that drive learning insights based on their actual behaviors. Recently, Eagle's Flight has moved most operations entirely into the virtual environment, using Howspace. The fourth step is sustainment and application followed by the final step, which is measurement. According to Chris, getting the management aligned first is
crucial not only because their commitment serves as aspiration to the others but also because they can help explain 'the why' and maintain focus on sustaining that has an impact is hard to make happen. So, you need to always be very clear on why you are doing what you are doing and communicate
it in a way that resonates with the people on the frontline. And - the way people get involved needs to be pragmatic, something they see the benefit of doing and can execute within the practical constraints of their job," he describes. "You need to always be very clear on why you are doing what you are doing and communicate it in a way that resonates
with the people on the frontline." 3. Facilitation continuous experimenting and reflection within your teams. Wilma Mutka is CEO and Founder at Mukamas, a Finnish learning design company, Mukamas facilitates agile, transformational learning processes for large companies, public sector organizations, and development networks. The overall aim is
to create more agile learning culture to work places, through building learning capabilities in teams and individuals. This means not only applying learning process with fellow learners. "It is still hard for many people to truly understand that organizational development
really is about learning together. Learning should always be present and with a digital tool like Howspace, the process can continue also asynchronously, not just when people meet but when it is relevant and convenient," she states. For Vilma and her colleagues, supporting people in their individual learning skills and journey is key. Therefore, also
the leadership model and work practices need to support and enable learning in every way. For instance, superiors and team leaders become and are even replaced with learning can be cultivated in communities of practice. "They are
usually connected to an individual's personal desire or need to develop a subject or aspect within their organization. So, they start or join a community of practice - a group of people interested in sharing knowledge and experiences on a certain topic. This is how work and learning genuinely become entwined," Vilma Mutka explains. "It is still hard
for many people to truly understand that organizational development really is about learning together." Effective learning together. Effective learning is always collaborative What is common for all of these examples of organizational learning together.
how you can use Howspace to drive innovation and collaboration in your L&D programs, why not give it a try? Start for free today and unlock Howspace's key features for you and up to 20 participants. Interorganizational learning process that takes place within
an organization can be immensely multiplied when one considers the opportunities for organizations. However, there must be specific steps taken to learning interorganizations to learning interorganizations. However, there must be specific steps taken to learning interorganizations to learning interorganizations.
Powell et al., 1996: Knowledge creation occurs in the context of a community, one that is fluid and evolving rather than tightly bound or static... Sources of innovation do not reside exclusively inside firms; instead, they are commonly found in the interstices between firms, universities, research laboratories, suppliers and customers. (Powell et al.
1996, p. 121). From this standpoint, the authors explicate two venues for collaborative learning: a strategic perspective and a knowledge creation perspective, each having more structure, established goals, and a partner selection criteria; whereas, a knowledge creation
other through formal channels, learn. The research refers to it as interorganizational learning and it has conceptualized how members are able to learn by developing sets of rules that are separate from the rules of the persons organization. Therefore this learning group is indeed a unique learning group or interorganizational learning group. Since
World War II the number of multinational corporations has grown dramatically (Macharzina, Oesterle, Brodel, 2003). This fact is indicated by the growth in global trade, which has consistently grown at a faster rate than the overall global economy. Multinational corporations (MNCs) have a number of unique challenges that they face, but the ability to
learn and adapt best practices from within the company, yet across cultures, is among the greatest challenges MNCs must overcome if they are to be successful. Organizational learning and knowledge management can facilitate the internationalization process and improve the competitiveness of a MNC (Macharzina, Oesterle, Brodel, 2003). If,
however, a MNC fails to learn effectively or deploy learned knowledge across the organization, much of the efficiencies of size can go unrealized and actually cost the enterprise dearly in duplicative efforts and non-value added learning. Interorganizational path
public and non-public sector to work together to ensure adequate crisis response to American civilians. This is accomplished by having their emergency management components (e.g. Fire Department, Police, Explosive Ordnance, and Medical Services) engage in table topic exercises. As a result, trust increases among the organizations. In addition
the collaboration can create new scenarios which provide new learning abilities for all stakeholders involved. The challenges of working and conducting business across international boundaries increases the challenges of working and conducting business across international boundaries increases the challenges of working and conducting business across international boundaries increases the challenges organizations face in cross-cultural interaction. Macharzina, Oesterle, & Brodel in Dierkes, Antal, Child, & Nonaka (2003) suggest
 "the diversity and complexity of managing a geographically dispersed system of value-added activities is greater than - and hence qualitatively different from that of managing operations with a single national market" (p. 632). Furthermore, while these challenges originate at the foreign local level, their "effects" are systemic, for they involve the
characteristics of cross-border processes. The authors though, further suggest that these increased challenges over time can actually benefit the whole of the organization as the challenges are studied and solutions found in multiple areas. These new solutions can be beneficial in other areas and new strategies formulated can be spread throughout
the entire organization. Thus while the challenges may prove much larger than in singular national arenas, certainly an important factor given the increased globalization of companies and markets. When organization increases its competitive
advantage and organizational effectiveness. Many organizations have come to rely on alliances with key players in the marketplace as strategic ventures for maintaining a competitive advantage. These key relationships can help foster organizational learning, thus giving an edge over the competition. This serves as a primary motivation for alliance
formation. In addition to the motivation of furthering org learning, there are other benefits of alliance formation, such as the potential for significant partnership agreements (Lei, Slocum, and Pitts 1997). Short-term and long-term strategic planning can flourish when collaborative partnerships with suppliers, customers, and even competitors are
considered. Daft (2005) characterizes effective learning organizations as those who have permeable boundaries - companies that will often link themselves with other businesses providing each organization with a larger access to information about current needs and directional trends in the industry. Daft continues to state, "Some learning organization with a larger access to information about current needs and directional trends in the industry. Daft continues to state, "Some learning organization with a larger access to information about current needs and directional trends in the industry. Daft continues to state, "Some learning organization with a larger access to information about current needs and directional trends in the industry. Daft continues to state, "Some learning organization with a larger access to information about current needs and directional trends in the industry."
is in the sharing of a mutually beneficial marketing strategy. For example, Advanced Circuit Technologies in Nashua, New Hampshire, formed a coalition of 10 electronic firms to jointly market non-competing products - each member company still conducts its own business, but, as a coalition, they now can adopt a strategy of bidding on projects
larger beyond what they could deliver as an individual company as they partner with other firms for services they can't do themselves (Daft 2005). Strategic alliances and joint ventures are hybrid arrangements that combine strategic objectives and cultures of partnered organizations (Child, 2003). Such alliances may incorporate the blending of
management systems, sales and marketing strategies, or other potentially synergistic aspects of the partnered entities' businesses. Organizations can benefit from strategie alliances and joint ventures by incorporating best practices from partnered organizations can benefit from strategies, or other potentially synergistic aspects of the partnered entities' businesses.
best alliances, mutual learning is achieved through knowledge transfer, and through the "dynamic synergy that may be stimulated" by experts coming from different backgrounds (Child, 2003). One problem with such alliances, however, is the fact that there are substantial barriers to knowledge sharing that arise for any number of reasons. For
example, the underlying relationship between the partners may be inherently competitive (e.g. General Motors and Toyota partnering on New United Motor Manufacturing, Inc -aka NUMMI) or one organization has the capacity to absorb large volumes of information and the other partner lacks that capacity (e.g. a large pharmaceutical company
partnering with a small biotech company). For the most part, however, such alliances are beneficial for all parties involved, especially if there is a substantial transfer of knowledge, transformation of that knowledge into usable information within the broader organization, and synthesis of new knowledge that is the direct result of the knowledge
sharing that comes about as a result of the alliance. As organizations continue to expand into new markets internationally, interorganizational learning will provide cost-effective measures that will assist companies 'too new markets internationally, interorganization requires companies 'too new markets internationally, interorganization requires companies as they expand into new global markets. Merriam and Caffarella (1999), citing Ulrich (1998) state, "Globalization requires companies to markets internationally, interorganization requires companies as they expand into new global markets.
move people, ideas, products, and information around the world to meet local needs'" (p. 13). Meeting these local needs means understanding local logistics, culture, and languages. The authors, continuing to cite Ulrich, state that organizations important ingredients to the mix when making strategy: volatile political situations,
contentious global trade issues, fluctuating exchange rates, and unfamiliar cultures'" (p. 14). If individual companies embark upon this enormous learning curve without attempting to learn from other organizations, even competitors, progress may be minimal and likely slow its advance. "In short, globalization requires that organizations increase
their ability to learn and collaborate and to manage diversity, and abiguity'" (p. 14). One of the silos of organizational learning can happen. One of the case studies for interorganizational learning is
occurring in Springfield, Missouri. Two churches, Calvary Temple and Parkcrest Assembly, are combining efforts to create a learning organizations. Rather than continuing separate organizations they are uniting their resources of land, congregations, and finances. They have created a step process plan considering all angles and problems that might
arise. The greatest organizational learning tool they have is trust and united vision. This is how they are learning interorganizationally. They have a common goal, common direction, created together not independent of one another. They are building on what unites them, not concentrating on what might divide them. Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid
Dec 30, 2023 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Feb 26, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Dec 26, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Dec 30, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Dec 30, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Dec 30, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Dec 30, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Dec 30, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Dec 30, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Dec 30, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Dec 30, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Dec 30, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Dec 30, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Dec 30, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Dec 30, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Dec 30, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Dec 30, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Dec 30, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Dec 30, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Dec 30, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Dec 30, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Dec 30, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Dec 30, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Dec 30, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Dec 30, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Dec 30, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Dec 30, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Dec 30, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Dec 30, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Dec 30, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Dec 30, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Dec 30, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Dec 30, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Dec 30, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Dec 30, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Dec 30, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Dec 30, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Dec 30, 202
2023 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Feb 27, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Feb 21, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Feb 21, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Feb 21, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Feb 21, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Feb 21, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Feb 21, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Feb 21, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Feb 21, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Feb 21, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Feb 21, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Feb 21, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Feb 21, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Feb 21, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Feb 21, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Feb 21, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Feb 21, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Feb 21, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Feb 21, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Feb 21, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Feb 21, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Feb 21, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Feb 21, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Feb 21, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Feb 21, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Feb 21, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Feb 21, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Feb 21, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Feb 21, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Feb 21, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Feb 21, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Feb 21, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Feb 21, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Feb 21, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Feb 21, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Feb 21, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Feb 21, 2024 | Fina
Harvard Business Review defines a learning organization as one that excels at acquiring, creating, and sharing knowledge, and adjusts its behavior based on new insights. By doing so, these organizations outperform their competitors in talent retention, innovation, and staying ahead of the curve. Here are some examples of how organizations have
embraced the concept of organizational learning is easier said than done, as failures often outweigh successes despite countless learning programs being organized annually. This is because organizational learning is easier said than done, as failures often outweigh successes despite countless learning is easier said than done, as failures often outweigh successes despite countless learning is easier said than done, as failures often outweigh successes despite countless learning is easier said than done, as failures often outweigh successes despite countless learning is easier said than done, as failures often outweigh successes despite countless learning is easier said than done, as failures often outweigh successes despite countless learning is easier said than done, as failures often outweigh successes despite countless learning is easier said than done, as failures often outweigh successes despite countless learning is easier said than done, as failures often outweigh successes despite countless learning is easier said than done, as failures often outweigh successes despite countless learning is easier said than done, as failures often outweigh successes despite countless learning is easier said than done, as failures often outweigh successes despite countless learning is easier said than done, as failures often outweigh successes despite countless and the said than done, as failures of the said than done of the said th
work to be effective. Otherwise, it will be forgotten as soon as the program ends. To truly embed this culture of learning, there are various approaches organizational learning from a cultural perspective, along with some practical tips. These organizational
learning examples showcase different ways to create a continuous learning environment that drives innovation and success. Because of the various drivers of change currently transforming the world, organizational learning: 1. Encourage
people to look for learning moments in their work Lisandro Morón works as a Learning and Organizational Consulting Group, which is a Scandinavian-based consulting Group Group
 finance, engineering, FMCG, or retail. He says that the key to facilitating organizational learning is to really appreciate the fact that 70% of learning happens at daily work. "You learn through getting better at your work and actually implementing what you have learned," he explains. How to do this in practice? Lisandro breaks it down into three
parts: structural, technical, and cultural. The structural perspective is the learning program itself: making sure to align the skills and capabilities the organization wants to gain with its strategy. The technical perspective is the technical per
according to Lisandro, often also the most overlooked. "The cultural perspective means activating people and creating a situation where they look for learning moments in their work. The most overlooked aspect of this is time. We once did a large survey for one of our big retail clients regarding barriers to learning, and as much as 75-80% of
respondents said the biggest obstacle to learning was the lack of time," he summarizes. "You learn through getting better at your work and actually implementing what you have learned better at your work and actually implement is aligned with the learning objectives Chris Evans is the Executive Vice President of Marketing and Business Development at Eagle's Flight
an organizational training & development company specializing in Experiential Learning on a specific topic such as leadership, inclusion, sales
transformation, or Safety Culture. According to Chris, this usually happens in five steps: "First we get the senior team aligned on what it will look like when that has been achieved. The second part is what I call an inclusive discovery and customization approach: get people involved in co-creating the learning journey, so
there will have a high level of ownership in learning and applying that which is taught." After that, he says, comes the phase of experiential learning deployment - usually a mix of virtual and classroom-based sessions where participants engage in fun and interactive experiences that drive learning insights based on their actual behaviors. Recently
Eagle's Flight has moved most operations entirely into the virtual environment, using Howspace. The fourth step is sustainment and application followed by the final step, which is measurement. According to Chris, getting the management aligned first is crucial not only because their commitment serves as aspiration to the others but also because
they can help explain 'the why' and maintain focus on sustaining the learning long enough to form habits. "Learning that has an impact is hard to make happen. So, you need to always be very clear on why you are doing what you are doing what you are doing what you are doing and communicate it in a way that resonates with the people on the frontline. And - the way people get involved
needs to be pragmatic, something they see the benefit of doing and can execute within the practical constraints of their job," he describes. "You need to always be very clear on why you are doing and communicate it in a way that resonates with the people on the frontline." 3. Facilitation continuous experimenting and reflection
within your teams Vilma Mutka is CEO and Founder at Mukamas, a Finnish learning design company. Mukamas facilitates agile, transformational learning processes for large companies, public sector organizations, and development networks. The overall aim is to create more agile learning culture to work places, through building learning
capabilities in teams and individuals. This means not only applying learnings continuously in daily work, but also continuously co-developing the learning process with fellow learning together. Learning should always be present and with a
digital tool like Howspace, the process can continue also asynchronously, not just when people meet but when it is relevant and convenient," she states. For Vilma and her colleagues, supporting people in their individual learning is
every way. For instance, superiors and team leaders become and are even replaced with learning coaches who help facilitate continuous experimenting and reflection in teams. In addition, sharing and learning can be cultivated in communities of practice. "They are usually connected to an individual's personal desire or need to develop a subject or
learning together." Effective learning is always collaborative What is common for all of these examples of organizational learning? They all emphasize that learning is always collaborative What is common for all of these examples of organizational learning? They all emphasize that learning is always collaborative What is common for all of these examples of organizational learning? They all emphasize that learning is always collaborative What is relevant and beneficial to the learning in daily work on a continuous basis and in a way that is relevant and beneficial to the learning is always collaborative What is common for all of these examples of organizational learning?
emphasized that effective learning requires collaboration. People should not be subjected to learning, but rather co-create it. Howspace, a collaborative platform, places people at the center of organizational change initiatives and learning programs. If you're curious about how you can use Howspace to drive innovation and collaboration in your L&D
programs, why not give it a try? Start for free today and unlock Howspace's key features for you and up to 20 participants. Articles • elinkcopy AuthorshipSCIMAGO INSTITUTIONS RANKINGS Different forms of strategic alliances that
translate into a growth in the number of organizations that have started to deal with interorganizational relationships with different actors. These circumstances reinforce Crossan, Lane, White and Djurfeldt (1995) and Crossan, Mauer and White (2011) in exploring what authors refer to as the fourth, interorganizational, level of learning. These
authors, amongst others, suggest that the process of interorganizational learning (IOL) warrants investigation, as its scope of analysis needs widening and deepening. Therefore, this theoretical essay is an attempt to understand IOL as a dynamic process found in interorganizational cooperative relationships that can take place in different structured
and unstructured social spaces and that can generate learning episodes. According to this view, IOL is understood as part of an organizational learning spaces; learning continuum and is analyzed within the framework of practical rationality in an approach that is less cognitive and more social-behavioral. interorganizational learning spaces; learning
episodes; cooperation; interorganizational relationships Different organizational relationships Different forms of strategic alliances (Inkpen & Tsang, 2007). As a result, organizational relationships with different forms of strategic alliances (Inkpen & Tsang, 2007).
actors such as organizations, universities and trade associations, etc. (Dacin, Reid, & Ring, 2008). This constitutes an appropriate strategy when faced with an environment that is becoming more and more uncertain (Human & Provan, 1997). In addition to this, a second point highlighting the importance of organizations working from collaborative
perspectives, exploring learning (situations) built on relationships between organizations is highlighted by Crossan, Lane and White (1999), where the authors discuss different levels of learning, reinforcing this paper focus's. Interorganizational learning
(IOL) processes have become a relevant field of research, particularly as researchers attempt to understand the scenarios and processes involved in new organizational relationships and settings. It should be pointed out that, however relevant IOL may be, it is still poorly investigated and is best termed a field in progress (Crossan, Mauer, & White,
2011; Engeström & Kerosuo, 2007; Inkpen & Tsang, 2007; Knight & Pye, 2005; Larsson, Henriksson, & Sparks, 1998). The earliest studies dealing with IOL date back to the late 1990s (Larsson et al., 1998) and are still seen as limited in scope, which means that further investigation is of paramount importance (Dierkes, Antal, Child, &
Nonaka, 2001; Easterby-Smith, Burgoyne, & Araujo, 2001; Easterby-Smith & Lyles, 2003; Engeström & Kerosuo, 2007; Inkpen & Tsang, 2007; Nooteboom, 2008). Indeed Engeström and Kerosuo state that "recent conceptual models of organizational and interorganizational learning tend to be worryingly generalized and common
sensical" (2007, p. 338). Antonello and Godoy (2009, 2010, 2011) identifying learning processes that pervade organizational boundaries, which reinforces the need to introduce additional units of analysis in order to advance this field of
knowledge. Considering this, Hardy, Phillips and Lawrence (2003), Greve (2005), Engeström and Kerosuo (2007), Inkpen and Tsang (2007), Nooteboon (2008) amongst others point out the need to deepen studies on IOL. With this in mind, the need to put forward some
theoretical and empirical reflections, and afford greater depth to studies in the field of IOL is clear. This theoretical essay is based on the assumption that IOL is understood as part of the continuum of Organizational Learning as was proposed by Crossan et al. (1995), Knight (2002), Bapuji and Crossan (2004), Holmqvist (2004), Knight and Pye (2005)
and Crossan et al. (2011). Following this line of thought, IOL is understood as a dynamic process that occurs in interoganizational relations of cooperation, in different social spaces (structured and non-structured), stimulating learning situations that will be referred to in this paper as learning episodes. More specifically, we consider that the practice
based perspective extends the literature on organizational learning by advocating a fourth level of analysis (the interorganizational) and the four processes (intuiting, interpreting, integrating and institutionalizing) of the
Organizational Learning construct proposed by Crossan et al. (1999). Therefore, our proposed model is based on new evidence gathered from our practice-based approach, taking as a starting point Crossan et al. (1995) and Crossan et al. (1995) and Crossan et al. (1995).
about: How does the process of IOL occur from a practice-based perspective? Therefore the objective is to understand IOL, based on a socio-behavioral view, within the logic of practice or practice or practice-based approach. Gherardi
referential concepts around the topic in question. Corradi, Gherardi and Verzelloni (2010) argue that the practice-based perspective has been used as a theoretical lens for reinterpret IOL as an interorganizational phenomenon. Practice-based
studies can make a significant contribution to link the analysis of working, learning and organizing because they enable contextualization of organizing within a circumscribed empirical context, define them as a collective practical accomplishment, analyze
(a) some reflections about organization and learning process; (c) Interorganizational Learning and cooperation; (e) the range of social spaces that make learning possible.
Finally, the contribution and the most important reflections and considerations on the topic and their implications for further research are presented. Organization follows a positioning of organization follows a positioning of organization and Learning The author's understanding of organization follows a positioning of organization follows a position f
is important in enabling us to understand interorganizational learning that emphasizes relationships and a built process based on organization, as highlighted by Czarniawska (2008). Czarniawska (2008, p. 5) points out three
main ideas about organization. The first, characterized by the adjective "organized", is related to mechanistic Taylorism and idealist administration theory. In the second idea, the participle "organized" has been replaced by the adjective "organization." which was inspired by what the author calls "the most fashionable branch of science
 cybernetics". However, there is a third position in describing what organization is, and it is exactly this idea that inspired our understanding of organization. We follow Weick's perception of organization is, and it is exactly this idea that inspired our understanding of organization. We follow Weick's perception of organization is, and it is exactly this idea that inspired our understanding of organization. We follow Weick's perception of organization is, and it is exactly this idea that inspired our understanding of organization.
for a practice-oriented approach to the study of organizational knowing and acting, which indicates movement and process. As Suchman (2000, p. 313) points out, "learning how to translate one's experience, though acknowledged forms of speaking, writing and other productions, as
observably intelligible and rational organizational action". We justify this point of view by the fact that modern management and learning occur in multiple contexts, though multitudes of kaleidoscopic movements. As Weick (1979) notes, organizing happens in many places at once, and organizers move around quickly and frequently. In this scenario
organizational learning is gaining ground and attention amongst research in the last few years. Although OL is widely accepted and its importance to the strategic performance of organizations is fully acknowledged, the complexity and diversity of concepts that permeate these
studies compound this scenario (Amorim & Fischer, 2009; Antonacopoulou & Chiva, 2007; Argote, 2011; Bitencourt, 2005; Easterby-Smith & Lyles, 2003; Fiol & Lyles, 1985; Ruas, Antonelo, & Boff, 2005). The situation of IOL is not different. While OL is not the main focus of this research, it supports another dimension of this concept, namely IOL
The intraorganizational dimension serves as a basis for the understanding of an interorganizational dimension, with a focus on their intersection (OL and IOL). Holmqvist (2003, 2004, 2009) claims that the interconnection between intraorganizational dimension serves as a basis for the understanding of an interorganizational dimension, with a focus on their intersection (OL and IOL).
(Larsson et al., 1998). The focus of this theoretical essay is on the type of IOL that takes place in different interorganizational relationships (strategic alliances) within the framework of the multi-level learning process. Multi-level structure of the learning process.
of interorganizational relationships. Over the last ten years, the focus of studies on OL has been achieved at the expense of conceptual developments (Engeström & Kerosuo, 2007). In their exploration of OL in the last decade,
Crossan et al. (2011) demonstrated the need for studies to be carried out using a multi-level structure, as OL is a phenomenon that takes place on multiple levels, including the external context of the organization and the interorganization and the int
(intuiting, interpreting, integrating and institutionalizing) on three levels of analysis. These authors emphasize that these levels are permeated (linked) by both social and psychological processes. Thus, IOL is presented as the fourth level of learning, after the organizational level, inspired in the practice-based perspective. The theoretical framework
could be seen in the Figure 1. Figur
understanding, IOL will be treated as part of a continuum of organizational learning as identified by Crossan et al. (1999), even though this is not included in the corresponding framework presented by these authors. We propose the inclusion of fourth level into the framework elaborated by Crossan et al. (1999) which refers
to the analysis of IOL, and which deals with the fifth process on this level, namely cooperation. Figure 2 demonstrates its inclusion in the framework. Figure 2 IOL as a Dynamic Process through Co-operation. Note. Source: Adapted from Crossan, M. M., Lane, H. W., & White, R. E. (1999). An organizational learning framework: from intuition to
institution (p. 532). Academy of Management Review, 24(3), 522-537. doi: 10.5465/AMR.1999.2202135 Building on the ideas in Crossan et al. (1999), the dynamics of this framework is explained with relationships established through
cooperation between different actors through cooperation. Cooperation, the fifth process included in the framework, is related to relationships. Such interorganizational relationships happen in structured and non-structured social spaces
and they result in learning episodes under a context of cooperation. Thus, in interpreting the first three levels of learning and the four processes involved operate along the lines of the ideas espoused by Crossan et al. (1999). However, with respect to the fourth level and the resulting inclusion of a fifth level, despite following
the same logic, it is worth noting that intuition intervenes in interpretation, which in turn interpretation, which in turn interpretation interpretation interpretation intervenes in institutionalization, which in turn interpretation interpretation.
Sequentially then, interpretation intervenes in integration, which ultimately intervenes in intuition. Faced with this dynamic, (movement in both directions), it can be observed that learning takes place over four levels: individual, group, organizational and interorganizational. However, inclusion on this fourth level means that the direct interference of
intuition on institutionalization (as proposed by Crossan et al., 1999) is transferred to cooperation. Pursuing this line of thought, when the authors propose that institutionalization has a direct effect on intuition. Moreover, as they point out, such levels are permeated by social and
psychological processes. Figure 2, as reproduced here, illustrates the multi-level structure characteristics of the learning process, exposing the intimate interconnection between all levels and the fact that they are pervaded by processes that reinforce the importance of approaching learning from a social and behavioral view, from a practice-based
approach rather than from a cognitive approach. Our view follows the reasoning put forward by Marshall (2008, p. 420) corroborates this in stating
that, "socially shared cognitions play a crucial part in guiding practices". Given the fact that learning is an everyday action in the sense that it is the effect of a series of interrelated practices and operations (Corradi, & Verzelloni, 2010; Sandberg & Tsoukas, 2011; Styhre, Josephson, & Knauseder, 2006), it should be noted that learning is
closely related to the social-behavioral view (Macdonald & Crossan, 2010) and that this is a less cognitive approach (Knight & Pye, 2005). It is believed that viewing learning as a social-behavioral process greatly contributes to a better understanding and advancement of IOL theory, thus expanding the possibilities for analysis based on every day
practices. Interorganizational learning as a process: practice-based perspective Larsson, Bengtsson, Henriksson and Sparks (1998) claim that IOL may be seen as the collective acquisition of knowledge between groups of organizations, in this way compassing the idea of interactions between organizations. Therefore, IOL is distinct from OL in that it
includes the effects of interactions between organizations, which generates greater synergy and fosters learning. It is precisely the synergy that results from interactions (cooperation) between actors, which
is not limited to organizational boundaries, that give rise to a collective learning environment. Thus, a diversity of bonds is created, generating competitive advantages (Kenis & Oerlemans, 2008). IOL is understood as a form of learning that takes place by means of cooperative relationships (interactions) between different agents. These interactions
improve and expand each participant's knowledge base and boost the potential to create individual and collective comparative advantages. It is apparent that many variables affect IOL, showing its complexity, and reinforcing its importance. Therefore, facing this emerging reality (Estivalete, Pedrozo, & Cruz, 2008), this research field still requires
theoretical studies, particularly of an empirical nature, such as those by MacDonald and Crossan (2010), that deal with the learning between different organizations. Knight and Pye (2005) identify the central role of social interactions in their study of IOL in interorganizations. Knight and Pye (2005) identify the central role of social interactions in their study of IOL in interorganizations. Knight and Pye (2005) identify the central role of social interactions in their study of IOL in interorganizations.
interactions between different actors in interorganizational settings are an important element in the facilitation of learning and innovation. Child, Faulkner and Tallman (2005) point out that one of the several reasons leading organizations to interact with others is the need to acquire new competencies that can generate innovation with recognized
economic market value. Given IOL's focus, the plurality of the concepts involved and in particular the overlapping and subtle differentiations, this theoretical essay will draw on the concept outlined by Greve (2005, p. 1026): Interorganizational learning is a distinctive form of learning because the organization learns from the experience of others
rather than from its own experience. While distinctive in the source of learning, interorganizational processes of knowledge creation and retention, and some of its findings parallel those of research on intraorganizational transfer of knowledge. In order to gain a better understanding of the IOL process,
some of the precepts from OL, which explain certain aspects of IOL, will be employed. This draws particularly on Crossan et al. (1999). Pursuing this logic, the question of process-based learning (Easterby-Smith, 1997; Gherardi, 2006) arises - returning to Bitencourt's statement (2010) on how learning occurs through relationships, which is
interesting precisely for its process-based perspective of learning and rather than a descriptive perspective. Lundvall (1992) already understood learning to be a process rather than a product (or stock of knowledge), recognizing the value of interaction and personal contact. Considering that this study returns to a process-based vision of learning at
an organizational level, it is necessary to understand action within the social context, in the sense highlighted by Gherardi, Nicolini and Odella (1998), reiterating that learning is inherently a relational activity. It should be remembered that in the scope of this theoretical essay, learning is defined along the lines of the work developed by Styhre,
Josephson and Knauseder (2006), Corradi et al. (2010) and Sandberg and Tsoukas (2011). These authors see learning as an everyday action, a flow of activities that are part of the daily work routine, an effect of a series of interrelated practices and operations that are part of the daily work routine, an effect of a series of interrelated practices and operations that are part of the daily work routine, an effect of a series of interrelated practices and operations that are part of the daily work routine, an effect of a series of interrelated practices and operations that are part of the daily work routine, an effect of a series of interrelated practices and operations that are part of the daily work routine, an effect of a series of interrelated practices and operations that are part of the daily work routine, an effect of a series of interrelated practices and operations that are part of the daily work routine, an effect of a series of interrelated practices and operations that are part of the daily work routine, an effect of a series of interrelated practices are part of the daily work routine, an effect of a series of interrelated practices are part of the daily work routine, an effect of a series of interrelated practices are part of the daily work routine, and the
Studies making use of a practice-based approach have surfaced in recent years, and can potentially go beyond a conventional organizational analysis (Geiger, 2009), in addition to the cognitive view, highlights that the practice-based approach also came about as a critique
of a positivist and rationalist view of organizations. Both authors however understand that this is not a conflict that necessarily needs to be resolved. As Geiger (2009) states, the variety of interests and research traditions that are dubbed practice-based studies(1), means that it is not easy to delineate a common perspective. This paper will however
also adopt this perspective, with the aim of reaching of the IOL process, just as Gherardi (2000) attempted to do in understanding OL. Something that many practice-based studies have in common is an interest in the collective, situated and provisional nature of knowledge (Gherardi, 2009). In terms of the differences, the
same author states that some central questions remain, for example the very concept of practice, and above all, when it is used synonymously with routine. In situating our work as an attempt to improve understanding of IOL in practice, and above all, when it is used synonymously with routine. In situating our work as an attempt to improve understanding of IOL in practice, and above all, when it is used synonymously with routine.
process that is delineated in the framework proposed by Crossan et al. (1999) that is to say, interorganizational cooperation. This agrees with Geiger's (2009) view that is oriented towards the subjective, emotional and provisional, as the author considers that practice-based studies call into question the objective, cognitive and abstract nature of
knowledge. Also according to Gherardi (2000, 2008, 2009), Nicolini, Gherardi and Yanow (2003), Nicolini (2009) and Gherardi and Souto (2013), organizational learning as a process at the interorganizational level sees everyday action as an element in the social setting as a whole, in
the sense stressed by Gherardi et al. (1998): learning is an inherently relational activity. Referring to Le Boterf (1999), Antonello (2011) states that "everyday situations can become a vehicle for the development of learning processes" (Antonello, 2011, p. 140).
activities occur, but crucially as enacted, whereby its elements are simultaneously influenced by mediums and outcomes of social activity" (Marshall, 2008, p. 419). According to Bispo (2013, p. 22) "practices can be associated with a bricolage work which gathers material, mental, social and cultural elements in a situated context". Gherardi (2006, p.
47) suggest that "learning is integrated into individuals' daily lives, deriving from informal sources of social relations. It is therefore assumed that any activity can constitute an opportunity for learning and that casual social situations are as important as formal learning experiences". MacDonald and Crossan (2010) state that behavioral issues have
received insufficient attention in spite of the perception that they may help understand learning between different organizations. Therefore, it is believed that an analysis of IOL should not focus solely on cognitive aspects. Such an analysis of IOL should not focus solely on cognitive aspects.
of practical rationality. As MacDonald and Crossan state (2010, p. 12): "The integration of new information at the group level makes inter-organizational learning possible. It is the individuals and the social processes and practices, such as dialogue, through which they develop shared understandings that facilitate inter-organizational learning". In line
with this view, these authors identify dialogue as a central element of IOL processes because dialogue creates a shared understanding that facilitates learning. "The more that the structures and mechanisms of engagement between the organizations make sustained dialogue, and hence a kind of joint sensemaking, possible the more likely there will be
inter-organizational learning" (Macdonald & Crossan, 2010, p. 12). Larsson et al. (1998) already advocated that IOL may be hindered by a lack of communication. Importance is given to dialogue and communication. Such interactions, particularly cooperative
ones, foster IOL, which takes place through a range of existing interorganizational relationships. Interorganizational cooperation tresults. It facilitates the production of new knowledge, fosters innovation and new solutions and helps organizations achieve a more
central and competitive position in relation to enterprises that work in isolation. Cooperation as the fifth process included in the Crossan et al. model (1999) is related to relational strategies established between the different actors that are external to the organization, facilitating IOL as a dynamic process. As Jorde and Teece (1989) point out, these
new organizational arrangements offer improved access to new knowledge by facilitating OL, providing access to new technologies and innovation processes and improving technologies and innovation processes are processed and innovation processes are processed and innovation processes are processed and i
```

knowledge flows is clear, something which is facilitated in a system of interorganizational cooperation and claim that, in addition to allowing the sharing of knowledge between organizations, this facilitates the production of new knowledge. Shima (2006) underscores how

```
important it is for companies to share resources and information and to increase the flow of information global enterprises now need. Therefore, it can be said that organizations that assume different organizations that assume different organizations that assume different organization and to increase the flow of information global enterprises now need. Therefore, it can be said that organizations that assume different organization and to increase the flow of information global enterprises now need. Therefore, it can be said that organizations that assume different organization and to increase the flow of information global enterprises now need.
 smith, Lyles, & Tsang, 2008; Holmqvist, 2004; Inkpen, 2004; Inkpen, 2000; Inkpen & Tsang, 2007; Knight & Pye, 2005; Lane, 2001; Macdonald & Crossan, 2010; Powell, 1998). Richardson (1972) also emphasized the importance of adding cooperation to the picture by saying that cooperation can be found in different organizational arrangements and contrasted this
concept with the idea that the market rules. Ebers and Jarillo (1998), Powell (19
organizations' performance. Jarillo (1993) and Ebers and Jarillo (1993) and Ebers and Jarillo (1993) points out that the atomistic view of traditional models, in which each
individual player faces the world by him or herself, may not be the most efficient way to compete. Lubatkin, Florin and Lane (2001), Hardy et al. (2003) and Zaheer et al. (2010) also share this cooperation may be seen as stemming from collaborative actions established in interorganizational relationships, with mutual
commitment. However, the idea of competition is not absent in this setting. Even within the logic of cooperation, the coexistence of cooperation and competitive advantage (Cassiolato & Lastres, 2003; Ebers & Jarillo
1998; Kenis & Oerlemans, 2008; Muthusamy & White, 2005; Zaheer, Gözübüyük, & Milanov, 2010). In interorganizational relationships, learning is often seem as a natural result of cooperation (Child, 2003). IOL is viewed as part of a continuum of organizational learning, thus enlarging the scope of IOL analysis. However, it is also seen as a dynamic
process that takes place in cooperative interorganizational relationships, found in the interactions established in different structured and unstructured social learning spaces are discussed below and the occurrence of learning episodes in them are highlighted. Different social learning spaces and learning episodes Given that this
theoretical essay aims to understand the IOL process through interorganizational cooperative relationships, we propose a micro-level analysis in which the various social spaces involved are important to this dynamics. Interorganizational relationships are established in both structured and unstructured social spaces for learning (Janowicz-Panjaitan &
Noorderhaven, 2009), providing learning episodes (Knight & Pye, 2005). Janowicz-Panjaitan and Noorderhaven (2009) demonstrate that learning behaviors can be formal (taking the form of spontaneous interaction), with different repercussions in the IOL process. These authors emphasize that IOL does
not always occur spontaneously. As a result, IOL can be stimulated if structural measures are formalized. Similarly, Wenger (1998) has stressed that in an ordinary interorganizational contexts, informal social interactions are supported by the formal structure. In agreement with this, Knight (2002) stated that in an ordinary interorganizational contexts, informal social interactions are supported by the formal structure.
formal and informal aspects of learning, without privileging one over the other. Powell (1998) highlighted formal and informal aspects as subtle elements that need to be thought out, given that neither information nor knowledge are easily transferred by way of license or purchase. When these opportunities for social interaction are perceived as an
obligation and not as a voluntary learning opportunity, people become less willing to interact and formality tends to inhibit informality, leading to a loss of spontaneity (Janowicz-Panjaitan & Noorderhaven, 2009). These authors assert that both formal and informal social interactions have a positive effect on IOL results, as Contu and Willmott (2003)
suggest. They also highlight the complementarity between formal interactions. Even though formality reinforce each other, these relationships cannot be said to be perfect complements, given that the positive effect of informality reinforce each other, these relationships cannot be said to be perfect complements, given that the positive effect of informality reinforce each other, these relationships cannot be said to be perfect complements, given that the positive effect of informality reinforce each other, these relationships cannot be said to be perfect complements.
the extent of informal learning behavior will yield consistent positive effects on formal behavior, additional formalization will have a positive effect on informal learning mechanisms only up to a point (Janowicz-Panjaitan & Noorderhaven, 2009). The authors show that, as Thompson (2005) advocated in the case of OL, excessive formalization (formal
mechanisms), even when used with the intent of stimulating learning, can hinder both informal learning behaviors and IOL. Therefore, it is clear that social spaces can foster interorganizational relationships, which, in turn, can lead to the occurrence of learning episodes in the flow of everyday activities that take place in formal and informal spaces.
More specifically, it is understood that IOL should be analyzed in accordance with Knight and Pye (2005), when they refer to the importance of analyzing context (history, aims and routine), content (changes that took place) and process (actions and intentions, leading to learning episodes). According to the assumptions demonstrated by Janowicz-
Panjaitan and Noorderhaven (2009), these formal spaces in interorganizational settings are essential in fostering IOL, a process, which can also be stimulated by informal spaces. In this line of reasoning, IOL is understood as a process, which can also be stimulated by informal spaces.
actors; i.e. within the logic of practical rationality. Such activity flows are what Knight (2002) termed network learning episodes, which, according to the author, offer an appropriate unit of analysis for empirical research, thus improving the understanding of learning in interorganizational relationships. These learning episodes, according to Knight
(2002) and Knight and Pye (2005), are related to the flow of everyday activities that are found both in structured spaces. In other words, learning episodes are actions and interactions that take place between different actors and which foster events and learning experiences (learning events), with a direct or indirect impact on
different interacting actors. Such learning episodes can be analyzed for their content, with a focus on what was learned (e.g. the research of Knight & Pye, 2005). Alternatively, the focus can be on episode occurrences, in which case their importance to the actors involved is analyzed. It is understood that establishing cooperative relationships between
different actors favors the occurrence of learning episodes, triggering IOL. Moreover, each organization's internal dynamics, as well as the nature of the interorganizational dynamics, determine whether IOL will take place (Van Wijk, Jansen, & Lyles, 2008). To sum up, it is clear that everyday activities that are carried out according to
interorganizational relationships provide structured and unstructured social learning spaces, in which learning events (episodes and experiences) take place (Knight & Pye, 2005). Such events are perceived as examples of IOL. In other words, interorganizational relationships that take place in structured and unstructured social spaces make learning
episodes possible, which are important to the analysis of IOL processes. In this microanalysis learning episodes occur daily in different social learning spaces through cooperation, as shown in Figure 3. This figure is part of the proposition of the inclusion shown in Figure 2, now exposed singly, and explains the interactions treated in this subsection.
Figure 3 Learning Episodes Occur in Different Social Learning Spaces through Cooperation. Finally, the existence of barriers are cognitive (social and cultural issues), while others are emotional (attachments, detachments, rivalries, family ties and friendship bonds).
They make relationships difficult and thus affect learning. Cognitive barriers and limited emotionality are also implicit control mechanisms that hamper IOL (Child, 2003; MacDonald & Crossan, 2010). Final Remarks To conclude the proposal presented here, we should emphasize that firstly, the ontological stance taken concerning organizing is best
suited for understanding the context and the framework that is proposed in this study. Secondly, IOL features were addressed according to social-behavioral views more than to cognitive approaches, emphasizing the practice-based approach. And thirdly, IOL was analyzed as a dynamic process that takes place in cooperative interorganizational
relationships found in different structured and unstructured social spaces in everyday life, that provide learning episodes. In line with this approach, IOL is understood as part of a multi-level learning structure that is presented as an element of an organizational learning continuum, a level proposed by Crossan et al. (1995), Knight (2002), Bapuji and
Crossan (2004), Holmqvist (2004), Knight and Pye (2005) and Crossan et al. (2011). To end this theoretical essay, it can be said that the scope of IOL analysis was expanded by identifying it as the fourth level of learning process. Such learning levels are
believed to be permeated by social and psychological processes (Crossan et al., 1999), a situation which is not different for the fourth level, IOL. Figure 2 illustrates the multi-level structure of the learning process, revealing the close interconnections between all learning levels. This makes it clear that these levels are permeated by processes that
reinforce the importance of dealing with learning by means of a social-behavioral view in which social interactions and context are considered according to the logic of practical rationality. Specifically in relation to the fourth level, that of IOL, we highlight cooperation as a key process for integrating the different organizations basing itself on a set of
elements that are both structured (structured and unstructured social spaces), and relational (learning spaces for learning. Such social spaces lead to
cooperative interorganizational relationships, triggering learning episodes that are echoed in differing ways in the process of IOL. To conclude, it should be underscored that this research is expected to contribute to the advancement of studies in the field of IOL, making its understanding easier by means of an analysis of learning episodes that take
place in different social spaces in which cooperation is ordinary. It is thought that this research contemplates a lesser-known level of analysis, namely interorganizational learning. It may also foster the advancement of the understanding of
interorganizational relationships, bringing the field of organizational studies closer to the area of interorganizational studies closer to the area of interorganizational studies closer to the area of interorganizational studies. We believe that understanding IOL through the lens of practice-based approach can generate important insights, including supporting the interpretive paradigm. The shift in theoretical lens in organizational studies
with the use of vision-based practice can help us in the search for a non-functionalist paradigm (Nicolini, 2009). Gherardi (2009) corroborates this assertion, highlighting the power of critique of practice-based studies. As a practical contribution, we underline the possibility of stimulating IOL using the proposed model. In this way, organizations will be
able to stimulate learning and cooperation between organizations based on the creation of learning spaces that value formal and informal practices. Although the need for further studies remains, we expect that the debate presented here will contribute to a better understanding and development of IOL, in addition to encouraging further theoretical
and empirical research in different interorganizational settings. As a suggestion for future studies, we propose the application of the framework in the context of collective nature, as in Local Productive Arrangements (LPAs), clusters, joint ventures and other organizational arrangements by means of interorganizational relations. Amorin, W. A. C., &
Fischer, A. L. (2009). Aprendizagem organizacional: uma análise sobre o debate e a escolha de categorias para estudos de caso. Perspectiva Contemporânea, 4(1), 101-125. Antonacopoulou, E., & Chiva, R. (2007). The social complexity of organizational learning: the dynamics of learning and organizational uma análise sobre o debate e a escolha de categorias para estudos de caso. Perspectiva Contemporânea, 4(1), 101-125. Antonacopoulou, E., & Chiva, R. (2007). The social complexity of organizational learning: the dynamics of learning and organizational uma análise sobre o debate e a escolha de categorias para estudos de caso. Perspectiva Contemporânea, 4(1), 101-125. Antonacopoulou, E., & Chiva, R. (2007). The social complexity of organizational learning: the dynamics of learning and organizational uma análise sobre o debate e a escolha de categorias para estudos de caso. Perspectiva Contemporânea, 4(1), 101-125. Antonacopoulou, E., & Chiva, R. (2007). The social complexity of organizational learning and organizational uma análise sobre o debate e a escolha de categorias para estudos de caso. Perspectiva Contemporânea, 4(1), 101-125. Antonacopoulou, E., & Chiva, R. (2007). The social complexity of organizational una análise sobre o debate e a escolha de categorias para estudos de categorias para estud
10.1177/1350507607079029» Antonello, C. S. (2011). Contextos do saber: a aprendizagem informal. In C. S. Antonello, & A. S. Godoy, Aprendizagem organizacional no Brasil (pp. 139-159). Porto Alegre: Bookman. Antonello, C. S., & Godoy, Aprendizagem organizacional no Brasil (pp. 139-159). Porto Alegre: Bookman. Antonello, C. S. (2011). Contextos do saber: a aprendizagem organizacional no Brasil (pp. 139-159). Porto Alegre: Bookman. Antonello, C. S., (2009). Uma agenda brasileira para os estudos em aprendizagem organizacional. Revista de Administração
de Empresas, 49(3), 266-281. Antonello, C. S., & Godoy, A. S. (2010). A encruzilhada da aprendizagem organizacional: uma visão multiparadigmática. Revista de Administração Contemporânea, 14(2), 310-332. Retrieved from . doi: 10.1590/S1415-65552010000200008 » • Antonello, C. S., & Godoy, A. S. (2011). Aprendizagem organizacional no Brasil
Porto Alegre: Bookman. Argote, L. (2011). Organizational learning research: past, present and future. Management Learning, 42(4), 439-446. doi: 10.1177/1350507611408217» Balestrin, A., & Verschoore, J. (2008). Redes de cooperação empresarial: estratégias de gestão na nova economia Porto Alegre: Bookman. Bapuji, H., & Crossan, M. (2004).
From questions to answers: reviewing organizational learning research. Management Learning, 35(4), 397-417. doi: 10.1177/1350507604048270» Bispo, M. (2013). Estudos baseados em prática: conceitos, história e perspectivas. Revista Interdisciplinar de Gestão Social, 2(1), 13-33. Bitencourt, C. C. (2005). Gestão de competências e aprendizagement.
nas organizações, São Leopoldo, RS, Brazil: Editora Unisinos. Bitencourt, C. C. (2010), Gestão contemporânea de pessoas: novas práticas, conceitos tradicionais (2a ed.), Porto Alegre, RS: Bookman. Cassiolato, J. E., & Lastres, H. M. M. (2003), O foco em arranjos produtivos e inovativos locais de micro e pequenas empresas. In H. M. M. Lastres, J. E.
Cassiolato, & M. L. Maciel (Orgs.), Pequena empresa: cooperação e desenvolvimento local (pp. 21-34). Rio de Janeiro: Relume Dumará. Child, J. (2003). Learning through strategic alliances. In M. Dierkes, A. B. Antal, J. Child, & I. Nonaka (Eds.), Handbook of organizational learning and knowledge (part VI, pp. 657-680). United States: Oxford
University Press. Child, J., Faulkner, D., & Tallman, S. (2005). Cooperative strategy: managing alliances, networks, and joint ventures (2nd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press. Contu, A., & Willmott, H. (2003). Re-embedding situatedness: the importance of power relations in learning theory. Organization Science, 14(3), 283-296. doi:
10.1287/orsc.14.3.283.15167» Corradi, G., Gherardi, S., & Verzelloni, L. (2010). Through the practice lens: where is the bandwagon of practice-based studies heading? Management Learning, 41(3), 265-283. doi: 10.1177/1350507609356938» Crossan, M. M., Lane, H. W., White, R. E., & Djurfeldt, L. (1995). Organizational learning: dimensions for a contraction of the bandwagon of practice-based studies heading? Management Learning and the practice lens: where is the bandwagon of practice-based studies heading? Management Learning and the practice lens: where is the bandwagon of practice-based studies heading? Management Learning and the practice lens: where is the bandwagon of practice-based studies heading? Management Learning and the practice lens: where is the bandwagon of practice-based studies heading? Management Learning and the practice lens: where is the bandwagon of practice-based studies heading? Management Learning and the practice lens: where is the bandwagon of practice-based studies heading? Management Learning and the practice lens: where is the bandwagon of practice lens: where 
theory. International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 3(4), 337-360. doi: 10.1108/eb028835» Crossan, M. M., Lane, H. W., & White, R. E. (1999). An organizational learning framework: from intuition to institution. Academy of Management Review, 24(3), 522-537. doi: 10.5465/AMR.1999.2202135» Crossan, M. M., Mauer, C. C., & White, R. E.
(2011). Reflections on the 2009 AMR decade award: do we have a theory of organizational learning? Academy of Management Review, 36(3), 446-460. Czarniawska, B. (2008). Organizations and Management: An International Journal, 3(1), 4-20. doi:
10.1108/17465640810870364» Dacin, T., Reid, D., & Ring, P. S. (2008). Alliances and joint ventures: the role of partner selection from an embeddedness perspective. In S. Cropper, M. Ebers, C. Huxham, & P. S. Ring (Eds.), Inter-organizational relations (pp. 90-117). Oxford: Oxford University Press. Dierkes, M., Antal, A. B., Child, J., & Nonaka, Inter-organizational relations (pp. 90-117).
(2001). Handbook of organizational learning and knowledge New York: Oxford University Press USA. Easterby-Smith, M. (1997). Disciplines of organizational learning: contributions and critiques. Human Relations, 50(9), 1085-1113. doi: 10.1177/001872679705000903» Easterby-Smith, M., & Araujo, L. (2001). Aprendizagem organizacional:
oportunidades e debates atuais In M. Easterby-Smith, J. Burgoyne, & L. Araujo, Aprendizagem organizacional e organizacional e organizacional e organizacional handbook of organizational learning and knowledge management. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. Easterby-Smith, M.
Lyles, M. A., & Tsang, E. W. K. (2008). Inter-organizational knowledge transfer current themes and future prospects. Journal of Management Studies, 45(4), 677-690. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6486.2008.00773.x» Ebers, M., & Jarillo, J. C. (1998). The construction, forms, and consequences of industry networks. International Studies of Management &
Organization, 27(4), 3-21. Engeström, Y., & Kerosuo, H. (2007). From workplace Learning to inter-organizational learning and back: the contribution of activity theory. Journal of Workplace Learning to inter-organizational learning and back: the contribution of activity theory. Journal of Workplace Learning to inter-organizational learning to inter-organizational learning and back: the contribution of activity theory. Journal of Workplace Learning to inter-organizational learning to inter-organizational learning and back: the contribution of activity theory. Journal of Workplace Learning to inter-organizational learning to inter-organization learning to inter-organi
relationships. Brazilian Administration Review, 5(4), 319-331. Retrieved from . doi: 10.1590/S1807-76922008000400006 » Payard, P. (2008). Apresentação empresarial: estratégias de gestão na nova economia (pp. IX- XII). Porto Alegre: Bookman. Fiol, C. M., & Lyles, M. A. (1985).
Organizational learning. The Academy of Management Review, 10(4), 803-813. doi: 10.5465/AMR.1985.4279103» Geiger, D. (2009). Revisiting the concept of practice: toward an argumentative understanding of practice based theorizing or
learning and knowing in organizations: an introduction. Organization, 7(2), 211-23. doi: 10.1177/135050840072001» Gherardi, S. (2006). Organizational knowledge: the texture of workplace learning Malden, MA, Oxford, UK, Victoria, Australia: Blackwell publishing. Gherardi, S. (2008). Situated knowledge and situated action. In D. Barry & H.
Hansen (Eds.), The SAGE handbook of new approaches in management and organization (pp. 516-525). London: Sage Publications. Gherardi, S., Vicolini, D., & Odella, F. (1998). Toward a social understanding of how people
learn in organizations: the notion of situated curriculum. Management Learning, 29(3), 273-298. doi: 10.1177/1350507698293002» Gherardi, S., & Souto, P. C. N. (2013, setembro). What do people do when they work? The contribution of practice-based studies to the understanding of working and organizing. Anais do Encontro Nacional da
Associação Nacional de Pós-Graduação e Pesquisa em Administração, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brasil, 37. Greve, H. R. (2005). Inter-organizational learning and heterogeneous social structure. Organization Studies, 26(7), 1025-1047. doi: 10.1177/0170840605053539» Hardy, C., Phillips, N., & Lawrence, T. B. (2003). Resources, knowledge and influence: the
organizational effects of interorganizational collaboration. Journal of Management Studies, 40(2), 321-347. doi: 10.1111/1467-6486.00342» Holmqvist, M. (2003). A dynamic model of intra-and interorganizational learning processes
of exploitation and exploration within and between organizations: an empirical study of product development. Organization and exploration for the learning organization? Management Learning, 40(3), 275-287. doi: 10.1287/orsc.1030.0056» Holmqvist, M. (2009). Complicating the organization and exploration for the learning organization? Management Learning, 40(3), 275-287. doi: 10.1287/orsc.1030.0056»
10.1177/1350507609104340» Human, S. E., & Provan, K. G. (1997). An emergent theory of structure and outcomes in small-firm strategic manufacturing networks. Academy of Management Journal, 40(2), 368-403. doi: 10.2307/256887 Inkpen, A. C. (2000). Learning through joint ventures: a framework of knowledge acquisitions. Journal of
Management Studies, 37(7), 1019-1045. doi: 10.1111/1467-6486.00215» Inkpen, A. C., & Tsang, E. W. K. (2007). Learning and strategic alliances. The Academy of Management Annals, 1(1), 479-511. doi: 10.1080/078559815» Janowicz-Panjaitan, M., & Noorderhaven, N. G. (2009). Trust, calculation, and interorganizational learning of tacit
knowledge: an organizational roles perspective. Organization Studies, 30(10), 1021-1044. doi: 10.1177/0170840609337933» Jarillo, J. C. (1993). Strategic networks: creating the borderless organization Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann. Jorde, T. M., & Teece, D. J. (1989). Competition and cooperation: striking the right balance. California Managemen
Review, 25-37. Kenis, P., & Oerlemans, L. (2008). The social network perspective: understanding the structure of cooperation. In S. Cropper, M. Ebers, C. Huxham, & P. S. Ring (Eds.), The Oxford University Press. Knight, L. (2002). Network learning: exploring learning by
interorganizational networks. Human Relations, 55(4), 427-454. doi: 10.1177/0018726702554003» Knight, L., & Pye, A. (2005). Network learning: an empirically derived model of learning by groups of organizations. Human Relations, 58(3), 369-392. doi: 10.1177/0018726705053427» Lane, C. (2001). Organizational learning in supplier networks. In
M. Dierkes, A. B. Antal, J. Child, & I. Nonaka (Eds.), Handbook of organizational learning and knowledge (pp. 699-715). United States: Oxford University Press. Larsson, R., Bengtsson, L., Henriksson, K., & Sparks, J. (1998). The interorganizational learning dilemma: collective knowledge development in strategic alliances. Organization Science, 9(3)
285-305. doi: 10.1287/orsc.9.3.285» Le Boterf, G. (1999). L'ingénierie des compétences Paris: Les editions d'organisation. Lubatkin, M., Florin, J., & Lane, P. (2001). Learning together and apart: a model of reciprocal interfirm learning. Human Relations, 54(10), 1353-1382. Lundvall, B.-A. (1992). National innovation systems: towards a theory of
innovation and interactive learning London: Pinter Publishers. MacDonald, P., & Crossan, M. (2010, June). Learning to innovate: the process of learning between diverse organizations. Proceedings of Organizations. Pro
based theories of organizational knowledge and learning: incompatible or complementary? Management Learning, 39(4), 413-435. doi: 10.1177/1350507608093712» Muthusamy, S. K., & White, M. A. (2005). Learning and knowledge transfer in strategic alliances: a social exchange view. Organization Studies, 26(3), 415-441. doi:
10.1177/0170840605050874» Nalebuff, B. J., & Brandenburger, A. M. (1996). Co-opetição Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Editora Rocco. Nicolini, D. (2009). Zooming in and out: practices by switching theoretical lenses and trailing connections. Organizations Studies, 30(12), 1391-1418. doi: 10.1177/0170840609349875» Nicolini, D., Gherardi, S., & Yanow, D.
(2003). Introduction: towards a practice-based view of knowing and learning in organizations. In D. Nicolini, S. Gherardi, & D. Yanow (Eds.), Knowing in organizations in inter-organization in inter-organization in inter-organizations. In S. Cropper, M. Ebers, C. Huxham, & P.
S. Ring (Eds.), The Oxford handbook of inter-organizational relations (pp. 307-634). Oxford: Oxford University Press. Powell, W. W. (1998). Learning from collaboration: knowledge and networks in the biotechnology and pharmaceutical industries. California Management Review, 40(3), 228-240. doi: 10.2307/41165952» Richardson, G. B. (1972). The
organisation of industry. Economic Journal, 82(327), 883-896. Ruas, R., Antonello, C. S., & Boff, L. H. (2005). Aprendizagem organizacional e competências: os novos horizontes da gestão Porto Alegre: Bookman. Sandberg, J., & Tsoukas, H. (2011). Grasping the logic of practice: theorizing through practical rationality. Academy of Management
Review, 36(2), 338-360. Shima, W. T. (2006). Economia de redes e inovação. (2006). In V. Pelaez & T. Szmrecsányi (Orgs.), Economia da inovação tecnológica (Cap. 14, pp. 333-364). São Paulo: Editora HUCITEC/Ordem dos Economistas do Brasil. Styhre, A., Josephson, P-E., & Knauseder, I. (2006). Organization learning in non-writing communities:
the case of construction workers. Management Learning, 37(1), 83-100. doi: 10.1177/1350507606060983» Suchman, L. (2000). Organization, 7(2), 311-327. doi: 10.1177/135050840072007» Thompson, M. (2005). Structural and epistemic parameters in communities of practice. Organization Science,
16(2), 151-164. doi: 10.1287/orsc.1050.0120» Van Wijk, R., Jansen, J. J. P., & Lyles, M. A. (2008). Inter- and intra-organizational knowledge transfer: a meta-analytic review and assessment of its antecedents and consequences. Journal of Management Studies, 45(4), 830-853. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6486.2008.00771.x» Weick, K. (1979). The social
psychology of organizing (2nd ed.). Reading, MA: Addison'Wesley. Wenger, E. (1998). Communities of practice: learning, meaning, and identity Cambridge University Press. Zaheer, A., Gözübüyük, R., & Milanov, H. (2010). It's the connections: the network perspective in the interorganizational research. Academy of Management
Perspectives, 24(1), 62-77. 1 See Gherardi, S. (2008). Situated knowledge and situated know
a matter of taste! Management Learning, 40(5), 535-550. doi: 10.1177/1350507609340812. This issue is dedicated to articles that use practice-based theory. Publication in this collectionSept 2014 Received1 July 2013 Reviewed13 Jan 2014 rev-request28 Jan 2014 Accepted1 July 2014
```