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 and endeavor to continue its 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 organizational learning, its meaning, and the nature of learning organization. Figure: Concept of Organizational Learning In the context of an organization, when individual learning is disseminated among all individual members of the organization and all collectively share it, organizational learning emerges. Organizational learning can be defined as a learning process through social interactions at the group and organizational levels. Through organizational learning "whole organizations or their components 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 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 experience through 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 realize that you don't know. Conscious competence: You learn to do, but with conscious effort. Unconscious competence: Performance comes effortlessly (easily). According to G.P. Huber, Organization learning is the assemblage of knowledge acquisition, information 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: The term learning organization has been popularized by Peter Senge who describes a learning organization as "a group of people continually enhancing their capacity to create what they want to create". A learning organization consists of people 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. The relationship between organizational learning and learning organization is that Organizational Learning is the process taking place in the organization, and the 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. 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 and endeavor to continue its 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 organizational learning, its meaning, and the nature of learning organization. Figure: Concept of Organizational Learning In the context of an organization, when individual learning is disseminated among all individual members of the organization and all collectively share it, organizational learning emerges. Organizational learning can be defined as a learning process through social interactions at the group and organizational levels. Through organizational learning "whole organizations or their components 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 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 experience through 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 realize that you don't know. Conscious competence: You learn to do, but with conscious effort. Unconscious competence: Performance comes effortlessly (easily). According to G.P. Huber, Organization learning is the assemblage of knowledge acquisition, information 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: The term learning organization has been popularized by Peter Senge who describes a learning organization as "a group of people continually enhancing their capacity to create what they want to create". A learning organization consists of people 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. The relationship between organizational learning and learning organization is that Organizational Learning is the process taking place in the organization, and the Learning Organization is the context (framework) where 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 organizations have embraced the concept of organizational learning. Successfully implementing 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 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 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 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 Consultant at Implement Consulting Group, which is a Scandinavian-based consulting company. His typical project is an international 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 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 technology needed to facilitate a continuous learning process. But the cultural perspective is what is the most essential and, 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." 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 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 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 learners. "It is still hard for many people to truly understand that organizational development really is about learning together." Effective learning is always collaborative What is common for all of these examples of organizational learning? They all emphasize that learning happens through applying learning in daily work on a continuous basis and in a way that is relevant and beneficial to the learner. All three experts we interviewed for this article 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 learning. 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. Interorganizational learning presents an opportunity for an exponential learning process. The advantages of a learning process than takes place within an organization can be immensely multiplied when one considers the opportunities for organizations to learn from other organizations. However, there must be specific steps taken to learning interorganizationally that is different from traditional organizational learning processes. Interorganizational learning, referred to as collaborative learning in a recent study conducted by Hardy et al (2003), requires a network of social interaction. The authors perpetuate their social constructivist view of knowledge by referring to it "as a property of community practice rather than as a resource that can be generated and possessed by individuals" (p. 326). The authors support their contention by citing 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. 117). From this standpoint, the authors explicate two venues for collaborative learning: a strategic perspective and a knowledge creation perspective, each having their own benefits and tradeoffs. A strategic perspective is understood as having more structure, established goals, and a partner selection criteria; whereas, a knowledge creation perspective is understood to be less inhibitive – having little or no formality that may inhibit openness and synergy; both of which are necessary for going beyond the boundaries of knowledge transference. As explained by Holmqvist (2003), a separate stream of organizational learning research focuses on how organizations in cooperation with each 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 is how they are learning interorganizationally. They have a common goal, common direction, created together but independent of one another. They are building on what might divide them. Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Jan 13, 2020 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Dec 26, 2023 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Feb 7, 2024 | Finance Posted by Md. Harun Ar Rashid | Dec 30, 2023 | Finance Posted 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 organizations have embraced the concept of organizational learning. Successfully implementing 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 not just a program, but a continuous culture that needs to be integrated into daily work to be effective. 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 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 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 Consultant at Implement Consulting Group, which is a Scandinavian-based consulting company. His typical project is an international 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 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 technology needed to facilitate a continuous learning process. But the cultural perspective is what is the most essential and, 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." 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 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 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 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 coaches who help facilitate continuous learning 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 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 is always collaborative What is common for all of these examples of organizational learning? They all emphasize that learning happens through applying learning in daily work on a continuous basis and in a way that is relevant and beneficial to the learner. All three experts we interviewed for this article 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 learning. 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 • • linkcopy AuthorshipsSCIMAGO INSTITUTIONS RANKINGS Different organizational settings have been gaining ground in the world economy, resulting in a proliferation of 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)'s argument that 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 continuum and is analyzed within the framework of practical rationality in an approach that is less cognitive and more social-behavioral. interorganizational learning; social learning spaces; learning episodes; interorganizational relationships Different organizational settings have been gaining ground in the world economy, with a growing number of different forms of strategic alliances (Inkpen & Tsang, 2007). As a result, organizations are increasingly introducing new learning relationships with different 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 interorganizational relationships is highlighted by Crossan, Lane and White (1999), where the authors discuss different levels of learning. Crossan, Mauer and White (2011) suggest new studies in the field of interorganizational learning, reinforcing this paper focus's. Interorganizational learning (IOL) processes have become a relevant field of research, particularly as researchers attempt to understand the processes involved in new organizational relationships and settings. It should be termed a field in progress (Crossan, Mauer, & White, 2011; Engeström & Kerosuo, 2007; Inkpen & Tsang, 2007; Knight & Pye, 2005; Larsson, Bengtsson, 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; Greve, 2005; 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) identified gaps in studies on organizational learning and highlighted the need to expand their scope of analysis by 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), Nooteboom (2008), Estivalete, Pedrozo and Cruz (2008) and Balestrin and Verschoore (2008) amongst others point out the need to deepen studies on IOL. With this in mind, the need to put forward some knowledge in knowing (Gherardi & Souto, 2013). This theoretical essay is built on a continuum of organizational learning as identified by Crossan et al. (1995), and Crossan et al.(1999), even though this is not included in the corresponding frameworks presented by these authors. We propose the following studies on IOL: as proposed by Crossan et al.(1999) which briefly mentions the interorganizational level at the corresponding framework elaborated by Crossan et al. (1999) which briefly refers to the analysis of IOL, and which deals with the fifth level, namely cooperation. Figure 2 demonstrates its inclusion in the framework. Figure 2 IOL as a Dynamic Process through Co-operation. 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 the inclusion of a fourth level of learning – interorganizational learning (IOL). This level of learning deals with relationships established through cooperation between different actors through cooperation. Cooperation, the fifth process included in the framework, is related to relational strategies (assumed to be cooperative) established between the different actors in interorganizational relationships. Such being the case, 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 fifth process that is delineated in the 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 concept of knowledge. Also according to Gherardi (2000, 2008, 2009), Nicolini, Gherardi and Yanow (2003), Nicolini (2009) and Gherardi and Souto (2013), organizational learning takes place in practice through participation. This view of 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). "Practice-based approaches conceptualize connect not simply as a container with walls around 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 essential that any activity can constitute an opportunity for learning and that casual social situations are 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 should rather be centered on a process view along the lines of practical rationality. As MacDonald and Crossan (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 learning environment 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 precisely because learning is seen as a process that involves human interaction. Such interactions, particularly cooperative ones, foster IOL, which takes place through a range of existing interorganizational relationships. Interorganizational learning and cooperation The interorganizational cooperation strategy is linked with several important results. 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 cooperative arrangements offer improved access to new knowledge by facilitating OL, providing access to new technologies and innovation processes and improving technological capabilities. To sum up, the importance of interorganizational arrangements yield gains to the economic actors involved. The importance of interorganizational knowledge flows is clear, something which is facilitated in a system of interorganizational cooperation. Hardy et al. (2003) discuss the effects 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 organizational arrangements by means of interorganizational relations are also trying to facilitate the spread of knowledge (Child, 2003; Easterby-smith, Lyles, & Tsang, 2008; Holmqvist, 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 (1998), Cassiolato and Lastres (2003), Muthusamy and White (2005), Balestrin and Verschoore (2008), Zaheer, Gözübüyük and Milanov (2010), among other researchers on the topic of cooperation, also highlight the importance of cooperative strategies in order to improve organizations' performance. Jarillo (1993) and Ebers and Jarillo (1998) state that collective actions must be considered in strategic terms so that cooperative relationships can become the source of competitive forces. In the same line by Richardson (1972), 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 cooperative premise. 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 competition is accepted (Jarillo, 1993; Jorde & Teece, 1989; Nalebuff & Brandenburger, 1996) as it constitutes an important source of 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 spaces. Such 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 planned events) or informal (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 studies on IOL require equal focus on the 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 Conta and Willmot (2003) suggest. They also highlight the complementarity between formal and informal interactions. Even though formality and informality reinforce each other, these relationships cannot be said to be perfect complements, given that the positive effect of informalization tends to disappear as the degree of formality increases. Therefore, while an increase in 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, a result of a flow of everyday activities, which is recurrent in horizontal relationships established between different 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 and unstructured 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 when 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 that hamper interorganizational relationships is accepted. Some of these 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, with cooperation being the fifth dynamic process in the multi-level structure of the 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 structural (structured and unstructured social spaces), and relational (learning spaces based on interaction). Thus, stated that understanding the process of IOL is facilitated by its analysis in terms of the occurrence of everyday activities in both structured and unstructured social 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 essay contributed to the advancement of existing knowledge on OL in organizational studies, given 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 relations 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 is expected 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 interorganizational arrangements by means of interorganizational relations.

Amorim, W. A. C., & Fischer, A. L. (2009). Aprendizagem organizacional: uma análise sobre o debate e a escolha de categorias para estudo de caso. Perspectiva Contemporânea, 4(1), 101-125. Antonacopoulou, E., & Chiva, R. (2007). The social complexity of organizational learning: the dynamics of learning and organizing. Management Learning, 38(3), 277–295. doi: 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, A. 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 aprendizagem 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 & 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. (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). Organizing: how to study it and how to write about it. Qualitative Research in 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, C. Huxham, & P. S. Ring (Eds.), Inter-organizational relations (pp. 90-117). Oxford: Oxford University Press. Dierkes, M., Antal, A. B., Child, J., & Nonaka, I. (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 organização de aprendizagem (pp. 15-38). São Paulo: Atlas. Easterby-Smith, M., & Lyles, M. A. (2003). The blackwell 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, 19(6), 336-342. doi: 10.1108/13665620710777084» Estivalete, V. F. B., Pedrozo, E. A., & Cruz, L. B. (2008). The learning process in interorganizational relationships. Brazilian Administration Review, 5(4), 319-331. Retrieved from . doi: 10.1590/S1807-76922008000400006 » ◆ Fayard, P. (2008). Apresentação. In A. Balestrin & J. Verschoore (Eds.), Redes de cooperação 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 practicing. Management Learning, 40(2), 129-144. doi: 10.1177/1350507608101228» Gherardi, S. (2000). Practice-based theorizing on 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. (2009). Practice? It's a matter of taste! Management Learning, 40(5), 535-550. doi: 10.1177/1350507609340812» 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. Organization Studies, 24(1), 95-123. doi: 10.1177/0170840603024001684» Holmqvist, M. (2004). Experiential learning processes of exploitation and exploration within and between organizations: an empirical study of product development. Organization Science, 15(1), 70-81. doi: 10.1287/orsc.1030.0056» Holmqvist, M. (2009). Complicating the organization: a new prescription for the learning organization? Management Learning, 40(3), 275-287. doi: 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 Management 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 handbook of inter-organizational relations (pp. 289-312). Oxford: 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 from the process of learning between diverse organizations. Proceedings of Organisational Learning, Knowledge and Capabilities Conference 2010, Boston, Massachusetts, USA, 5. Marshall, N. (2008). Cognitive and practice-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: a practice-based approach (pp. 3-31). New York: Sharpe. Nooteboom, B. (2008). Learning and innovation in inter-organizational relationships. 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). Organizing alignment: a case of bridge-building. 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: 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 action. In D. Barry & H. Hansen (Eds.), The SAGE handbook of new approaches in management and organization (pp. 516–525). London: Sage Publications, for a broader view of practice-based studies, (both historical and current). Gherardi, S. (2009). Practice? It's a matter of taste! Management Learning, 40(5), 535-550. This issue is dedicated to articles that use practice-based theory. Publication in this collection