



Investigating the impact of knowledge management On Tehran and suburbs subway organizational innovation: conceptual framework

Seyed Sajjad Mousavi¹, Amirashkan Nasiripour², Soudabe Jalili³

¹Department of Management , Electronic Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

²Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

³WEST TEHRAN, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

Sajjademousavi@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Innovation is an inherent part of knowledge management. The relationship between knowledge management and organizational innovation is getting an important issue in this millennium. However, without good capability of organizational learning, an organization cannot retain important knowledge management practices. The literature highlighted few studies that examine comprehensively the relationship among knowledge management, organizational learning and organizational innovation. Therefore, the purpose of the study is to examine the effect of knowledge management on innovation directly and through organizational learning. Tehran and suburbs subway is studied. The research results indicate that OL has a full mediation effect on KM and OI. However, there are still some confusing relations between KM and organizational learning (OL). Therefore, the positioning of OL as a mediator is also an important contribution to this topic.

Original Article:

Received 18 June. 2015

Accepted 25 Aug. 2015

Published 30 Sep. 2015

Keywords:

knowledge management;
organizational innovation;
organizational learning

INTRODUCTION

In this fast changing business world, innovation has become the mainstay of every Organization. The nature of global economic growth has been changed by the speed of innovation, which has been made possible by rapidly evolving technology, shorter product lifecycles and a higher rate of new product development. Organizations have to ensure that their business strategies are innovative to build and sustain competitive advantage. Innovation has become complex due to changing customer needs, extensive competitive pressure and rapid technological change (Calantone et al., 2002). The complexity of innovation has also been increased by the growth in knowledge available to organizations as basis for innovation. Innovation is extremely dependent on the availability of knowledge and therefore the complexity created by the explosion of richness and reach of knowledge has to be identified and managed to ensure successful innovation (Adams and Lamont, 2003; Cardinal et al., 2001). Innovation plays a key role in providing unique products/services, creating new values that were not recognized, and establishing entry barriers (Hurmelinna-Laukkanen et al., 2008). We found that organizational learning is mixed with knowledge management (García-Morales et al., 2006), and the relationship between knowledge management and organizational learning is not evident.

The purpose of this research is to address the theoretical gaps in the literature. First, a few studies have addressed the

relationship between Knowledge Management (KM) and Organizational Innovation (OI) by considering different aspects of Tehran and suburbs subway organizational learning, such as commitment to learning, shared vision and open mindedness. Furthermore, in accordance with Liao and Wu(2010), who suggested there are too few comprehensive studies that examine simultaneously the relationship among, knowledge management (KM) and organizational learning (OL) on different of type of Organizational Innovation (OI), e.g. radical process and product innovation, incremental process and product innovation and administrative innovation through mediating effect of organizational learning. Based on the problem statement, the objective of the research is to examine the effect of knowledge management on organizational innovation directly and through mediating variable organizational learning. Consequently, the current study will first examine the relationship between knowledge management and organization innovation. Secondly, this study will determine the relationship amid knowledge management and organizational learning and finally, it purposes to determine the association between organizational learning and organization innovation. On the bases of introductions and aims, this paper includes background of study, knowledge based theory, purposed conceptual framework, hypotheses of the study, methodology and conclusion.

Background of Study

Since the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) first proposed the concept of a

knowledge-based economy in 1996, the competitions among enterprises have turned land, labor, and capital from the past over to knowledge today as an input resource. In the twenty-first century, with increasing specialization and individualization, the changes of industry and technology have become more

significant. Knowledge is no doubt the key resource in changeable processes. According to (Quinn *et al.*, 1998) the key ingredient for organizational success in the post-industrial era has gradually shifted from physical asset management to intellectual capital and knowledge asset. The objectives of business today have focused on seeking various channels/sources to obtain new knowledge to maintain sustained competitive advantages (SCAs). Acquiring knowledge successfully in management processes will affect organizational innovation.

Despite the increasing importance of knowledge as being a resource of strategic perspective, there is still lack of understanding on the appropriate method to implement KM (Garavelli *et al.*, 2004; Hwang, 2003). Despite this, a growing number of studies have noted that KM could play a major role in increasing innovation (Rhodes *et al.*, 2008), however, there are limited studies that theoretically and comprehensively investigate the relationship between KM and innovation comprehensively. Therefore, firms have focused on seeking various sources to obtain new knowledge to maintain sustained competitive advantages. Therefore, knowledge management has become an important issue in today's business management (Shenbagavalli, 2013). A review of related literature shows that knowledge and knowledge management are complex and multi-faceted concepts (Becerra-Fernandez and Leidner, 2008). Liao and Wu (2010) studied relationship among of knowledge management, organizational learning and innovation. The results indicated that organizational learning is the mediating variable between knowledge management and organizational innovation. In addition, they purported just like a system, knowledge management is an important input, and organizational learning is a key process, then organizational innovation is a critical output.

Al-Hakim and Hassan (2013) argued that knowledge management and organizational learning should "go hand in hand" in the organization to achieve superior performance. Past research showed the issues of knowledge management (KM) are complicated. Some researchers are related to the competitive advantages, and some of them are the e-business Lin and Lee (2005), or are related to organizational learning, and organizational innovation (Darroch, 2005; Davenport and Pruzak, 2000). While, organizational learning is mixed with KM (García-Morales *et al.*, 2006), and the relationship between knowledge management and organizational learning is not evident (Hu, 2010). Reviewing past literature, many scholars conducted the research to understand the relation among knowledge management, organizational learning, and organization innovation separately (Liao and Wu, 2010). The findings show that both variables organizational learning and innovation contribute positively to business performance, and that organizational learning affects innovation. As can be seen, the purpose of KM is to pursue innovation so that and organization maintains sustainable competitive advantages and to make and organization

change and innovate through organizational learning. The previous studies have described the relation of knowledge management, organizational learning and organizational innovation. In this study, the knowledge-based theory is a suitable theory to support conceptual framework.

Knowledge Based Theory

The objectives of knowledge based view (KBV) are to make the enterprise act as intelligently as possible to secure its capability and overall success and to otherwise realize the best value of its knowledge assets (Grant, 1996). Particularly, knowledge is the most strategically important resource of the firm. Its proponents maintain that knowledge based resources are usually difficult to imitate and socially complex, heterogeneous knowledge bases and capabilities among corporations are the main determinants of sustained competitive advantage and superior organizational performance. This knowledge is embedded and carried through multiple entities including organizational culture, policies, routines, documents, and employees (Candra, 2014). Relationship between (KBV) and organizational learning is important, because based on knowledge based-theory; knowledge resource constitutes a company's intangible assets. Organizations in the emerging knowledge economy will need to build strategic capability to create value based on the intangible assets of the firm. Organizational learning is a field of knowledge within organizational theory that studies models and theories about the way an organization learns and adapts (Vasenska, 2013). Therefore, organizational learning as an intangible asset and its effect on organizational innovation is perfectly consistent with the knowledge based theory and the results of the relationship between organizational learning and organizational innovation can be interpreted with the theory. Relationship between KBV and Organizational Innovation is vital for organization because the essence of knowledge management regarding innovation is that it delivers a framework for management in their endeavour to develop and improve their organizational capability to innovate. (Cohen and Levinthal, 1990) reflect this as absorptive capacity. It defines the ability of an organization to recognize the value of new information and knowledge, assimilate, and apply them, and this ability is critical in determining an innovative result. Interpretation of the results of the relationship between knowledge management and organizational innovation can be explained entirely by the knowledge-based theory. Because, according to this theory, if knowledge management as an intangible asset is implemented effectively in different levels of the organization leads to some unique capabilities and capacities which in turn lead to superior performance through innovation (Leal-Rodríguez *et al.*, 2013).

Proposed Conceptual Framework and Hypotheses

The purpose of the research is to examine the effect of knowledge management on organizational innovation directly and through mediating variable organizational learning. In this study, a research model was presented and empirically tested. The knowledge-based views of firm are exercised as the main theoretical framework to predict and to interpret the relationship between variables. Fig.1 illustrates a model that includes three constructs, namely,

knowledge management, organizational learning, and organizational innovation.

Knowledge Management

After the field of knowledge management was introduced in the early 1900s, grounding its theoretical background in business and management science, the definition of knowledge management has been debated by practitioners and scholars. Knowledge management is difficult to define and measure because it is complex, multidimensional, and process-oriented (Gorelick and Tantawy-Monsou, 2005; Kumar and Thondikulam, 2006). Training and employee development programs, organizational policies, routines, procedures, reports, and manuals have served to manage precious knowledge for a long time (Alavi and Leidner, 2001). But the language used to define knowledge management is still unclear and definitions of knowledge management focused on the capacity to identify, acquire, store, distribute, and use explicitly documented knowledge (Büchel and Probst, 2000). The later definitions of knowledge management indicate a movement toward focusing on managing tacit knowledge, emphasizing knowledge sharing, and creating interpersonal interaction (Choi and Lee, 2002; Hansen et al., 2000; Zack, 2002). Despite efforts to acquire knowledge from individuals, most knowledge remains in the human mind; even though it could be the most valuable and intangible asset held by the organization, it is difficult to share with others (Chou, 2005; Nonaka and Von Krogh, 2009). Examples of knowledge to be managed are best practices, training, customer relations management, business intelligence, document management, the use of taxonomies, data warehousing, and supply chain management (Boiney, 2011; Milam, 2005). It is important that the knowledge management system is available at the right time to the right persons who require the information, and be presented to them in a format that facilitates their use of the information (Rowland et al., 2004). In a simplistic sense, knowledge management has two functions: it is a source of knowledge and a facilitator for cultivating, development, and exploiting knowledge at both the development organizational levels (Apostolou and Mentzas, 1999; Milam, 2005).

According to Lawson (2003), strategies and process designated to identify, capture, structure, value, leverage, and share an organization's intellectual assets to enhance its performance and competitiveness.

Knowledge Management Process (KMP) is based on two critical activities; capturing and documentation of individual explicit and tacit knowledge, and its dissemination within the organization. According to Lawson,

researchers combine various processes to form the knowledge management cycle. It included knowledge creation process, knowledge capture process, knowledge organization process, knowledge storage process, knowledge dissemination process, and knowledge application process.

Organization Learning

Organizational learning is an area of knowledge within organizational theory that studies models and theories about the way an organization learns and adapts (Vasenska, 2013). Organizational learning has been regarded as one of the strategic tool of archiving long-term organizational success

(Argote, 2013; Easterby-Smith and Lyles, 2011; Liao and Wu, 2010). Organizational learning has been considered, from a strategic perspective, as a source of heterogeneity among organizations, as well as a basis for a possible competitive advantage (Vera and Crossan, 2004). It is critical in today's global competitive marketplace for an organization to maintain its position in a rapidly changing environment. According to Senge (1994), a learning organization is; where people continually expand their capacity to create the results they truly desire, where new and expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured, where collective aspiration is set free, and where people are continually learning how to learn together. Senge (1994) also wrote that the precondition for a learning organization is that they need to replace individual thinking with systemic thinking, since learning always affects the whole system.

Organizational learning is a process related to the development of new knowledge (Huber, 1991), therefore, affects organizational innovation, since knowledge creation enhances the introduction of new products and services (Smith et al., 2005). Organizational learning is a process in which members of an organization detect errors or anomalies and correct it by restructuring organizational theory of action, embedding the results of their inquiry in organizational maps and images (Argyris and Schön, 1978). Organization learning included openmindedness, shared vision, and commitment to learning. Due to the broad process of innovation, the learning has enabled the implementation of new idea, product and process, new management styles in communication and marketing, organizational structure and relations with clients (Camarero and Garrido, 2011). The impact of learning orientation is studied through three dimensions: commitment to learning, an open mindedness and a shared vision. Similarly, Phromket and Ussahawanitchakit (2009) has also found that organizational learning has positive effect on innovation outcome and export performance.

Organization Innovation

Innovation is the process to develop and improve products, processes and markets, with the aim to aggregate value. The definition is based on a distinction made by Schumpeter (1934) between an invention, an idea, and innovation as the generation of value out of an idea (Cooke, 2001; Marins, 2008). Innovation typically involves creativity, but is not identical to it: innovation involves acting on the creative ideas to make some specific and tangible difference in the domain in which the innovation occurs. Amabile et al (1996) define innovation as the successful implementation of creative ideas within an Tehran and suburbs subway organization. In this view, creativity by individuals and teams is a starting point for innovation; the first is necessary but not sufficient condition for the second. A further characterization of innovation is as an organizational or management process. Based on Davila et al. (2012), Innovation like many business functions is a management process that requires specific tools, rules, and discipline. Through these varieties of viewpoints, creativity is typically seen as the basis for innovation, and innovation as the successful implementation of creative ideas within an organization (Amabile et al., 1996). From this point of view, creativity may be displayed by individuals, but innovation occurs in the organizational context only.

The firm's learning capabilities play a crucial role in generating innovations (Sinkula et al., 1997). Innovation implies the generation, acceptance, and implementation of new ideas, processes, products, or services. Organizational innovation is defined as the application of ideas that are new to the firm, whether the newness is embodied in products, processes, and management or marketing systems (Weerawardena et al., 2006). It is obvious that an organizational learning is closely related to organizational innovation.

It is essential to understand the types of innovation and their features because a specific type of innovation requires

unique and sophisticated responses from an organization (Hurmelinna-Laukkanen et al., 2008). Although, previous innovation studies suggested several innovations typologies, the most prominent type of innovation comprises the following categories; technological versus administrative innovation, incremental versus radical innovation, and product versus process innovation (Cooper, 1998).



Figure 1.

According to the proposed conceptual framework, three proposed hypotheses will be employed in this part.

H1: There is a positive relationship between knowledge management and organizational innovation.

H2: There is a positive relationship between knowledge management and organizational Learning

H3: There is a positive relationship between organizational learning and organizational innovation

METHODOLOGY

The hypotheses of this paper have been developed with the help of supporting theory. In this study, choosing a survey with questionnaire will allow hypothesis testing and generalizing the results. The questionnaire has been developed on the basis of literature review and previous empirical evidences. Thus, a survey by questionnaire will be conducted to provide sufficient evidence for the basic relationship of the study and potential moderating factors. This study can be classified as a cross-sectional study, since it measures the relationship between knowledge management and organizational learning and Tehran and suburbs subway organizational innovation within a specific period of time.

CONCLUSION

This research examines the relationships between knowledge management, organizational learning and

organizational innovation. Our findings reveal that knowledge management exerts a complete mediating effect on organizational innovation through organization learning. On the other hand, organization members with great experience knowledge management will enhance the performance of the organization on commitment to learning, shared vision and open-mindedness. Based on this article, it is clear that knowledge management plays a significant role in innovation. It is important for both innovation and knowledge management professionals to understand the systemic relationship between these concepts and the value that it can generate in respect of creating and maintaining sustainable competitive advantage for Tehran and suburbs subway organizations.

REFERENCES

1. Azar and Momeni, A. and M., 1390, Statistics and its application in management, publishing side.
2. Brgvn, Brian, 2003, the principles of knowledge management (Translation M. Ansari), Institute affectionate book publishing.
3. Bayat, Reza, 1390, to examine and Tjzy^a and analyze the effects of organizational culture on creativity and innovation organizations in the province government, Tehran University Lambatbayy, the letters MA in Public Administration.
4. Turban, Ephraim, 2006, IT Manager (Translating Hamid Riahi), published by PNU.

5. Dusty, G., 1382, Research Methodology and approach to writing the letters, publications reflect. Danaeefard and Alvani and November, Hassan and Syed Mehdi and just, 1387, a little Pfv▲Sh methodology management: a comprehensive approach, publications Sfar- illumination.
6. S. Jalili, Sydsjad Mousavi, 1393, the feasibility study regarding the establishment of a knowledge management infrastructure co-operation in the Tehran Metro (Conference of Jihad), University of Imam Ali (AS).
7. Adams, R., Bessant, J. and Phelps, R., 2006, "Innovation management measurement: a review ", vol. 8 No. 10, p. 21-47.
8. Akhavan, Peyman and Jafari, Mostafa and Fathian, Mohammad, 2006, "Critical success factors of knowledge management systems: a multi-case analysis", Department of Industrial Engineering,, vol. 18 No. 2, p. 97-113.
9. Alavi, M. and D. Leidner, , January 1999, " Knowledge management Systems: Emerging Views and Practices from the field," Proceedings of 32 nd Annual HICSS, Maui, HIAlegre-Vidal, J., Lapiedra-Alcami, R. and Chiva-Gomez, R. (2004), "Linking operations strategy and product innovation: an empirical study of Spanish ceramic tile producers ", Research Policy, Vol. 33 No. 5, pp. 829-39.
10. Adams GL, Lamont BT. 2003. Knowledge management systems and developing sustainable competitive advantage. *Journal of knowledge management*.7(2): 142-154.
11. Al-Hakim LAY, Hassan S. 2013. Knowledge management strategies, innovation, and organisational performance: An empirical study of the Iraqi MTS. *Journal of Advances in Management Research*. 10(1): 58-71.
12. Alavi M, Leidner DE. 2001. Review: Knowledge management and knowledge management systems: Conceptual foundations and research issues. *MIS quarterly*:107-136.
13. Amabile TM, Conti R, Coon H, Lazenby J, Herron M. 1996. Assessing the work environment for creativity. *Academy of management journal*. 39(5): 1154-1184.
14. Apostolou D, Mentzas G. 1999. Managing corporate knowledge: A comparative analysis of experiences in consulting firms. part 2.Knowledge and Process management. 6(4): 238-254.
15. Argirys C, Schön DA. 1978. Organizational learning: A theory of action perspective. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
16. Argote L. 2013. Organizational learning: Creating, retaining and transferring knowledge: Springer.
17. Becerra-Fernandez, I. and Leidner, D. E. 2008. Knowledge management: An evolutionary view. 12.
18. Boiney LG.2011. New Roles For Information Technology: Managing Internal Knowledge & External Relationships. Review of Business Information Systems (RBIS). 4(3): 1-10.
19. Büchel B, Probst G. 2000. From organizational learning to knowledge management.
20. Calantone RJ, Cavusgil ST, Zhao Y. 2002. Learning orientation, firm innovation capability, and firm performance. *Industrial marketing management*. 31(6): 515-524.
21. Camarero C, Garrido MJ. 2011. Incentives, organisational identification, and relationship quality among members of fine arts museums. *Journal of Service Management*. 22(2): 266-287.
22. Candra S. 2014. Knowledge Management and Enterprise Resource Planning Implementation: A Conceptual Model. *Computer Science*. 10(3): 9.
23. Cardinal LB, Alessandri TM, Turner SF.2001. Knowledge codifiability, resources, and science-based innovation. *Journal of knowledge management*. 5(2): 195-204.
24. Choi B, Lee H. 2002. Knowledge management strategy and its link to knowledge creation process. *Expert Systems with Applications*.23(3): 173-187.
25. Chou SW. 2005. Knowledge creation: absorptive capacity, organizational mechanisms, and knowledge storage/retrieval capabilities. *Journal of Information Science*. 31(6): 453-465.
26. Cohen WM, Levinthal DA. 1990. Absorptive capacity: a new perspective on learning and innovation. *Administrative science quarterly*: 128-152.
27. Cooke P. 2001. Regional innovation systems, clusters, and the knowledge economy. *Industrial and corporate change*. 10(4): 945-974.
28. Cooper JR. 1998. A multidimensional approach to the adoption of innovation. *Management Decision*. 36(8): 493-502.
29. Darroch J. 2005. Knowledge management, innovation and firm performance. *Journal of knowledge management*. 9(3): 101-115.
30. Davenport TH, Pruzak L. 2000. Working knowledge: How organizations manage what they know: Harvard Business Press.
31. Davila T, Epstein M, Shelton R. 2012. Making innovation work: How to manage it, measure it, and profit from it: FT Press.
32. Easterby-Smith M, Lyles MA. 2011. Handbook of organizational learning and knowledge management: Wiley. com.
33. Garavelli C, Gorgoglione M, Scozzi B. 2004. Knowledge management strategy and organization: a perspective of analysis. *Knowledge and Process management*. 11(4): 273-282.
34. García-Morales VJ, Llorens-Montes FJ, Verdú-Jover AJ. 2006. Antecedents and consequences of organizational innovation and organizational learning in entrepreneurship. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*. 106(1): 21-42.
35. Gorelick C, Tantawy-Monsou B. 2005. For performance through learning, knowledge management is critical practice. *Learning Organization, The*. 12(2): 125-139.
36. Grant RM. 1996. Toward a knowledge-based theory of the firm. *Strategic management journal*. 17: 109-122.
37. Hansen M, Nohria N, Tierney T. 2000. What's your strategy for managing knowledge. *The knowledge management yearbook*. 55-69.

38. Hu Y. 2010. The Impact of Market Orientation on Knowledge Management: An Empirical Investigation in China. *Proceedings of the 2010*
39. Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, 2010. WKDD'10. Third International Conference on: 432-435.
40. Huber GP. 1991. Organizational learning: The contributing processes and the literatures. *Organization science*. 2(1): 88-115.
41. Hurmelinna-Laukkanen P, Sainio LM, Jauhiainen T. 2008. Appropriability regime for radical and incremental innovations. *R&d Management*. 38(3): 278-289.
42. Hwang AS. 2003. Training strategies in the management of knowledge. *Journal of knowledge management*7(3): 92-104.
43. Kumar S, Thondikulam G. 2006. Knowledge management in a collaborative business framework. *Information, Knowledge, Systems Management*. 5(3): 171-187.
44. Lawson S. 2003. Examining the relationship between organizational culture and knowledge management. Nova Southeastern University.
45. Leal-Rodríguez A, Leal-Millán A, Roldán-Salgueiro JL, Ortega-Gutiérrez J. 2013. Knowledge Management and the Effectiveness of
46. Innovation Outcomes: The Role of Cultural Barriers. *Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management*. 11(1).
47. Liao SH, Wu CC. 2010. System perspective of knowledge management, organizational learning, and organizational innovation. *Expert Systems with Applications*. 37(2): 1096-1103.
48. Lin HF, Lee GG. 2005. Impact of organizational learning and knowledge management factors on e-business adoption. *Management Decision*. 43(2): 171-188.
49. Marins LM. 2008. The challenge of measuring innovation in emerging economies' firms: A proposal of a new set of indicators on innovation: United Nations University, Maastricht Economic and social Research and training centre on Innovation and Technology.
50. Milam J. 2005. Organizational learning through knowledge workers and infomediaries. *New Directions for Higher Education*. 2005(131). 61- 73.
51. Nonaka I, Von Krogh G. 2009. Perspective—Tacit knowledge and knowledge conversion: Controversy and advancement in organizational knowledge creation theory. *Organization science*. 20(3): 635-652.
52. Phromket C, Ussahawanitchakit P. 2009. Effects of Organizational Learning Effectiveness on Innovation Outcomes And Export Performance of Garments Business in Thailand. *International Journal of Business Research*. 9(7).
53. Quinn JB, Anderson P, Finkelstein S. 1998. Managing professional intellect: making the most of the best. *Harvard Business Review*, March-April G. 199.
54. Rhodes J, Hung R, Lok P, Lien BYH, Wu CM. 2008. Factors influencing organizational knowledge transfer: implication for corporate performance. *Journal of knowledge management* 12(3): 84-100.
55. Rowland A, Burns M, Hartkens T, Hajnal J, Rueckert D, Hill D. 2004. Information extraction from images (IXI): Image processing workflows using a grid enabled image database. *Proceedings of DiDaMIC*. 4: 55-64.
56. Schumpeter JA. 1934. The theory of economic development: An inquiry into profits, capital, credit, interest, and the business cycle (Vol.55): Transaction Publishers.
57. Senge PM. 1994. The fifth discipline fieldbook: Random House Digital, Inc.
58. Shenbagavalli R. 2013. International Journal of Management (IJM). *Journal Impact Factor*. 4(3): 01-07.
59. Sinkula JM, Baker WE, Noordewier T. 1997. A framework for market-based organizational learning: linking values, knowledge, and behavior. *Journal of the academy of Marketing Science*. 25(4): 305-318.
60. Smith KG, Collins CJ, Clark KD. 2005. Existing knowledge, knowledge creation capability, and the rate of new product introduction in hightechnology firms. *Academy of management journal*. 48(2): 346-357.
61. Vasenska I. 2013. Organizational Learning and Employee Empowering Increasing Tourist Destination Performance. *Proceedings of the 2013 Active Citizenship by Knowledge Management & Innovation: Proceedings of the Management, Knowledge and Learning International Conference 2013*: 615-624.
62. Vera D, Crossan M. 2004. Strategic leadership and organizational learning. *Academy of management review*. 29(2): 222-240.
63. Weerawardena J, O'Cass A, Julian C. 2006. Does industry matter? Examining the role of industry structure and organizational learning in innovation and brand performance. *Journal of business research*. 59(1): 37-45.
64. Zack MH. 2002. Developing a knowledge strategy. The strategic management of intellectual capital and organizational knowledge: 255-276.