World Economics & Finance Bulletin (WEFB)
Available Online at: https://www.scholarexpress.net
Vol. 58, May, 2026
ISSN: 2749-3628,

THE IMPACT OF ORGANIZATIONAL LEARNING MECHANISMS ON THE QUALITY OF ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE

Omar Ahmed Jasim
omar.ghazal@uosamarra.edu.iq
University of Samarra
Qutaiba Theyab Ahmed
qutaiba.d.ahmed@uosamarra.edu.iq
University of Samarra
Husam Raad Jasim
hussam.r.jassim@uosamarra.edu.iq
University of Samarra

Article history:

Received: 10th March 2026
Accepted: 8th April 2026

Abstract:

The study of organizational learning has been growing in recent years because it is seen as enabling organizations to improve performance in rapidly changing environments. This study aimed to determine the impact of organizational learning mechanisms on organizational performance quality. The study investigates four organizational learning mechanisms, including individual learning, group learning, knowledge management with continuous learning culture and their effect on organizational performance, which is multidimensional. In order to conduct this study, a descriptive analytical design was employed in which a structured questionnaire was developed based on approved scales used widely in the literature of organizational learning and performance and was applied to respondents who were managers, supervisors and managerial leaders working in different management levels of selected organizations. 385 questionnaires were distributed, out of which 358 were returned. After verifying the completeness and consistency of the answers, 342 questionnaires were used for statistical analysis, yielding a response validity rate of 97.7%. The questionnaire measures organizational performance quality through four basic dimensions: operational efficiency, organizational effectiveness, innovation capability and stakeholder satisfaction. The results of the study using multiple linear regression showed that the organizational learning mechanism has a strong, significant impact on institutional performance quality ($R2 = .731$, $F = 102.47$, $p < 0.001$). The study is useful as it provides statistical evidence of the integrated impact of organizational learning mechanisms. This study will help managers in enhancing organizational performance by implementing organizational learning.

Keywords: *organizational learning, learning mechanisms, quality of institutional performance, learning organization.*

FIRST: INTRODUCTION OF THE RESEARCH

Globalization and technological advancement are the main drivers of change in today's business world, which has become highly competitive and economically complex. Enterprises must continually develop adaptive capabilities to survive and excel. One of the concepts that have been at the core of management and organizational research is organizational learning, defined as the organization's capacity to acquire, understand and create knowledge that enables it to improve. In short, organizational learning means improved routines, thought processes and behavior based on acquired knowledge that allow the company to achieve better results (Argyris & Schön, 1996; Levitt & March, 1988). Research has shown that organizational learning facilitates innovation, efficiency and adaptation to change (Calantone, Cavusgil, & Zhao, 2002; Jiménez-Jiménez & Sanz-Valle, 2011). The concept of organizational learning has roots in earlier theoretical work that recognized learning from error as a way for organizations to improve their work. In their pioneering work, Argyris and Schön differentiated between single-loop learning and two-loop learning. They emphasized that organizations can learn to correct errors by either modifying procedures or questioning and altering the organization's basic underlying assumptions and policies (Argyris & Schön, 1996). Later research further developed this theory and defined learning as occurring at three levels: individual, group and organizational (Crossan, Lane, & White, 1999). Broadening this definition still further, learning mechanisms can be described as the means through which

World Economics & Finance Bulletin (WEFB)
Available Online at: https://www.scholarexpress.net
Vol. 58, May, 2026
ISSN: 2749-3628,

organizations acquire, share, interpret and embed knowledge. Individual learning, group learning, knowledge management and a culture that supports learning from near misses and best practices (Popper & Lipshitz, 1998; Schechter, 2008) are among such mechanisms. The presence of learning mechanisms has been positively linked to Organizational Innovation, decision-making, and ultimately organizational performance (Alavi & Leidner, 2001; López, Peón, & Ordás, 2005). While studies have suggested a positive relationship between organizational learning and organizational performance, empirical research examining the relationship between individual learning mechanisms and organizational performance has been scarce. This is especially true in emerging and growing organizations.

Additionally, past research has treated organizational learning as a single, global construct, without examining how learning occurs within organizations (García-Morales, Lloréns-Montes, & Verdú-Jover, 2007; Santos-Vijande, López-Sánchez, & Trespalacios, 2012). Our study seeks to fill this gap by empirically evaluating the role of organizational learning mechanisms in shaping organizational performance quality. Using data collected from professionals in organizations, we develop a model of organizational learning that includes four mechanisms: Individual Learning, Group Learning, Knowledge Management and continuous learning culture and study how they affect the quality of organizational performance.

THE RESEARCH PROBLEMS

In recent years, the learning process has attracted significant attention from researchers because of organizations' growing interest in knowledge-based capabilities, yet the extent to which learning affects organizational performance remains unclear. Even though the theoretical underpinnings justify the learning mechanism as essential to achieving strategic goals, many organizations fail to quantify the impact of learning activities on organizational performance. Organizations need to understand which learning mechanisms help achieve better institutional performance. Therefore, the Central Research problem of this study is:

How effective are the mechanisms of organizational learning-Individual Learning, Group Learning, Knowledge Management, a culture of continuous learning, and the quality of organizational performance in the studied institutions? And from this main question, several sub-questions emerge .

- Does individual learning significantly affect the quality of organizational performance?
- To what extent does group learning contribute to improving key performance indicators within organizations
- How knowledge management facilitates the integration and use of organizational knowledge to enhance performance results
- How does a culture supportive of continuous learning interact with other organizational variables in predicting the quality of organizational performance?

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Since the purpose of this study is to investigate the influence of organizational learning on organizational performance quality, it will aim to meet its objectives by explaining how different organizational learning mechanisms can help organizations enhance performance. It includes:

1. To investigate how individual learning, which is considered the fundamental mechanism of organizational learning, affects organizational performance quality. The individual learning process is where creation of organizational knowledge begins with the belief that employees 'knowledge, experience, and skills in resolving issues serve as the source of organizational learning' (Crossan, Lane, & White, 1999).
2. Find out how group learning can help improve organizational performance. Group learning supports knowledge sharing, team problem-solving, and integration, which may lead to improvements in organizational performance and innovation (Edmondson, 1999).
3. Ascertain how knowledge management helps in improving organizational performance quality. The creation and implementation of knowledge management systems in organizations help capture, store, distribute and utilize organizational knowledge, thereby improving decision-making processes and operational procedures (Alavi & Leidner, 2001).
4. Investigate how a continuous-learning culture drives high levels of Organizational Excellence. An organization with a learning culture focuses on experimentation, the acceptance of new ideas, and continuous improvement, all of which are essential in today's rapidly changing world (Marsick & Watkins, 2003).
5. Develop a comprehensive model that shows the link between organizational learning mechanisms, including individual learning, group learning, knowledge management, a continuous learning culture and organizational performance quality. The model will provide a statistical analysis that supports the claim that organizational learning mechanisms contribute to organizational performance outcomes.

World Economics & Finance Bulletin (WEFB)
Available Online at: https://www.scholarexpress.net
Vol. 58, May, 2026
ISSN: 2749-3628,

Hypotheses Based on Theoretical Foundations

Organizational learning and previous empirical studies that examined the relationship between learning processes and organizational performance, the following hypotheses were formulated to guide empirical research:

- Hypothesis 1 (H1): There is a statistically significant positive effect ($\alpha \geq 0.05$) of individual learning on the quality of organizational performance.
- Hypothesis 2 (H2): There is a statistically significant positive effect ($\alpha \geq 0.05$) of group learning on the quality of organizational performance.
- The third hypothesis (H3): there is a statistically significant positive effect of knowledge management on organizational performance quality ($\alpha > 0.05$).
- The fourth hypothesis (H4): there is a statistically significant positive effect ($\alpha \geq 0.05$) of the culture of continuous learning on organizational performance quality.

Theoretical Framework

Organizational learning is one of the most celebrated concepts in modern organizational and management studies. More specifically, it has been described as "processes through which organizations develop, retrieve, modify and interpret knowledge so that they can work more effectively and adapt to environmental changes" (Argote & Miron-Spektor, 2011, p. 349). Although there is no agreed-upon definition of organizational learning yet, most scholars accept that it entails three fundamental processes: "involve acquiring knowledge, disseminating it throughout the organization, and employing it" (Levitt & March, 1988, p. 319). Organizational learning stems from Argyris and Schön's seminal work on single-loop vs. two-loop learning. The former implies "detecting and correcting errors as organizations go about their business without altering the governing values that lead to the error."

Meanwhile, double-loop learning is defined as a process of "reviewing and re-evaluating the governing assumptions behind decision-making." (Argyris & Schön, 1996, p. 5). These ideas have significantly influenced subsequent organizational learning studies and theories related to organizational adaptation and Knowledge Development. Building on Argyris and Schön's theory of organizational learning, many authors have sought to expand on this concept, highlighting its multi-level nature and its connection to organizational systems. Crossan, Lane, and White (1999) offer a "dynamic" model of how learning occurs at the individual, group, and organizational levels through intuition, interpretation, integration, and institutionalization. Research on knowledge management also established that knowledge development requires organizational mechanisms that support knowledge creation and transfer, such as socialization and routines (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995). Overall, organizational learning theory evolved to focus less on learning as an individual mental process and more on learning as an organization's capacity.

Organizational Learning Mechanisms

Organizational learning mechanisms are the systems and procedures through which an organization creates, acquires and utilizes knowledge systematically. Mechanisms of organizational learning include routines, processes and practices through which organizations sense, interpret, store and use information about their knowledge and understandings and respond to their environment. Organizations use learning mechanisms to gather information, make sense of their experiences, store organizational knowledge and learn how to improve how they do things. Organizational learning mechanisms are how learning is manifested in an organization's systems and procedures (Lipschitz, Popper, and Oz, 2002). Research has shown that an organization's ability to establish learning mechanisms contributes to innovation, adaptability and improved performance (Crossan, Lane, & White, 1999; Argote & Miron-Spektor, 2011). Drawing from the organizational learning literature, this paper focuses on four primary mechanisms thought to be the key drivers of organizational learning:
(Individual learning, group learning, knowledge management, continuous learning culture).

A. Individual Learning

Individual learning is the most fundamental component of learning within an organization because knowledge ultimately resides in individuals' minds. It is the knowledge gained by employees through learning new concepts, skills, and meaning from experiences in new ways. Organizational learning at this level aims to improve employees' job performance and help the organization achieve its objectives. Kolb describes learning as 'the process whereby knowledge is created through the transformation of experience' (Kolb, 1984). He believed that knowledge is generated through a cycle of learning, starting with concrete experience, then reflecting on observations, abstracting and conceptualizing, and actively experimenting. In organizations, individual learning enables people to learn from their experiences and apply those lessons to their work. According to Social Cognitive Theory, observational learning, self-regulation, and cognitive thought also encourage individual learning (Bandura, 1986). Individual learning in organizations can occur through training, coaching, and development programs that encourage employees to learn from

World Economics & Finance Bulletin (WEFB)
Available Online at: https://www.scholarexpress.net
Vol. 58, May, 2026
ISSN: 2749-3628,

their own experiences and enhance their skills (Örtenblad, 2018). Individual learning enables organizations to improve by enhancing employees' learning.

B. Group learning

Although learning begins at the individual level, group learning is necessary to develop shared understanding throughout an organization. Group learning occurs when two or more individuals share and combine their knowledge to solve organizational issues. When individuals collaborate, they can create knowledge that no single individual could create alone. One well-known theory about group learning is Edmondson's psychological safety theory. Psychological safety is defined as "a shared belief that the team is safe for interpersonal risk taking" (Edmondson, 1999). Studies found that teams with high psychological safety were more comfortable discussing problems and sharing knowledge. They were also more likely to experiment, which enhanced learning behaviors and increased performance. Group learning can be seen in numerous settings, such as team projects, brainstorming, cross-functional groups, and communities of practice. The knowledge shared between individuals enables organizational knowledge transfer and the development of shared mental models.

C. Knowledge Management

Knowledge Management KM: refers to the process of creating, storing, sharing and utilizing knowledge. KM has become recognized as part of the larger body of organizational learning. Davenport and Prusak (1998) defined KM as "the application of processes that enhance the creation, capturing, sharing and use of organizational knowledge". Knowledge management helps organizations retain knowledge that can be lost when employees leave and enables faster retrieval of information needed to make informed decisions. Organizations can also use technology such as platforms, databases and sharing mechanisms to store explicit and tacit knowledge. Research has shown that KM positively impacts organizational performance. Alavi and Leidner (2001) found that KM systems contributed to organizational learning by facilitating the creation, sharing, and utilization of knowledge. Zack, McCain and Singh (2009) found that KM also contributes to organizational performance.

D. Culture of Continuous Learning

Learning culture is the larger environment in which learning mechanisms function. Culture is defined as shared norms, values, standards, and beliefs that promote learning among individuals and teams. Cultures that foster learning enable employees to continuously gain knowledge, try new ideas, learn from mistakes and more. In other words, employees are learning regularly. Watkins and Marcek (1993) identified learning cultures as those that promote dialogue, debate, and inquiry among employees, helping establish organizations as learning organizations. Dialogue means asking questions about how things are done and looking for alternatives. Debate is about challenging the status quo. Inquiry allows employees to share ideas that can benefit the organization. Other research has shown that a learning culture strengthens the relationship between learning mechanisms at the individual and team level and organizational performance. Learning culture was found to mediate the relationships among individual learning, team learning, and organizational learning, and sustained organizational performance (Yang, Watkins, and Marcek, 2004). Learning culture is a necessity for developing into a learning organization.

Quality of Organizational Performance

Organizational performance quality can be defined as the degree to which an organization achieves its strategic goals with optimal productivity and operational effectiveness, given available resources and current stakeholder expectations. Most scholars agree that organizational performance cannot be adequately represented by financial outcomes alone. Still, they should be "assessed from several perspectives to obtain a more comprehensive view of organizational performance" (Kaplan and Norton, 1996). To this end, many models of organizational performance have been developed to account for changes in organizational priorities over time. Traditionally, measures of organizational performance have focused on financial results, operational efficiency, and organizational effectiveness.

More recently, the ability to learn and innovate, and stakeholder satisfaction, have also been considered core markers of performance. Operational efficiency is the ability of an organization to maximize the utility of its human, financial, and technological resources, thereby increasing productivity while minimizing waste. Efficiently operating organizations should be better positioned to gain a competitive advantage over rivals through bottom-line productivity (Neely, Adams, & Kennerley, 2002). Organizational effectiveness measures how well an organization meets its strategic goals and accomplishes its organizational mission, given the expectations of its operating environment. Organizational effectiveness emphasizes the measurable outputs of organizational activities and an organization's ability to remain agile in the face of environmental pressures (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983).

World Economics & Finance Bulletin (WEFB)
Available Online at: https://www.scholarexpress.net
Vol. 58, May, 2026
ISSN: 2749-3628,

Innovation refers to an organization's ability to learn and adapt to changes in its environment by developing new knowledge that leads to new organizational processes, services, or product offerings. Researchers have shown that there is a positive relationship between an organization's ability to learn and their overall innovation levels (Jiménez-Jiménez & Sanz-Valle, 2011). Lastly, stakeholder satisfaction is increasingly seen as a necessary perspective for measuring an organization's performance. Stakeholders can be anyone with an interest in the organization's capacity to operate, including customers, employees, investors, and the society in which the organization operates. Stakeholders continuously interact with the organization and thereby dictate how well it will operate in the long run (Freeman, 1984).

The Relationship between Organizational Learning and Performance Quality

Multiple experimental studies have examined the relationship between learning organizations and performance, confirming a strong link between the two. As a result, learning organizations are more likely to develop sustained, successful business operations, which translate into better performance. Among the key benefits of learning organizations are the ability to develop knowledge, create effective decision-making systems and structures, and build innovation capabilities. Jiménez-Jiménez and Sanz-Valle (2011) conducted an experimental study with a sample of 451 Spanish organizations. They found that organizational learning contributes to innovation, which, in turn, positively affects organizational performance. They argue that organizations that support learning can build adaptive capabilities. Hsu and Shen (2005) demonstrated that knowledge management practices contribute to operational performance, in terms of efficiency and product quality, in Taiwanese IT companies. They conclude that Knowledge Management is instrumental in turning organizational knowledge into organizational performance.

Regional studies conducted in Arab countries, such as Al-Ajmi (2019) and Harasha (2020), have shown that learning positively impacts the performance of government institutions in Kuwait and Jordan, respectively. Ahmadi (2021) demonstrated that a learning culture is a major determinant of performance quality in dynamic organizations. Recent studies outside the region also support these findings. Gao et al. (2021) found that group learning had a positive impact on innovation performance by facilitating knowledge in Chinese manufacturing firms. Pontes, L. D. O., & Oliveira (2018) found that organizational learning contributes to performance by converting human capital to structural capital. These findings clearly support the argument that organizational learning leads to better organizational performance. Learning organizations support the creation, sharing and implementation of knowledge, which allows them to adapt to environmental changes.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

To fulfill the purposes of this research, a descriptive-analytical approach was applied. One of the most commonly applied types of organizational and managerial studies is descriptive-analytical research, in which relationships among variables are analyzed and the characteristics of the phenomenon under study are described through experiments and statistical procedures. A descriptive aspect of the research methodology was used to provide a detailed explanation of basic terms related to factors affecting organizational learning mechanisms and the quality of organizational performance. The analytical aspect of this study examined relationships among the variables and tested the extent to which organizational learning mechanisms explain variance in organizational performance. To conduct this study, two data sets were used. The first set includes secondary data: theoretical background literature, a review of related academic publications, and previously conducted empirical studies pertinent to the field of organizational learning and performance management. Both have been used to extract major concepts that informed the theory-hypothesis of this study. The second set includes initial data gathered during the implementation of the measurement tool (questionnaire). The questionnaire consisted of measurement scales used in the literature and was distributed to managers/managing leaders employed in private and public organizations. Once the data were gathered, statistical procedures were used to test the study hypotheses and the research model.

Sampling

The sample of managers interviewed represented managers, supervisors and managerial leaders at three levels: top management, middle management and executive management. The managers worked in organizations in both the public and private sectors. Stratified random sampling was used to achieve representation of managers at different levels and across different social sectors. Stratified random sampling allows the researcher to include a variety of managerial standpoints while simultaneously limiting sampling error in research related to Organization Studies. Calculation of sample size was made through the use of Cochrane's (1977) sample size equation. This equation is widely used in the social sciences to determine sample size when researching large populations. 385 questionnaires were sent out to the sample population. 358 questionnaires were returned (approximately 93% return rate). After eliminating 16 incomplete questionnaires, 342 were used for statistical analysis (response rate of 97.7%, an acceptable rate for experimental organization research).

World Economics & Finance Bulletin (WEFB)
Available Online at: https://www.scholarexpress.net
Vol. 58, May, 2026
ISSN: 2749-3628,

Questionnaire

The instrument data were collected through a structured questionnaire designed based on the specific measurement instruments used in prior experimental studies. The research tool included two sections. In the section, "demographic information was collected (gender, level of education, years of work experience, managerial position, organizational sector). The second section included statements related to measuring the study's variables. More precisely, it includes information on the measurement of independent variables (organizational learning mechanisms) and the dependent variable (organizational performance quality). All subscales were measured on a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Measurement items were adopted after several instruments were validated in past research. Measurement items for individual learning were adopted from Kolb (1984) and Örtenblad (2018). Group learning measurement items were slightly modified after Edmondson (1999). Knowledge management measurement items were based on Alavi and Leidner (2001) and Zak, Makin and Singh (2009). The statements measuring learning culture were borrowed from Watkins, Marcek (2003) and Yang, Watkins and Marcek (2004). Lastly, the indicators of quality organizational performance were adapted from Kaplan and Norton's (1996) and Neely, Adams and Kennerley's (2002) frameworks.

Table (1): paragraphs of the research questionnaire with paragraph code and source

The symbol	Dimension and paragraph	The scale	Source
1 TF	You are keen to develop your job skills through training and self-learning continuously.	Likert 1-5	Kolb (1984)
2 TF	Take advantage of your mistakes and past experiences to improve your job performance.	Likert 1-5	Kolb (1984)
3 TF	Apply the knowledge gained from the training programs in your business tasks.	Likert 1-5	Örtenblad (2018)
4 TF	She participates in the organization's professional development programs.	Likert 1-5	Örtenblad (2018)
1 TJ	Your team regularly and effectively exchanges experiences and knowledge.	Likert 1-5	Edmondson (1999)
2 TJ	Team members feel safe to express their thoughts and observations freely.	Likert 1-5	Edmondson (1999)
3 TJ	Your working group holds regular sessions to draw lessons learned.	Likert 1-5	Edmondson (1999)
4 TJ	Team members collaborate in solving problems in a participatory group style.	Likert 1-5	Edmondson (1999)
1 IK	The organization has an effective system for documenting, preserving and systematizing knowledge.	Likert 1-5	Alavi & Leidner (2001)

Stability

Questionnaire content validity was assessed by a committee of seven academicians specializing in business administration & management sciences. Minor changes were made to the questionnaire's wording and terms based on their recommendations to achieve conceptual and content homogeneity before administering the finalized instrument. Stability of the tool was assessed using Cronbach's Alpha coefficients, which reflect the internal consistency of each paragraph of the scale. Alpha values were greater than 0.70, indicating adequate internal consistency (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). Convergent validity was assessed using the extracted average variance extracted (AVE), which exceeded 0.50, indicating adequate convergence among the measurement items. The Composite Reliability (CR) value is also greater than the minimum required level.

Table (2): Truthfulness and constancy indicators for resolution dimensions

Dimension	Number of paragraphs	Alpha Cronbach (α)	AVE	Vehicle reliability (CR)

World Economics & Finance Bulletin (WEFB)
Available Online at: https://www.scholarexpress.net
Vol. 58, May, 2026
ISSN: 2749-3628,

Individual learning	4	0.851	0.591	0.876
Group learning	4	0.889	0.634	0.901
Knowledge management	4	0.836	0.573	0.857
A culture of continuous learning	4	0.872	0.614	0.888
Quality of corporate performance	4	0.863	0.607	0.880

Data Analysis

The data on statistical techniques were analyzed using SPSS Statistics (version 27). Several statistical methods were used to examine the research hypotheses and analyze the study variables, as described below.
Descriptive statistics - including frequency, Percentages, Averages and standard deviations - were used to describe and summarize the characteristics of the sample, the respondents' perceptions of the study variables.

A Pearson correlation analysis was performed to examine the strength and direction of the relationships between organizational learning mechanisms and organizational performance quality.

Multiple linear regression analysis was used to test research hypotheses and to determine the relative contribution of each independent variable to the prediction of organizational performance quality. To confirm the regression model's validity, multiple linear diagnostics were performed using the contrast amplification factor (VIF). All FF values were below 2.0, indicating that multilinearity was not a concern in regression analysis.

RESULTS

The demographic distribution of respondents indicates a relatively balanced representation of administrative files. Males constituted 58.8% of the sample, while the most representative age group was 30-44 years old, with 47.4% of the sample. This age distribution indicates a significant level of professional maturity among the participants. Regarding educational background, 89.7% of respondents hold a bachelor's degree or higher, which enhances the reliability of the responses and indicates a well-educated managerial sample. In addition, more than half of the participants reported more than ten years of professional experience, reflecting significant managerial experience relevant to the assessment of organizational learning practices.

Table (3): demographic distribution of the study sample (n = 342)

The variable	Category	Redundancy	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	201	58.8%
	Female	141	41.2%
Age group:	Less than 30 years old	71	20.8%
	30 - 44 years old	162	47.4%
	45 - 54 years old	81	23.7%
	55 years and over	28	8.2%
Academic qualification	Intermediate diploma	35	10.2%
	Bachelor	183	53.5%
	Masters	94	27.5%
	Ph. D. in	30	8.8%
Years of experience	Less than 5 years	54	15.8%
	5 - 10 years	88	25.7%
	11 - 20 years old	134	39.2%
	More than 20 years	66	19.3%
Sector	Government	178	52.0%
	Special	121	35.4%
The variable	Mixed	43	12.6%

Study Variables

World Economics & Finance Bulletin (WEFB)
Available Online at: https://www.scholarexpress.net
Vol. 58, May, 2026
ISSN: 2749-3628,

The descriptive statistics show moderately positive attitudes towards establishing organizational learning practices in the analyzed organizations. The highest mean value was achieved for learning after group learning (M = 3.94), followed by learning after individual learning (M = 3.82). The lowest mean value was received for learning after Knowledge Management (M = 3.56). This may suggest limitations in the use of formalized knowledge management processes in the analyzed organizations. The average value for all variables was higher than 3.50, indicating positive attitudes towards organizational learning.

Table (4): descriptive statistics of the study axes (n = 342)

Dimension	N	Lowest value	Highest value	Arithmetic mean	Standard deviation	Torsion
Individual learning (TF)	342	1.50	5.00	3.82	0.69	-0.341
Group learning (TJ)	342	1.25	5.00	3.94	0.72	-0.427
Knowledge management (IK)	342	1.00	5.00	3.56	0.81	-0.218
Culture of continuous learning (TM)	342	1.50	5.00	3.78	0.74	-0.389
Quality of corporate performance (JP)			5.00	3.88	0.66	-0.362

Correlation Analysis

Pearson correlation analysis revealed statistically significant positive relationships between all dimensions of organizational learning and organizational performance quality. Group learning showed the strongest correlation with the quality of performance (r = 0.681, p <0.01), while Knowledge Management "showed the lowest correlation (r = 0.513, p <0.01). These results provide preliminary experimental support for the proposed research hypotheses.

Table (5): correlation matrix between study variables (n = 342)

The variable	TF	TJ	IK	TM	JP
Individual learning (TF)	1.000	—	—	—	—
Group learning (TJ)	0.491**	1.000	—	—	—
Knowledge management (IK)	0.418**	0.447**	1.000	—	—
Learning culture (TM)	0.512**	0.558**	0.439**	1.000	—
Quality of performance (JP)	0.571**	0.681**	0.513**	0.637**	1.000

**Correlation D is statistically significant at the level of significance (0.01) according to a two-party test.

Regression Analysis

Multiple regression analysis was performed to examine the predictive contribution of the four organizational learning mechanisms to organizational performance quality. Before performing a regression analysis, the main assumptions were checked. The residuals showed a normal distribution, and the Durbin-Watson statistic (1.94)

World Economics & Finance Bulletin (WEFB)
Available Online at: https://www.scholarexpress.net
Vol. 58, May, 2026
ISSN: 2749-3628,

confirmed independence. In addition, the VIF values indicated that there was no multicollinearity among the explanatory variables.

Table (6): summary of the multiple regression model

The model	R	R^2	R2 rectifier	Standard error	Calculated F	Denotation (p)
1	0.855	0.731	0.727	0.344	102.47	< 0.001

Table (7): regression coefficients and statistical significance

The independent variable	(B) non-standard	Standard error	(β) standard	The value of t	Denotation (p)	VIF
Constant (Constant)	0.389	0.142	—	2.739	0.007	—
Individual learning (TF)	0.218	0.049	0.241	4.449	< 0.001	1.803
Group learning (TJ)	0.333	0.047	0.362	7.085	< 0.001	1.947
Knowledge management (IK)	0.141	0.043	0.173	3.279	0.001	1.712
Culture of continuous learning (TM)	0.176	0.048	0.198	3.667	< 0.001	1.881

It is clear from the results that the regression model is statistically significant ($F(4,337) = 102.47$, $p < 0.001$), the results also indicated that the four learning mechanisms jointly explained 73.1% of the variation in the quality of organizational performance ($R2 = 0.731$), which represents a relatively high explanatory power in behavioral research, among the predictors, group learning emerged as the strongest indicator ($\beta = 0.362$, $p < 0.001$), followed by individual learning ($\beta = 0.241$, $p < 0.001$), continuous learning culture ($\beta = 0.198$, $p < 0.001$), and finally knowledge management ($\beta = 0.173$, $p < 0.001$). These results support all four research hypotheses.

Table (8): summary of hypothesis testing results

Premise	The independent variable	β	p-value	Resolution
H1	Individual learning → quality of performance	0.241	< 0.001	Acceptable
H2	Group learning → quality of performance	0.362	< 0.001	Acceptable
H3	Knowledge management → quality of performance	0.173	0.001	Acceptable
H4	Continuous learning culture → quality of performance	0.198	< 0.001	Acceptable

DISCUSSION

The findings offer robust support to the notion that organizational learning processes positively contribute to organizational performance excellence. The overall explanatory power of the suggested model indicates that learning-centered processes matter in explaining the performance outcomes of today's organizations. The importance of group learning as a leading predictor confirms Edmondson's (1999) proposition that psychological safety enables teams to speak up and share knowledge, thereby fostering better organizational learning. Similar reasoning can be applied to relate these findings to Crossan et al.'s (1999) multi-level learning framework. The impact of individual learning underscores the importance of well-developed individual knowledge stocks within organizations. At the same time, its

World Economics & Finance Bulletin (WEFB)
Available Online at: https://www.scholarexpress.net
Vol. 58, May, 2026
ISSN: 2749-3628,

ranking as the second-strongest indicator underscores the need to embed individual knowledge into collective and structural procedures if any meaningful organizational impact is to be achieved. Finally, the effect of learning culture signals the importance of leadership and climate in cultivating learning behaviors. As Yang et al. (2004) eloquently stated, a strong "learning culture allows organizations to internalize adaptive individual- and group-level learning as a long-lasting organizational capacity." The relatively low impact of knowledge management can either be telling of inadequate investments in formal knowledge management systems in the sampled organizations. Nevertheless, their statistical significance underscores the role of IS and knowledge repositories in facilitating high performance (Alavi & Leidner, 2001).

CONTRIBUTIONS

This study provides many theoretical contributions to the Arabic and international administrative literature. First, he develops a comprehensive normative model that integrates four mechanisms of organizational learning into one framework and measures their impact on multidimensional organizational performance. Secondly, he emphasizes the priority of collective learning over other mechanisms in the context of Mashreq organizations, adding empirical evidence that enriches the academic dialogue on cultural differences in learning mechanisms. Thirdly, the study enriches the resource perspective by emphasizing that learning capabilities constitute a rare and strategic resource that is difficult to imitate and that yields a sustainable competitive advantage.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to establish that organizational learning mechanisms, through theoretical analysis and field research, positively impact the institution's performance quality. The study established that organizational learning mechanisms are critical success factors that should be taken seriously by any organization that aspires to be excellent.

Findings based on the proposed model revealed that the four organizational learning mechanisms studied (Individual learning, group learning, knowledge management, and continuous learning culture) are interconnected, forming a system that impacts performance, with group learning having the greatest impact and learning culture acting as a catalyst. Similar to the limitations outlined in the study, this study faced some limitations. These limitations include its cross-sectional design and its being conducted in only one region at a given time point. The authors recommend that future studies conduct similar research in different regions with longitudinal designs; they also recommend that future research examine mediating variables such as social capital and transformational leadership.

REFERENCES AND SOURCES

1. Alavi, M., & Leidner, D. E. (2001). Review: Knowledge management and knowledge management systems: Conceptual foundations and research issues. MIS Quarterly, 25(1), 107–136.https://doi.org/10.2307/3250961.
2. Argyris, C., & Schön, D. A. (1996). Organizational learning II: Theory, method and practice. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315237127.
3. Calantone, R. J., Cavusgil, S. T., & Zhao, Y. (2002). Learning orientation, firm innovation capability, and firm performance. Industrial Marketing Management, 31(6), 515–524.https://doi.org/10.1016/S0019-8501(01)00203-6.
4. 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.https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1999.2202135.
5. García-Morales, V. J., Lloréns-Montes, F. J., & Verdú-Jover, A. J. (2007). Influence of personal mastery on organizational performance through organizational learning and innovation. Technovation, 27(9), 547–568.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2007.02.004.
6. Jiménez-Jiménez, D., & Sanz-Valle, R. (2011). Innovation, organizational learning, and performance. Journal of Business Research, 64(4), 408–417.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2010.09.010.
7. Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1996). The balanced scorecard: Translating strategy into action. Harvard Business School Press.https://doi.org/10.1108/meq.1997.8.2.174.3.
8. Levitt, B., & March, J. G. (1988). Organizational learning. Annual Review of Sociology, 14, 319–340.https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.14.080188.001535.
9. López, S. P., Peón, J. M. M., & Ordás, C. J. V. (2005). Organizational learning as a determining factor in business performance. The Learning Organization, 12(3), 227–245.https://doi.org/10.1108/09696470510592494.
10. Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). The knowledge-creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation. Oxford University Press.https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-6301(96)81509-3.

World Economics & Finance Bulletin (WEFB)
Available Online at: https://www.scholarexpress.net
Vol. 58, May, 2026
ISSN: 2749-3628,

11. Popper, M., & Lipshitz, R. (1998). Organizational learning mechanisms: A structural and cultural approach to organizational learning. The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 34(2), 161–179.https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886398342003.
12. Santos-Vijande, M. L., López-Sánchez, J. Á., & Trespalacios, J. A. (2012). How organizational learning affects a firm's flexibility, competitive strategy, and performance. Journal of Business Research, 65(8), 1079–1089.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2011.09.002.
13. Schechter, C. (2008). Organizational learning mechanisms: The meaning, measure, and implications for school improvement. Educational Administration Quarterly, 44(2), 155–186. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X07312130.
14. Argote, L., & Miron-Spektor, E. (2011). Organizational learning: From experience to knowledge. Organization Science, 22(5), 1123–1137.https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1100.0621.
15. Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. Administrative Science Quarterly, 44(2), 350–383.https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999.
16. Marsick, V. J., & Watkins, K. E. (2003). Demonstrating the value of an organization's learning culture. Advances in Developing Human Resources, 5(2), 132–151.https://doi.org/10.1177/1523422303005002002.
17. Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). The knowledge-creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation. Oxford University Press.https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-6301(96)81509-3.
18. Argote, L., & Miron-Spektor, E. (2011). Organizational learning: From experience to knowledge. Organization Science, 22(5), 1123–1137.https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1100.0621.
19. Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203765001.
20. 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.https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1999.2202135.
21. Davenport, T. H., & Prusak, L. (1998). Working knowledge: How organizations manage what they know. Harvard Business School Press.https://doi.org/10.1145/348772.348775.
22. Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. Administrative Science Quarterly, 44(2), 350–383.https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999.
23. Kolb, D. A. (1984). Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development. Prentice-Hall.https://doi.org/10.4324/9780133892406.
24. Lipshitz, R., Popper, M., & Oz, S. (2002). Building learning organizations: The design and implementation of organizational learning mechanisms. The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 38(1), 78–98.https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886302381005.
25. Örtenblad, A. (2018). What does "learning organization" mean? The Learning Organization, 25(3), 150–158.https://doi.org/10.1108/TLO-02-2018-0016.
26. Watkins, K. E., & Marsick, V. J. (1993). Sculpting the learning organization: Lessons in the art and science of systemic change. Jossey-Bass.https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.3920050112.
27. Yang, B., Watkins, K. E., & Marsick, V. J. (2004). The construct of the learning organization: Dimensions, measurement, and validation. Human Resource Development Quarterly, 15(1), 31–55.https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.1086.
28. Zack, M., McKeen, J., & Singh, S. (2009). Knowledge management and organizational performance. Journal of Knowledge Management, 13(6), 392–409.https://doi.org/10.1108/13673270910997088.
29. Freeman, R. E. (1984). Strategic management: A stakeholder approach. Boston: Pitman.
30. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139192671.
31. Hsu, I. C., & Shen, S. M. (2005). Knowledge management and organizational performance. Journal of Knowledge Management, 9(3), 21–32.https://doi.org/10.1108/13673270510602809.
32. Jiménez-Jiménez, D., & Sanz-Valle, R. (2011). Innovation, organizational learning, and performance. Journal of Business Research, 64(4), 408–417.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2010.09.010.
33. Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1996). The balanced scorecard: Translating strategy into action. Harvard Business School Press.https://doi.org/10.1108/meq.1997.8.2.174.3.
34. Neely, A., Adams, C., & Kennerley, M. (2002). The performance prism: The scorecard for measuring and managing business success. Financial Times/Prentice Hall.https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203998157.
35. Quinn, R. E., & Rohrbaugh, J. (1983). A spatial model of effectiveness criteria. Management Science, 29(3), 363–377.https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.29.3.363.
36. Alavi, M., & Leidner, D. E. (2001). Knowledge management and knowledge management systems. MIS Quarterly, 25(1), 107–136.https://doi.org/10.2307/3250961.
37. Crossan, M. M., Lane, H. W., & White, R. E. (1999). An organizational learning framework. Academy of Management Review, 24(3), 522–537.https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1999.2202135.

World Economics & Finance Bulletin (WEFB)
Available Online at: https://www.scholarexpress.net
Vol. 58, May, 2026
ISSN: 2749-3628,

38. Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. Administrative Science Quarterly, 44(2), 350–383.https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999.
39. Jiménez-Jiménez, D., & Sanz-Valle, R. (2011). Innovation, organizational learning and performance. Journal of Business Research, 64(4), 408–417.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2010.09.010.
40. Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1996). The Balanced Scorecard. Harvard Business School Press.
41. Neely, A., Adams, C., & Kennerley, M. (2002). The Performance Prism. Financial Times Prentice Hall.
42. Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). Psychometric theory (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
43. Yang, B., Watkins, K. E., & Marsick, V. J. (2004). The construct of the learning organization. Human Resource Development Quarterly, 15(1), 31–55.https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.1086.
44. Zack, M., McKeen, J., & Singh, S. (2009). Knowledge management and organizational performance. Journal of Knowledge Management, 13(6), 392–409.https://doi.org/10.1108/13673270910997088.