The Current Issue and Full Text Archive of this Journal is available on
The Science Publishing House at www.scipubhouse.com

https://www.doi.org/10.56830/IJSOL122025

Sustainability through Learning: Exploring the Intersection of Organizational Learning and Corporate Social Responsibility

doi.org/10.56830/IJSOL12202504

Received:23/09/2025
Revised: 19/10/2025
Accepted 29/11/2025

Ana Paula Fonseca

Heriot Watt University, Edinburgh, UK

The Corresponding author: a.fonseca@hw.ac.uk

Abstract

Corporate social responsibility (CSR) is a contested concept, with skepticism about the social commitment of corporations and accusations of greenwashing. However, increased stakeholder and regulatory demands for ethical behavior and environmental responsibility highlight the urgency of responsible business decision-making. Organizational learning is central to the creation of effective CSR practices and, thus, sustainable innovation. The integration of knowledge creation, social capital, and responsible innovation enables organizations to adopt sustainability practices, react proactively to stakeholder issues, and create eco-innovations. The shift from traditional CSR toward a broader perspective on sustainability represents an essential re-orientation of companies towards society and the environment framed by theories such as Corporate Social Performance, Stakeholder Theory, and Triple Bottom Line. Industry context, regulatory context, technology context, and ethics context determine how learning processes shape outcomes in CSR. Leadership is important in establishing visions of sustainability and the ethical values that are necessary for long-term success. Companies need to transform economic information into knowledge in order to understand social and environmental impacts and manage them effectively. Achieving sustainability requires companies to go beyond traditional business models by adopting continuous learning processes that adjust to complex contextual variables while fostering collective action across industries. This synthesis indicates that sustainability through intentional organizational learning is key to restoring trust and gaining legitimacy in an age characterized by heightened demands for social responsibility and environmental accountability.

Keywords: Sustainability, Organizational Learning, Social Responsibility

THE SCIENCE PUBLISHING HOUSE
International Journal of Strategy and Organisational Learning

Vol.2 No.2

1. Introduction

Despite its perceived importance, however, intense debate persists on the very nature and underlying meaning of corporate social responsibility (CSR) (Brophy Haney, Pope, & Arden, 2020). Mintzberg et al. (2006) contend that the phrase is an oxymoron—mixing the concept of social responsibility with an institution whose private shareholders have themselves been rendered socially irresponsible. Others argue that socially responsible behaviour can still occur in fragmented form, with benefits proudly trumpeted by those responsible despite attention measured in minutes from C.E.O.s and shareholders "tied up in hedge funds." Such scepticism is compounded by the perception that routine allegations of greenwashing undermine any commitment to environmentally friendly initiatives (Maher, 2010).

CSR remains one of the principal means by which organisations strive to achieve a more sustainable future. The need to recognise the potential of organisational learning to promote sustainability arises from clarity regarding the "what" of responsibility and the realisation that the "how" remains poorly understood. Sustainable practices exhibit an inverse relationship with the materiality of issues, thereby emphasising stakeholder engagement through social capital. In parallel, learning about responsible innovation and the triple-bottom-line approach propels organisations beyond mere compliance towards systemic solutions. Encouragingly, many approaches to behavioural learning have proven effective in a non-CSR context. (Fedotova, Bocharova, Rachwał-Mueller, Byrski, Grabiński, & Luty, 2023).

Recent studies demonstrate that other learning practices further heighten the odds of achieving desired responsibilities, encompassing the establishment of dedicated training programmes and an architecture that embeds sustainability deeply, measurement of impacts alongside demonstration of outcomes, and amplification of influence through an organisational culture, leadership style, and ethical norms that reflect high responsibility. Contextual factors specific to any particular organisation—including industry dynamics, geographical and regulatory contexts, and rapid shifts in technology—inevitably frame and often condition responses to sustainability-related learning. (Razali & Jamil, 2023)

2. Conceptual Foundations

Organizations increasingly recognize the need for social and environmental accountability, and many cite benefits such as enhanced reputation, stakeholder alignment, and improved operational efficiency. Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), defined here as actions that go beyond regulatory compliance to further social welfare and protect the environment, has gained considerable attention. High-profile corporate failures demonstrate the need for more responsible decision-making, while stakeholders and regulatory agencies demand stricter controls to mitigate corporate misconduct. (Mäkelä & Cho, 2022).

Despite the growing interest in CSR, the mechanisms through which firms develop and realize responsible behaviors remain largely underexplored. Learning is crucial because the complex and shifting nature of social and ecological issues means that implementing CSR ultimately hinges on knowledge, skills, and capabilities. Learning and knowledge creation therefore play key roles in developing meticulous CSR policies and innovative solutions. Research links Organizational Learning (OL) to CSR, emphasizing that learning facilitates the acquisition of crucial information for sustainable decision-making.

Defining learning is complicated. Over several decades, scholars have advanced competing OL definitions based on varying underlying logics (Maher, 2010). Nevertheless, these multiple definitions can coexist and collectively support a broader interpretation that enables a more comprehensive examination of CSR and

organizations. Individual and collective provocations prompt the articulation of mind-sets, world-views, ethical frameworks, and principles guiding enterprises beyond mere compliance. Learning remains central to discerning and resolving complex problems spanning economic, social, and environmental domains. CSR actions may not be legally required, yet the absence of such behaviors is perceived as irresponsible, necessitating a learning orientation.

Beginnings of OL, dating back to the early 1990s, (Brophy Haney, Pope, & Arden, 2020) suggest that organizations learn through stakeholder group engagement. When stakeholders raise concerns, prompt evaluation follows, potentially altering operational practices such as product design, service delivery, and sustainability.

2.1. Organizational Learning

Organizations continuously engage in learning as a vital process for their survival and development. Recognition of the significance of organizational learning is now commonplace within organizations, underscored by various academic theories and frameworks. Major challenges lie ahead as organizations strive towards sustainability, particularly in relation to their corporate social responsibility (CSR) endeavors. A preliminary yet crucial step is to establish a foundation for understanding organizational learning.

Learning refers to the process by which knowledge is acquired, renewed, and enhanced (Maher, 2010). This essential component supports change through the perception and interpretation of new information. Organizational learning, therefore, involves collective acquisition or modification of the structure of knowledge among members of an organization; the ultimate control remains with the individual (Ali Kashefi & Ebrahim Sanjaghi, 2013). Learning that fosters a broader view of roles and responsibilities, generates more options, connects widely dispersed sources of lessons, 7e82f174-ae97-47a4-9ade-4f91542c6ff6gns individual with corporate objectives, and influences stakeholders in the external environment is likely to influence CSR substantially. Organizations constantly contend with environmental changes and challenges. Acquiring the necessary understanding of CSR for meaningful commitment to that course of action requires a substantially higher level of organizational learning.

2.2. Corporate Social Responsibility

CSR involves the set of obligations undertaken by corporate entities toward society. CSR practices usually take the form of philanthropic or charity donations, such as contributing to health, education, arts and culture or disaster relief in affected areas. CSR also includes corporate or employer support for the charitable activities of employees or paying for employee volunteer time. Sustainability represents a more radical transformation than CSR, shifting focus away from profit toward the dynamics of an organization's relationship with earth and society, a focus that is reflected in the theories of Corporate Social Performance, Stakeholder Theory and the Triple Bottom Line. Theoretical foundations of CSR expand naturally to sustainability themes. The

implementation of triple-bottom-line practices by firms is positively affected by CSR practices that contribute to the social and environmental elements of sustainability and that emphasize the priority of stakeholder groups. (Wirba, 2024).

Controversy persists over what constitutes CSR practices and the correct terminology to use, including sustainable development, sustainable capitalism, civil society, stakeholder engagement, social entrepreneurship and corporate accountability (Maher, 2010).

2.3. Sustainability in Organizations

For organizations struggling to address sustainability, corporate strategies focused on economic growth through scalable market segments for renewable or bio-based products have sometimes offered attractive solutions. However, once caught in these strategies, firms often find themselves grappling with the externalities of business-as-usual operations. Moreover, many corporate sustainability experts recognize the need for a much broader and in some cases more radical approach since, at the planetary level, firms have yet to develop and adopt sustainability innovations, technologies, or business models capable of processing and converting biomass or carbon emissions into fuels, chemicals, and materials at scales sufficient to close the carbon, plastic, energy, or water loops of society. Still, various levels of knowledge development must be fulfilled for innovations at the market scale (Brophy Haney, Pope, & Arden, 2020); (Maher, 2010).

3. Theoretical Linkages Between Learning and CSR

Until recently, the investigation of the relationship between organizational learning and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) has been comparatively less vigorous than studies examining the connections between learning and other strategic and operational areas. These latter domains include Quality Management, Technological Innovation, and Supply Chain Management. In addition to these investigations, there has been a growing interest in understanding how organizational learning influences a firm's capacity to acquire and utilize resources for the development and commercialization of sustainable technologies and practices. (Osagie, Wesselink, & Blok, 2022).

Emerging research highlights that the learning–CSR connection materializes through various theoretical paths, each illustrated with a relevant example. First, specific forms of knowledge generation enhance a firm’s ability to engage with and integrate aspects of sustainability into its philosophy and activities. Second, the presence of appropriate forms of social capital facilitates stakeholder engagement and knowledge diffusion, which become even more salient in the context of sustainability (Maher, 2010). Third, compliance with mandatory sustainability-oriented requirements often initiates incremental modifications, and requirements imbedded into external technology-sourcing procedures stimulate case-specific adaptations and modifications of sustainable offerings.

Different types of knowledge provision from external stakeholders support the incorporation of sustainability into ultimate offerings. Two primary learning loops with direct bearing on sustainability issues emerge. The first loop derives from individual-led initiatives requiring personal behavior change and is reflected in updates to the firm's ultimate offerings. The second loop arises from sustainability-oriented technology-sourcing interactions even in industries where sustainability is not a core theme and manifests itself through individual updates to business operations previously deemed unconnected to sustainability. (Scorrano, Borin, Thrassou, Cavallo, & Mastroleo, 2025).

3.1. Knowledge Creation for Sustainable Practices

The implementation of sustainable practices in response to increasing demands from stakeholders necessitates that companies cultivate new forms of knowledge pertaining to sustainability. To ensure that this knowledge—often categorized as 'ontological' or 'disciplinary' knowledge—is applicable to their operational activities, organizations must engage in processes of 'sustainable knowledge conversion,' akin to the 'knowledge conversion' frameworks outlined by Nonaka and Takeuchi. (Kucharska & Karwowska, 2025).

Such sustainable knowledge conversion encompasses several stages: (1) recognizing and perceiving sustainability challenges, (2) developing concepts and principles related to sustainability, (3) articulating and disseminating representations of sustainability, and (4) identifying, interpreting, and selecting viable sustainability options. As a result, companies that have developed a robust organizational learning framework for the creation of sustainable knowledge are likely to acquire insights into sustainable practices at a significantly faster rate than their competitors, thereby enhancing their ability to implement these relevant practices. (Maher, 2010).

- Core Sustainable Knowledge Conversion Function

$$SKC = f(R + C + D + S)$$

Where:

- **R** = Recognition of sustainability challenges
- **C** = Concept development (principles & frameworks)
- **D** = Dissemination of sustainability representations
- **S** = Selection & interpretation of viable sustainability options

- Sustainable Practice Implementation Equation

$$SP = \alpha(SKC \times OL)$$

The implementation of sustainable practices is proportional to the interaction between sustainable knowledge conversion and organizational learning capability.

- Learning-Speed Advantage Equation

To capture Maher's idea of faster acquisition:

$$\frac{dSK}{dt} = \beta(OL \times SKC)$$

Where:

Rate of sustainable knowledge acquisition = dSK/dt

B = Learning efficiency coefficient

This implies that organizations with stronger learning frameworks build sustainable knowledge more quickly.

3.2. Social Capital and Stakeholder Engagement

Effective engagement with external parties enhances organizational learning, which serves as a critical driver of CSR (Maher, 2010). Depending on their respective capabilities, novel ideas and alternative viewpoints about a company's activities and impacts, ethically and otherwise, can be gained from participation in social dialogue with non-market stakeholders alongside discussions with governmental organizations and market stakeholders. The firm's learning is enriched by stakeholder interactions on environmental, social and governance (ESG) issues, especially where firm and stakeholder objectives differ. Such learning influences managerial thinking, and the incorporation of novel ideas and principles into internal systems expands the sustainability and supply-chain criteria applied to new ventures, products and services. The very nature of engagement with external parties changes as deliberation extends beyond traditional "transactional" themes to embrace subjects contributing to the wider public good.

3.3. Responsible Innovation and Learning Loops

Responsible innovation involves learning loops that foster profound change in sustainability practices. Several authors have contributed to understanding how transformative learning and competencies drive sustainability efforts. The concept of triple-loop learning has been discussed, though its terminology lacks clear conceptual foundation. (Wesselink & Popa, 2025).

Organizations learn from external stakeholders through dialogue, understanding their perspectives, values, assumptions, and mental models, which helps create shared meaning. Deep Seated Learning involves internalizing stakeholder insights to foster innovation and sustainability. Some studies suggest firms use double loop learning,

indicating deep, transformative learning, especially when developing new sustainability products and engaging in stakeholder dialogue (Brophy Haney, Pope, & Arden, 2020).

4. Mechanisms by Which Learning Drives CSR Outcomes

Addressing human-induced climate change, resource depletion, biodiversity loss, and wider sustainability challenges requires a more drastic shift in business activities than has thus far been achieved. CSR and sustainability continue to rate highly on management and investor agendas (Maher, 2010), as they are seen as essential success factors for the decades-long restoration of trust in the corporate sector required following major crises such as the financial crash of 2007–2009 and the current COVID-19 pandemic.

Similar shifting of priorities took place during the extensive civil unrest of 2020 highlighting gender inequality and racial injustice, but the by-now-familiar commitment to the subject from many organizations has been labelled "performative," "superficial," "business as usual," or even "greenwashing" by several commentators. Nonetheless, both CSR and sustainability continue to motivate a significant portion of organizational change and to spawn highly vocal stakeholder pressure groups of numerous types. (D'Souza, Ahmed, Khashru, Ahmed, Ratten, & Jayaratne, 2022).

In a world of ever-increasing uncertainty and rapid change, the importance of (re)learning indeed increases: "Organizational learning is the process of detecting and correcting errors. It involves experience, knowledge, and attitudes, and it leads to individual and collective change." In fact, organizational learning has been described as one of the "critical enablers" of effective and efficient corporate sustainability management. (Razali & Jamil, 2023); (Bianchi, Testa, Boiral, & Iraldo, 2022).

4.1. Learning Architecture and Training for Sustainability

The organizational learning literature has produced models, frameworks, and systems for the design of cybernetic systems aimed at the creation and sharing of knowledge and innovation (Brophy Haney, Pope, & Arden, 2020). Garvin (1993) defined an architectural framework that consists of three components: aligned purpose; information flows; and incentives and rewards. Cybernetic systems comprise goals and measures that influence the choices and behaviors of decision makers. Organizational learning can benefit from this architecture as organizations develop the cognitive and social capabilities needed to adapt to sustainably focused changes. Sustained focused training programmes that indicate the broad and systemic perspective of sustainability can support an ongoing multi-level understanding of sustainability.

4.2. Measurement, Evaluation, and Adaptation

An organization's CSR efforts may be enhanced—and their public image restored—by re-establishing a reliable, networked system for measuring, evaluating, adapting, and developing existing CSR practices (Brophy Haney et al., 2020). Corporate social responsibility (CSR) combines ethical behavior with public good, a balancing act made

more intricate yet critical by the pandemic and associated social unrest. As the external world shapes dense, task-related choices that require a high degree of habitual effort, learning on multiple loops is necessary for secure, frequent topic shifts across exploratory and exploitative activities (Ali Kashefi & Ebrahim Sanjaghi, 2013). In the same vein, the organization itself originates and absorbs social capital across broader frontiers—not through abstraction but as primary software operating in adaptable learning, like Lemoine, D., and Kreiter, G.-P., 2023.

4.3. Leadership, Culture, and Ethical Norms

By nature, leadership plays a central role in shaping organizational behavior and values (Prutina, 2015). Leaders are instrumental in promoting the organizational commitment to sustainability and responsible practices (Brophy Haney, Pope, & Arden, 2020). During recent years, corporate social responsibility (CSR) has become a growing priority for business leaders because of its increasing significance (Ali Kashefi & Ebrahim Sanjaghi, 2013). As a result, a great number of organizations see value in developing leadership skills and ethical perspectives that contribute to sustainability practices.

Leadership provides organizations with the necessary strategic direction to embrace and successfully implement sustainability initiatives. From the establishment of an official sustainability mission and vision to the continuous encouragement of sustainability processes through ethical values and norms, leadership renders significant contributions to accomplishing sustainability goals.

5. Contextual Factors Shaping the Learning–CSR Nexus

Research emphasizes that the influence of organizational learning on CSR initiatives depends on various contextual factors (Maher, 2010). Such factors include industry dynamics and regulatory frameworks, geographic and socioeconomic characteristics, as well as technological changes and data transparency.

Industry dynamics relate to the prevalence of specific CSR pressures in a given sector. Regulative, normative, and cognitive forces within the institutional context, including the government, norms, and the media, create different perceptions of CSR relevance for firms across regions. For instance, local stakeholder groups frequently exert limited pressure on manufacturing firms within developing nations, while broader sustainability is seen as more relevant for oil-related industries in these regions. Geographical location, climate conditions, and the availability of natural resources can also affect the natural resource-related sustainability of firms. (Ijabadeniyi & Govender, 2024).

The role of stakeholder communities on learning, innovation, knowledge development, and ethical circuits is accentuated by technological progress, particularly in the digital sharing economy. Stakeholders can influence each other through these mechanisms. Technological changes also affect the availability of data on budget allocation,

employees' working hours, traceability of supply chains, carbon footprints, and other impact evaluation parameters. (Alshukri, Seun Ojekemi, Öz, & Alzubi, 2024).

5.1. Industry Dynamics and Regulatory Environments

Industry dynamics and regulatory environments affect corporate sustainability and influence the relationship between organizational learning and CSR. Regulatory settings shape the pressures and opportunities firms face for sustainability initiatives, and play a major role in determining whether proactive or merely reactive CSR is developed (Brophy Haney, Pope, & Arden, 2020). These insights have implications for policymakers seeking to stimulate greater sustainability outcomes from businesses. Learning-oriented approaches for leaders need to tackle regulatory changes that limit or curb individual action in business sustainability. Patterns of engagement with frameworks like ISO 26000 vary, and anticipate the standard may become mandatory (Ali Kashefi & Ebrahim Sanjaghi, 2013). Understanding the dynamics of industry evolution can help companies formulate responsive strategies that enable effective engagement with CSR pressures.

5.2. Geographic and Socioeconomic Contexts

Attainment status must further be examined within an appropriate spatial context. When status is measured in broad, summary form across the entire population, spatial differences in the attainment of high school, college, and graduate credentials for successive cohorts reveal important fluctuations over time and between places. The federal government does not officially classify metropolitan areas and rural places in the same manner; nevertheless, from the standpoint of occupational structure, many counties and smaller places can be grouped as rural even if they are located within and classified as part of standard metropolitan areas. Hence, educational attainment must be examined in tandem with a similar inventory of occupational structure and economic activities in order to understand more fully the significance of selected spatial differences in the educational system's structure (Brophy Haney, Pope, & Arden, 2020).

The spatial approach to attainment analysis, especially within the rural milieu, helps to clarify certain dynamics that govern knowledge and universal educational opportunities. Apart from about a dozen global cities—New York; London; Paris; and Tokyo, for example, that exhibit a geographic character akin to rural, provincial, and cosmopolitan educational and occupational structures, and within a wider circumpolar area of the northern hemisphere that includes metropolitan areas such as Minneapolis, balance progresses along certain lines of resistance to progressive structural flexibility over a broader fabric. The strains associated with urban activities and the structural flows toward cities, likewise operate in reverse within the rural milieu, restricting more mobile provisioning and memory structures that characterize, at least in default form, dynamic metropolitan patterns . (Yang, 2023)

5.3. Technological Change and Data Transparency

Technological change profoundly influences organizational learning, enhancing data transparency Aligned with the consideration of sustainability, technological change shapes stakeholder expectations regarding social responsibility and firms' positioning of these expectations within their operational practices. Technological advances and data transparency encourage businesses to develop holistic frameworks for addressing economically profitable and environmentally sustainable activities (Brophy Haney, Pope, & Arden, 2020) within the broader concept of corporate social responsibility. The expanding field of machine learning might even be regarded as artificial intelligence for the first time. This new field is already transforming learning, allowing companies to predict trends and evaluate more effectively the impact of their actions. Today's learning architectures must consider technical capabilities and constraints, data ownership, ethical consequences, expected long-term consequences of adoption, tacit knowledge, and measurement techniques. Within this context, machine-generated insights serve to establish learning architectures that enhance the capacity to anticipate, avert, and mitigate learning impediments. The degree of technological change dictates which dimensions of the learning–corporate social responsibility interface remain most relevant (Ali Kashefi & Ebrahim Sanjaghi, 2013). Sustainability cannot remain a mere discipline within the organizational knowledge—flooded space, unless the organization takes proactive measures to find new ways with the external environment.

6. Implications for Practice and Policy

To remain competitive, businesses must implement responsible practices that respect the environment, community, and relevant stakeholders. However, the absence of managerial understanding of corporate sustainable development makes devising suitable responses difficult.

Learning and CSR both represent social constructs which are inherently complex and multi-facetted (Maher, 2010). To gain insight into the learning–CSR nexus, it is essential first to build a theoretical understanding of learning and CSR in general and focus in particular on how organizations might learn about CSR. A second step consists of examining how they might transform the knowledge gained into actual CSR practices.

The limited theoretical framework elaborates on specific concepts or ideas within both learning and CSR and how they inter-relate. It identifies a few known drivers and articulates them in the context of CSR activities and desired outcomes without rediscovering existing theoretical frameworks or overly emphasizing a particular aspect. The ultimate objective consists of providing theoretical insight relevant to managerial practice and helping businesses articulate problems more explicitly so that possible solutions may be found. (Khan & Khan, 2024).

6.1. Strategic Implications for Firms

Business organizations are under substantial pressure from society to consider the social and environmental consequences of their activities. This reflects widespread concern for such issues, widespread expectations that firms should recognize and act on these issues, and a belief that they should be managed as effectively as economic ones. When organizations take comprehensive responsibility for the diverse, often diverging issues that constitute corporate social responsibility (CSR), they must convert economic information into knowledge for understanding the social consequences of their activities, and therefore the growing pressure to exercise CSR requires them to learn as organizations. KOS companies, organized analysis about learning in activity theory, and many of their organizational counterparts remain very limited. Moreover, CSR has become a focal aspect of discussions on corporate governance and organizational transformation, and a productive framework for analyzing the phenomenon is therefore developing. Various entities regard knowledge and learning as vital to implementing social responsibility (Maher, 2010).

6.2. Imperatives for Governance and Accountability

Society's awareness of social responsibility is expanding, and organizations increasingly face pressures from stakeholders, such as governments, the media, and NGOs. Consequently, firms must respond promptly to changing societal expectations regarding responsible practices, such as healthy foods, recyclable packaging, and fair labor conditions. The journey toward good corporate citizenship encompasses five stages: denying problems, minimal responsibility, integrating social issues into daily operations, recognizing CSR as a strategic opportunity, and encouraging industry-wide collective action. At the same time, firms must adapt their learning approaches through these stages, combining organizational learning models with CSR evolution to traverse social challenges effectively (Ali Kashefi & Ebrahim Sanjaghi, 2013).

Establishing appropriate governance systems and accountability mechanisms is essential when corporations make systemic and strategic decisions involving significant changes to technology, people, processes, and products. The proliferation of available data, including real-time information on mental and emotional well-being, furthers this need. Leaders must safeguard against technology choice become default or systemic through perverse motivators, dislocating work, eroding community, diminishing value, and preventing aspiration (Maher, 2010).

6.3. Policy Recommendations and Collaborative Platforms

In numerous areas, there is mounting interest in collaborative action that can reassign the parameters of the public discussion, recently characterised as "broad-based cof04ff44a-8f9e-4475-94bd-f44ec9859176tions for sustainability experimentation". Public policy may also favour the interactive dynamics of organisations as agents of change. One option is to establish a portal for organisations to connect in a structured way, allowing different collaborations to emerge in response to particular challenges or motivating purposes.

A second option is to constitute an ever-evolving cross-organisational group that addresses in partnership the foundational underpinnings of "communities of practice." Beyond work processes, attention would encompass the framing of the sustainability, ESG and related agendas, the connections to learning in its various forms and some other initial critical dimensions of organizing. In combination, these approaches have the potential to activate initiatives and agendas that may otherwise await the emergence of more specific and direct stimuli for action (Ali Kashefi & Ebrahim Sanjaghi, 2013).

7. Conclusion

This article examines the interrelationship between organizational learning (OL) and corporate social responsibility (CSR) within the context of sustainable development. The role of OL in driving improvements in CSR can be understood by linking three OL concepts—knowledge creation, social capital, and responsible innovation—to three corresponding CSR goals: establishing sustainable practices, addressing stakeholder concerns, and developing eco-innovations. A further examination of OL's influence on CSR identifies three mechanisms that mediate this relationship: the establishment of a learning architecture that incorporates sustainability training, processes for measuring sustainability performance to evaluate impacts and promote learning, and the fostering of a leadership style, culture, and ethical norms that emphasize OL.

The exploration of the relationship between OL (Organizational Learning) and CSR (Corporate Social Responsibility) is framed within the expansive and important theme of "sustainability through learning." This theme conveys the compelling idea that learning has the potential to unlock numerous pathways to sustainable development by enabling the sustainable sourcing and utilization of vital knowledge. While sustainability can indeed be seen as a significant driver of OL, this investigation takes an alternate approach, reversing this conventional perspective by highlighting various frameworks through which OA (Organizational Agility) actively fosters CSR initiatives. Furthermore, it critically considers a range of broader contextual factors that shape the intricate learning−CSR nexus within organizations. These factors include the complex dynamics of different industry sectors, the specific geographic location of businesses, varying socioeconomic conditions, and the profound influence of technological change alongside the increasing demand for data transparency. In reality, many firms are currently struggling to adapt their existing business models to the pressing challenges posed by sustainability. Therefore, they should devote an increased level of attention to the embedded knowledge that is crucially needed to effectively meet and tackle these multifaceted and complex challenges. It is essential for organizations to not only understand these dynamics but also to actively engage with them, ensuring they are prepared for a sustainable future.

References:

Ali Kashefi, M., & Ebrahim Sanjaghi, M. (2013). A New Framework for Learning Approaches toward Social Evolution of Organizations.

Alshukri, T., Seun Ojekemi, O., Öz, T., & Alzubi, A. (2024). The interplay of corporate social responsibility, innovation capability, organizational learning, and sustainable value creation: does stakeholder engagement. *Sustainability*.

Bianchi, G., Testa, F., Boiral, O., & Iraldo, F. (2022). Organizational learning for environmental sustainability: Internalizing lifecycle management. . *Organization & Environment*, 35(1), 103-129.

Brophy Haney, A., Pope, J., & Arden, Z. (2020). Making it personal: Developing sustainability leaders in business.

D'Souza, C., Ahmed, T., Khashru, M. A., Ahmed, R., Ratten, V., & Jayaratne, M. (2022). The complexity of stakeholder pressures and their influence on social and environmental responsibilities. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 358, 132038.

Fedotova, I., Bocharova, N., Rachwał-Mueller, A., Byrski, W., Grabiński, T., & Luty, Z. (2023). Corporate social responsibility as an instrument of sustainable business development: exploring types and dimensions. *Zeszyty Naukowe Wyższej Szkoły Ekonomii i Informatyki w Krakowie*, (19), 83-110.

Ijabadeniyi, A., & Govender, J. P. (2024). Intrinsic drivers of the reputation for CSR: a cognitive analysis of consumer expectations. *Social Responsibility Journal*.

Khan, M. I., & Khan, A. N. (2024). Exploring Management Practices and Theories through Grounded Theory. *A Review. Journal of Policy Options*.

Kucharska, W., & Karwowska, E. (2025). Company culture matters! Knowledge-driven companies' way to innovations and sustainability. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*.

Maher, R. (2010). How do organizations learn from their external stakeholders in the context of corporate responsibility? *a systematic review*.

Mäkelä, H., & Cho, C. H. (2022). Calls for accountability and sustainability: how organizations respond. *Handbook of Accounting and Sustainability*.

Osagie, E., Wesselink, R., & Blok, V. (2022). Organization for corporate social responsibility implementation: Unravelling the intricate relationship between organizational and operational learning organization... Organization &.

Prutina, Ž. (2015). DIAGNOSING THE CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY CULTURE.

Razali, M. Z., & Jamil, R. (2023). Sustainability learning in organizations: Integrated model of learning approaches and contextual factors. *SAGE Open*.

Scorrano, P., Borin, E., Thrassou, A., Cavallo, F., & Mastroleo, G. (2025). Knowledge sharing between businesses and stakeholders for systemic and sustainable regional development. Insights in the agri-food sector. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 29(4), 1278-1300.

Wesselink, R., & Popa, E. (2025). Responsible learning organizations: a framework to embed responsible innovation within organizations. *The Learning Organization*.

Wirba, A. V. (2024). Corporate social responsibility (CSR): The role of government in promoting CSR. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*.

Yang, Z. (2023). Human capital space: A spatial perspective of the dynamics of people and economic relationships. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*.