



---

# SHAPING A CULTURE OF LEARNING FROM ERRORS IN THE ORGANIZATION – ANALYSIS OF OPPORTUNITIES AND THREATS

DOI: 10.33141/po.2023.03.29

Organization Review, No. 3(998), 2023, pp. 272-280

[www.przegladorganizacji.pl](http://www.przegladorganizacji.pl)

Anna Pluta

© Scientific Society of Organization and Management (TNOiK)

The best people have been formed by correcting their own errors.

*William Shakespeare*

## Introduction

The speed and chaotic nature of the changes taking place in the environment of BANI (Brittle, Anxious, Non-linear and Incomprehensible) (Sridharan, 2021) affects the growth of the role of knowledge and the process of its acquisition, i.e. learning. What counts is not only updating or expanding theoretical knowledge but also practical knowledge – allowing the effective fulfillment of work.

While focusing on acquiring practical knowledge by employees, it is worth considering the concept of learning from errors. In the world of BANI, the likelihood of errors will not decrease; on the contrary – it seems that it may increase. Besides, „much of human learning is learning from error” (Keith et al., 2020, p. 712). However, this is not always easy or possible, especially in professional life. In this area, errors can be treated as a taboo subject,

failures, and reasons for shame, so it is better to keep silent and hide their occurrence so as not to lose authority and experience ostracism and exclusion, or a hindrance to a professional career (Pluta, 2020). However, „errors are fundamental for human development and organizations” (Frese, Keith, 2015, p. 662).

That being said, it is important to consider how to build a culture where it is possible to learn from one’s own errors. Also, are organizations capable of learning from errors? What is the possibility for, and what is the block to such behavior? This article aims to answer these questions, which is part of the trend visible in literature discussing the increasing interest in errors (e.g. Goodman et al., 2011; Javed et al., 2020). In particular, it contributes to the discussion on learning from errors (Keith et al., 2020). A better understanding of the conditions for learning from

errors can help improve the actions taken in the organization to learn from errors. To achieve this goal, the first part of the article defines error and learning from it, as well as shows the essence of a culture in which it is possible to learn from errors and outlines the conditions that favor its existence. The second part is the presentation of selected results of the study<sup>1</sup>, which are related to the problem of shaping culture based on personnel activities. The deliberations end with presenting theoretical and practical implications and indicating limitations in the discussion.

## Error and learning from errors

**M.** Frese and N.Keith (2015, p. 662) define „action errors as unintended deviations from plans, goals, or adequate feedback processing, as well as incorrect actions resulting from lack of knowledge”. Their occurrence, for the most part, can be repaired, but some of them can lead to various damages and accidents, which is especially analyzed in the medical or aerospace sector (Syed, 2017). It is not surprising, therefore, that errors are usually associated with something negative. However, the wealth of knowledge they carry (Horvath, 2020) can also be interpreted positively. The informative value of errors is emphasized by F.Kofman (2019, p. 132), stating that an error is „like a symptom that reveals a disease and makes it possible to treat it; an error is an opportunity to check and improve the process that led to it”. Errors lead to rethinking the current practices and help to introduce appropriate modifications and allow the prevention of waste or various types of losses. Errors should not be approached solely as negative but also seen as positive in the fact that they appear. Research shows that such positive error orientation can contribute to better long-term outcomes (Arenas et al., 2006) and is linked to organizational and individual innovation (Fischer et al., 2018), which favors the use of an exploratory approach in the organization (Gadomska-Lila, Rudawska, 2006). In addition, when an error occurs, optimism encourages attempts to find a solution to this embarrassing situation, attracts people and inspires confidence. As a result, inventions that change the world can be created – as was the case with T.A.Edison (Gelb, Caldicott, 2010).

Dualism in the approach to errors and assessing their significance in the work process affects the learning process through them. Treating errors as failures in implementing professional duties or organizational taboos can lead to various difficulties in obtaining information from errors. Knowledge is then hidden, and the importance of information associated with errors is marginalized. In the communication process between employees, the causes of interruptions in the flow of organizational activities are unknown, and the methods and conditions in which they took place are not considered. The lack of such information fails to allow for the transformation of individual and group experiences of employees of the organization, which are crucial for the formation of knowledge and learning (Kolb, 1984), nor is there an increase in effectiveness to action (Kim, 1998). Empirical evidence indicates

that the consequences of errors attract employees' attention, which contributes to increased learning (Keith et al., 2020). It turns out that the key to science is not the error itself but its consequences. The lesson of errors will be more valuable if they have serious consequences (Horvath et al., 2021). Errors with mild consequences are usually easier to overlook, ignore or dismiss (Cannon, Edmondson, 2005). In addition, more lessons come from errors than successes, and knowledge from failures is slower to lose value than that derived from successes (Madsen, Desai, 2010). While research also shows that one's own errors have greater potential for knowledge and learning ability (Horvath et al., 2021), as they have great personal significance and lead to greater motivation not to repeat them in the future.

Nevertheless, according to the theory of social learning (Bandura, 1986), learning also occurs through observation and receiving information on a specific topic. The incoming signals and received messages are transformed and make learning more likely, because errors are analyzed, and solutions are searched for that can fix them. This process can take place at the level of a group of workers or an organization and is understood „as an ongoing process of reflection and action, characterized by asking questions, seeking feedback, experimenting, reflecting on results, and discussing errors or unexpected outcomes of actions” (Edmondson, 1999, p. 353). This requires testing assumptions and open exchange of information related to them, discussing differences and similarities of action and obtaining results between members of the group/organization.

For the process of learning from errors to occur efficiently in the organization, it is necessary to provide favorable conditions for this. It is necessary to go beyond the usual schemes suggesting only preventing errors and any symptoms of their appearance because this promotes the formation of various learning blocks and causes fear amongst employees. The focus on error prevention results from the organization's focus on reliability, which equates any deviation from previous action with failure. This is considered „a specific form of man-made evil” (Łojewska-Krawczyk, 2017, p. 9). Errors trigger fear in the organization, and employees feel nervousness, worry, shame and guilt, disappointment and embarrassment, and even fear of taking on further professional duties (Wontorczyk, 2020, p. 183). This motivates people to avoid errors while also discouraging the sharing of knowledge about said errors because errors made can be attributed to negligence in the implementation of tasks (Frese, Keith, 2015). Resistance to talking about errors may also result from the concern regarding an employee's image at work. Employees do not want to be accused of incompetence and control the information revealed in social interactions (Goffman, 2008), as well as take action to hide errors. They are silent and do not report or discuss them with others. As a result, the likelihood of errors recurring increases, and the organization is overwhelmed by silence and fear (Edmondson, 2021). It becomes necessary to encourage rational thinking about the error, which will allow us to



consciously combat the habit of a negative approach to error and replace it with another, presenting the error as feedback about the action, which should be listened to and widely considered. Errors will not lose their informative value, and valuable lessons can be learnt from them.

## A culture focused on learning from errors – the essence and conditions

**E**rrors have been, are and will be an emerging and often repetitive event in the organization. Seeing them as constructive factors positively affect an organization's performance because it fosters learning and innovation (Lei et al., 2016). However, this requires creating an environment free from fear and prone to factual conversations about errors. An environment where the emphasis is not on preventing errors but above all, on managing and learning from them. It is characterized by an active approach to errors that limits the negative effects of their occurrence and strengthens the positive ones. This is made possible by quickly detecting errors and checking the damage that has resulted from them (Frese, Keith, 2015). A particularly important part of the environment understood in this way is its culture. It is a set of values, beliefs, attitudes and behaviors that help employees understand the functioning of the organization (Griffin, 2022, p. 90) and the principles of its operation. It is a space where employees work and react to emerging errors.

An open approach to errors and learning from them is possible based on an error management culture (EMC). This culture „is defined as a shared set of organizational norms and practices to collect, communicate, handle, and report error-related information” (Javed et al., 2020, p. 25). This culture exists when employees have the courage to admit errors and openly discuss their occurrence (van Dyck et al., 2005; van Steenbergen et al., 2019). Errors are identified and analyzed on an ongoing basis, and the deviations they cause in the organization are corrected quite quickly. Knowledge of errors is shared within the organization because they provide a valuable lesson for everyone, not just those who experience them personally (van Dyck et al., 2005). It is then possible to better prevent the occurrence of errors in the future and also to limit the negative consequences of those that have already occurred. Employees understand that errors occur at work and try to control the damage resulting from them. Thus, the key causative factor enabling the formation of EMC lies in employees – their individual approach to errors and the resulting motivation to report on them. This applies to all employees of the organization, but managers have a special influence on the formation of EMC.

Introducing EMC into an organization may not be an easy task, and it is still worth creating a culture strength high (Steinmann, Schreyögg, 1995, pp. 425–427; Schneider et al., 2002). Only a clear idea of what is desirable in the organization, the large dissemination of this image and its deep assimilation by employees can lead to real learning from errors. This is evidenced by research (van Dyck et al., 2005, Horvath, 2020) showing that learning from

errors is more effective in organizations with a high-error management culture (HEMC). It has been observed that managers working at HEMC tend to be more empathetic and less severe when errors occur (van Dyck et al., 2005). In organizations, there is then less guilt and fewer penalties, which seems to increase the chance of a positive attitude towards errors among employees. In addition, managers' sense of self-efficacy (awareness of competencies to deal with the difficulties encountered) and humility (the desire to look at oneself accurately to objectively assess one's strengths and weaknesses) (Seckler et al., 2021) seem to help in dealing with errors in the organization. The humility of the CEO strengthens the organizational climate (Ou et al., 2014), and „teams with humble leaders are more inclined to learn, speak up, and perform better” (Hu et al., 2022, p. 24).

However, it should be emphasized that culture is a concept that escapes objective measurements and observations (Griffin, 2022, p. 90). Therefore, it is difficult to indicate specific and commonly accepted measures of it. Previous considerations, however, allow us to suppose that the pillars of a culture capable of learning from errors may be HEMC oriented on: psychological safety, communication openness and cooperation between employees. Psychological safety (PS) seems to be crucial for building a culture of learning from errors in an organization. It is defined as the belief of an individual or group that it is safe to take interpersonal risks (Edmondson, 1999, p. 354) because people trust and respect each other. A work climate is created „where people feel free to express their opinions and be themselves” (Edmondson, 2021, p. 13). Employees thus „feel able to show and employ one's self without fear of negative consequences to self-image, status or career” (Kahn, 1990, p. 708). Research to date indicates that PS impacts individual and group behavior and the resulting learning (Edmondson, 1999; 2021).

PS is the basis for the emergence of another condition for forming a culture of learning from errors – communication openness (CO). Employees feeling „free to express their concerns and talk about errors without fear of embarrassment or punishment” (Edmondson, 2021, p. 13) begin to discuss their work loudly. There are spontaneous, uninhibited conversations, during which emerging deviations in the process of performing professional duties are discussed; concerns, opinions and suggestions are transmitted (Morrison, 2014). „A high degree of communication about errors allows for the development of shared knowledge about errors” (van Dyck et al., 2005, p. 1230), which is conducive to organizational learning in a difficult situation (Batorski, 2007). As a result, it becomes possible to openly search for solutions and inspiration to deal with one's own or group's errors. Doing so can not only affect the quality of dealing with this difficult situation of failure but can also contribute to finding a solution faster. Thanks to this, the work will move forward and the probability of not achieving the goal decreases.

The presence of these two pillars allows the third to exist, which is a cooperation between employees (CBE). The implementation of professional duties by employees

is then based on the „win-win” concept (Waitley, 1996), and synergy is realized (Griffin, 2022). There is cognitive stimulation among employees, resulting in more creative ideas (Nijstad et al., 2002). Thanks to this, the chance of better dealing with emerging errors may increase. Additionally, collaboration seems to foster openness in seeking help between employees (Varella et al., 2012).

The realization of these three pillars of HEMC in the organization requires systemic actions within human resource management (HRM). Among the existing approaches to HRM (Armstrong, 2006), commitment-based actions seem to be crucial, as such behavior is a strong predecessor to the organization’s civic behavior and knowledge sharing (Swart et al., 2014). This may encourage learning from errors at work. This creates a socio-organizational climate measured by trust, cooperation, common codes and language (Collins, Smith, 2006; Ensign, Hébert, 2009; Szulanski, 1996). This is conducive to sharing knowledge between employees, including those who made errors.

## Methodology of own research

In order to check the correctness of the previous considerations and assess their reflection of reality, selected fragments of research material collected as part of the NCN grant were analyzed. Information received from administrative staff employed in four manufacturing and service organizations operating in north-western Poland was considered. The research was conducted between November 2019 and January 2021. The analysis used material obtained only from employees whose work environment, work itself and tasks performed within it have not changed, despite the emergence of the COVID-19 pandemic.

The study used online questionnaires (CAWI method). In total, responses were taken from 116 employees (the maneuverability compared to those invited to the study was 64%). Among the respondents, 82 persons carry out administrative work, and 34 perform operational work. 53% of the study participants were women. Most respondents have at least higher vocational education (65%) and, on average, have about 9.5 years of professional experience and over 8 years of work experience in the organization.

The survey was conducted on the basis of an employee self-assessment questionnaire, in which respondents assessed the HEMC pillars and the HR practices used in the organization employing them. Due to the volume limitations of the article, only the level of perception of both variables and the correlation between them was presented. The focus has been on perception analysis because, according to some researchers, this approach to study allows better prediction of employees’ attitudes and behavioral outcomes (Bowen, Ostroff, 2004; Kehoe, Wright, 2013). For example, HR practices contribute to desired outcomes only to the extent they are perceived (Bowen, Ostroff, 2004), and their perception may differ from the information contained in managerial reports (Liao et al., 2009).

The study of the perception of the pillars of the culture of learning from errors was based on the assessment of psychological safety measures developed by A. C. Edmondson (1999), as well as measures of communication openness and cooperation between employees prepared in the project team, which were verified in practice and reliability assessed (PS  $\alpha = 0.70$ ; CO  $\alpha = 0.62$ ; CBE  $\alpha = 0.74$ ). „A general accepted rule is that  $\alpha$  of 0.6–0.7 indicates an acceptable level of reliability” (Ursachi et al., 2015, p. 681). Respondents rated on a scale of 1 to 7 how much they agreed (7) or disagreed (1) with the given statements. On the other hand, the concept of J. C. Collins and K. G. Smith (2006) was used to study the perception of commitment-based HRM, which allowed to estimate HR activities in the organization in four groups: recruitment and selection ( $\alpha = 0.75$ ), motivation and remuneration ( $\alpha = 0.76$ ), assessment and development ( $\alpha = 0.83$ ), as well as company communication ( $\alpha = 0.67$ ). The reliability of the measure used was  $\alpha = 0.79$ . Respondents rated on a scale from 1 (not applicable) to 7 (the use of HR solutions in the organization is fully used). This made it possible to investigate the intensity of their use (Aryee et al., 2012; Katou et al., 2014) and a statement that is actually used in the organization. HR solutions were analyzed in an aggregated form across four groups, which aligns with the research trend in this area (Farndale et al., 2011; Bowen, Ostroff, 2004).

## Results of the study on the possibility of building HEMC

The data collected in Table 1 shows the aggregate perception of HEMC and the situation in each of the four organizations surveyed. Generally, dominant values oscillate above level „4” – approaching level „5”. This means that the perception of the HEMC pillars is not concrete and clear in all study participants. Employees of the surveyed organizations perceive their workplaces as moderately allowing for building HEMCs. The lowest rating is CO, and the other two pillars have slightly higher marks.

Considering individual organizations, it turns out that employees’ perception of HEMC pillars is diverse. Additional analyses reveal that this is influenced by employees’ professional experience and their seniority in the organization. It is surprising that with the increase in professional experience and seniority in the organization, there is a visible decrease in the sense of work in a place that allows one to learn from one’s own errors. One of the explanations is that together with an increase in work-related skills and organizational tenure there is a greater pressure of correctness and high performance and being a role model for other employees. The greatest professional experience and seniority of employees were recorded in the Gamma organization. There is also a work environment that is least approving of a positive attitude towards errors. This is evidenced by the result of the average PS rating and the average CBE rating – only at a moderate level. The average CO rating does not even reach this level. It seems that the best environment for learning from errors is in an Alpha organization. In Alpha the employees’



organizational tenure and work experience is not high and the PS and CBE pillars get an average grade above 5, and CO receives a grade below this score.

It also turns out that in every organization the biggest barrier to building a culture of learning from errors is the openness of communication. The average rating for this pillar ranges from 3.97 in Gamma to 4.97 in Delta.

The existence of an environment in which HEMC can be shaped is influenced by commitment-based HRM. An assessment of staffing activities carried out in the organizations participating in the survey is presented in Table 2.

Employees participating in the survey do not have the best opinion about commitment-based HR activities that are carried out in the organizations employing them. The average of overall assessments of two HRM practices' groups (recruitment and selection, as well as corporate communication) is above 4, which means a moderate perception of those practices. In the case of the two remaining groups respondents declare that HR practices are rarely used (the average for assessment and development is 3.98, and for motivation and remuneration – only 2.65). An analysis of the responses given by employees of

Table 1. Perception of the HEMC pillars

Pillar of culture	Indicator	Organization				Total
		Alfa	Beta	Gamma	Delta	
Psychological safety	average	5.34	4.94	4.53	4.98	<b>4.98</b>
	n	27	26	18	45	116
Communication openness	average	4.73	4.52	3.97	4.97	<b>4.66</b>
	n	27	26	18	45	116
Cooperation between employees	average	5.20	4.53	4.74	5.08	<b>4.93</b>
	n	27	26	18	45	116

Source: own elaboration

Table 2. Perception of commitment-based HRM practices (average of respondents' ratings)

Group of HRM practices	Organization				Total
	Alfa	Beta	Gamma	Delta	
Recruitment and selection	4.36	4.53	3.43	5.27	<b>4.60</b>
Motivation and remuneration	3.16	2.00	2.94	2.53	<b>2.65</b>
Assessment and development	3.54	4.03	3.78	4.31	<b>3.98</b>
Company communication	3.58	3.29	3.63	5.27	<b>4.18</b>

Source: own elaboration

Table 3. The level of the linear relationship between the groups of commitment-based HR practices and the pillars of the culture of learning from errors

Variable	Psychological safety	Communication openness	Cooperation between employees
Recruitment and selection	.5035 p=.000	.5137 p=.000	.5038 p=.000
Motivation and remuneration	.2223 p=.045	.0797 p=.477	.3315 p=.002
Assessment and development	.3964 p=.000	.3814 p=.000	.4124 p=.000
Company communication	.3580 p=.000	.4218 p=.000	.3795 p=.000

Source: own elaboration

individual organizations shows that the highest extent of commitment-based HR practices application is perceived by employees of Delta organizations. At Gamma, on the other hand, HR practices are so rare that employees do not notice it often enough.

An analysis of stochastic relationships between commitment-based HR activities and HEMC pillars reveals significant correlations (Table 3). Positive relationships ( $r$ -Pearson  $> 0$ ) of different strength were registered (in 5 situations the strength of the compound is moderate, while the remaining compounds are weak). Only one relationship turns out to be statistically insignificant (between motivation and remuneration and openness to communication).

## Conclusions and practical implications

The presented theoretical considerations and the results of empirical research were aimed at answering three questions. Considering the first question (How to build HEMC?) It can be said that the basis for creating a culture that promotes organizational learning from errors is to focus on a positive approach to errors and appreciate their informative value. A critical analysis of the literature on the subject indicates that adopting this perspective enables the elimination of fear and silence from the organization. It becomes necessary to create a safe workplace (Edmondson, 2021), where one can speak out about one's own errors and seek help to deal with them. This means building HEMC based on three pillars: PS, CO and CBE. These pillars can be supported by influencing employees with commitment-based HR practices.

Answering the second question (Are organizations capable of learning from errors?) required checking whether the conclusions drawn from the critical analysis of the literature on the subject (indication of the three pillars of HEMC) are reflected in the functioning of modern organizations. The presented results of the empirical study show a rather worrying situation. The assessments declared by employees suggest that in organizations, there is a rather moderate sense of free expression of their opinions, and loud discussion about work among cooperating employees. Organizations do not seem ready to learn from errors right now. In addition, employees rate the use of commitment-based HR practices quite low. This means that they do not constitute a significant aid to the realization of the HEMC pillars.

A lack of readiness to shape the HEMC has been observed, but paradoxically, this situation also indicates a high potential for improvement, which, if properly used, can contribute to changing the approach to errors in the organization. A clue seems to be the answer to the third question: What constitutes a possibility, and what constitutes a block to such behavior? Empirical research shows that organizations do not cope with both the elimination of fear – and, what is more, silence among employees regarding errors and their causes. Lack of verbal and visual communication about the course of work and emerging problems is a key barrier that can make it difficult to learn

from errors. The change in this situation seems to be particularly important in the situation of time pressure (Pluta, 2018) present during work, which affects the frequency of seeking feedback (van der Rijt et al., 2012). Therefore, given that the role of behaviors related to seeking information and asking others for it is increasing (Lim et al., 2020), it is worth taking action in the organization to help eliminate silence between employees.

Rated at a moderate level, PS and CBE can be a good starting point for eliminating this silence and building HEMC. However, it is necessary to promote the idea of learning from errors more because the results obtained indicate that only some employees see symptoms of such initiatives in the organization. The average assessment of HEMC pillars declared by employees proves that the idea of learning from errors is not widely shared and accepted (Steinmann, Schreyögg, 1995, pp. 425–427), and this is the basis for shaping the culture of learning from errors. It also turns out that professional experience and seniority are not conducive to the rooting and establishing of behaviors that recognize the positive value of error or even otherwise they could be the reason for hiding the errors. In this situation, it is necessary that managers design a systemic support to employees in shaping a culture capable of learning from errors. However, employees perceive relatively low application levels in their organizations of commitment-based HR practices. The commitment-based recruitment and selection HR practices are an exception, mainly addressed for newcomers. The other groups of commitment-based HR practices (motivation, assessment and development, communication) aiming to maintain long-term relationships with longer-tenured employees are applied to a lower extent. It is worth emphasizing the groups of the latter rather than the recruitment HR practices are significant for developing the HEMC as they are addressed to all employees regardless of tenure. This shows that management does not take advantage of the opportunities offered by undertaking HR initiatives and does not build an environment, which minimizes hindrances between employees and is conducive to the sharing of knowledge between employees (Szulanski 1996; Ensign, Hébert 2009), which facilitates the exchange of information about errors and learning from them. It seems necessary to modernize the solutions used, as well as to disseminate them and to make them more widely available and perceived by employees. The better understanding of HECM pillars and their relationships with HR practices can enable it.

## Contribution and directions of further research

The reflections are part of the current discussion on learning from errors (Keith et al., 2020), and contribute to the theory of social learning (Bandura, 1986). The approach used in the article has a cognitive value and allows for filling in the gaps in publications on this subject, especially concerning the situation in Polish organizations. Specifically, it shows an exemplary way of shaping



a culture oriented towards learning from errors based on three pillars: PS, Co and CBE. It also states that commitment-based HR practices are factors shaping the HECM. Additionally, the presented paper gives some guidelines for managers interested in facilitating employees' learning from errors at work, namely, assessment of the HR practices application from the employees' perspective and the effect of those practices on HECM. Practitioners notice that the potential for learning from errors can be better exploited if the right environment is created (Edmondson, 2021), and HR practices are the base for it. At the same time, CEOs get stronger premises for their decisions; thus we can talk about the application value of work.

The author is aware that the theoretical discussion and the results of the empirical study did not cover all aspects of shaping a culture oriented towards learning from errors and might be inductive in some groups. The limitations of this study (e.g., limited number of organizations and individuals who were working only on the administrative positions) trigger avenues for further studies. More detailed research is needed, taking into account the type of work, its form (traditional, remote or hybrid), as well as the effects. It may also be interesting to engage in a broader discussion on the role of leaders in shaping an organizational culture in which it is possible to learn from errors. Future research could also verify cross-cultural influences on learning from errors. Employees of modern organizations more and more often come from different countries, and this can affect the quality of the pillars of the culture interested in learning from errors. The proposals presented do not exhaust all the possibilities of future research, but they may provide inspiration for further closer observation of this situation.

---

**Anna Pluta, Ph.D., D.Sc.**  
**University of Szczecin**  
**Institute of Management**  
**ORCID: 0000-0002-9833-3908**  
**e-mail: anna.pluta@usz.edu.pl**

## Endnote

- <sup>1)</sup> The presented results are part of a research project carried out as part of a research grant financed by the National Science Centre (UMO\_2018/29/B/HS4/01085) and are the result of direct research activities of the author of the article.

## References

[1] Arenas A., Taberero C., Briones E. (2006), *Effects of Goal Orientation, Error Orientation and Self-efficacy on Performance in an Uncertain Situation*, „Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal”, Vol. 34, No. 5, pp. 569–586.

[2] Armstrong M. (2006), *A Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice*, 10th Edition, Kogan Page, London – Philadelphia.

[3] Aryee S., Walumbwa F. O., Seidu E. Y. M., Otake L. E. (2012), *Impact of High-performance Work Systems on Individual – and Branch-level Performance: Test of a Multilevel Model of Intermediate Linkages*, „Journal of Applied Psychology”, Vol. 97, No. 2, pp. 287–300.

[4] Bandura A. (1986), *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Perspective*, Princeton-Hall, Englewood Cliffs.

[5] Batorski J. (2007), *Kryzys organizacyjny jako podstawa organizacyjnego uczenia się i zarządzania wiedzą w przedsiębiorstwie*, „Przeгляд Organizacji”, Nr 2, s. 12–14.

[6] Bowen D. E., Ostroff C. (2004), *Understanding HRM – Firm Performance Linkages: The Role of the „Strength” of the HRM System*, „Academy of Management Review”, Vol. 29, pp. 203–221.

[7] Cannon M. D., Edmondson A. C. (2005), *Failing to Learn and Learning to Fail (Intelligently): How Great Organizations Put Failure to Work to Innovate and Improve*, „Long Range Planning”, Vol. 38, No. 3, pp. 299–319.

[8] Collins J. C., Smith K. G. (2006), *Knowledge Exchange and Combination: The Role of Human Resource Practices in the Performance of High-technology Firms*, „Academy of Management Journal”, Vol. 49, No. 3, pp. 544–560.

[9] Edmondson A. (1999), *Psychological Safety and Learning Behavior in Work Teams*, „Administrative Science Quarterly”, Vol. 44, No. 2, pp. 350–383.

[10] Edmondson A. C. (2021), *Firma bez strachu*, MT Biznes, Warszawa.

[11] Ensign P. C., Hébert L. (2009), *Competing Explanations for Knowledge Exchange: Technology Sharing within the Globally Dispersed R&D of the Multinational Enterprise*, „Journal of High Technology Management Research”, Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 75–85.

[12] Farndale E., Hope-Hailey V., Kelliher C. (2011), *High Commitment Performance Management: The Roles of Justice and Trust*, „Personnel Review”, Vol. 40, No. 1, pp. 5–23.

[13] Fischer S., Frese M., Mertins J. C., Hardt Gawro J. V. (2018), *The Role of Error Management Culture for Firm and Individual Innovativeness*, „Applied Psychology”, Vol. 67, No. 3, pp. 428–453.

[14] Frese M., Keith N. (2015), *Action Errors, Error Management, and Learning in Organizations*, „Annual Review of Psychology”, Vol. 66, pp. 661–687.

[15] Gadomska-Lila K., Rudawska A. (2006), *Kultura organizacyjna a organizacyjne uczenie się w świetle badań empirycznych*, „Przeгляд Organizacji”, Nr 11, s. 25–28.

[16] Gelb M. J., Caldicott S. M. (2010), *Mysleć jak Edison*, Dom Wydawniczy REBIS, Poznań.

[17] Goffman E. (2008), *Człowiek w teatrze życia codziennego*, Alatheia, Warszawa.

[18] Goodman P. S., Ramanujam R., Carroll J. S., Edmondson A. C., Hofmann D. A., Sutcliffe K. M. (2011), *Organizational Errors: Directions for Future Research*, „Research in Organizational Behavior”, Vol. 31, pp. 151–176.

[19] Griffin R. W. (2022), *Podstawy zarządzania organizacjami*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa.

[20] Horvath D. (2020), *Learning from Errors and Error Management Culture in Teams*, Ph.D. Thesis – Technische Universität Darmstadt, Darmstadt.

- [21] Horvath D., Klamar A., Keith N., Frese M. (2021), *Are all Errors Created Equal? Testing the Effect of Error Characteristics on Learning from Errors in Three Countries*, „European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology”, Vol. 30, No. 1, pp. 525–554.
- [22] Hu J., Zhang S., Lount Jr R. B., Tepper B. J. (2022), *When Leaders Heed the Lessons of Mistakes: Linking Leaders' Recall of Learning from Mistakes to Expressed Humility*, „Personnel Psychology”, pp. 1–30.
- [23] Javed B., Jalees T., Heran G. M., Rolle J.-A. (2020), *Error Management Culture and Its Impact on Organizational Performance: A Moderated Mediation Model*, „Journal of Business & Retail Management Research”, Vol. 15, No. 1, pp. 23–35.
- [24] Kahn W. A. (1990), *Psychological Conditions of Personal Engagement and Disengagement at Work*, „Academy of Management Journal”, Vol. 33, No. 4, pp. 692–724.
- [25] Katou A. A., Budhwar P. S., Patel C. (2014), *Content vs. Process in the HRM-performance Relationship: An Empirical Examination*, „Human Resource Management”, Vol. 53, No. 4, pp. 527–544.
- [26] Kehoe R. R., Wright P. M. (2013), *The Impact of High-Performace Human Resource Practices on Employees' Attitudes and Behaviors*, „Journal of Management”, Vol. 39, No. 2, pp. 366–391.
- [27] Keith N., Horvath D., Klamar A. (2020), *The More Severe the Merrier: Severity of Error Consequences Stimulates Learning from Error*, „Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology”, Vol. 93, No. 3, pp. 712–737.
- [28] Kim D. H. (1998), *The Link between Individual and Organizational Learning*, „The Strategic Management of Intellectual Capital”, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 41–62.
- [29] Kofman F. (2019), *Świadomy biznes. Jak budować wartość poprzez wartości*, Wydawnictwo Galaktyka, Łódź.
- [30] Kolb D. A. (1984) *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source Of Learning And Development*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs.
- [31] Lei Z., Naveh E., Novikov Z. (2016), *Errors in Organizations: An Integrative Review via Level of Analysis, Temporal Dynamism, and Priority Lenses*, „Journal of Management”, Vol. 4, No. 5, pp. 1315–1343.
- [32] Liao H., Toya K., Lepak D. P., Hong Y. (2009), *Do They See Eye to Eye? Management and Employee Perspectives of High-Performance Work Systems and Influence Processes on Service Quality*, „Journal of Applied Psychology”, Vol. 94, pp. 371–391.
- [33] Lim J. H., Tai K., Bamberger P., Morrison E. W. (2020), *Soliciting Resources from Others: An Integrative Review*, „The Academy of Management Annals”, Vol. 14, No. 1, pp. 122–159.
- [34] Łojewska-Krawczyk M. (2017), *Błędy w myśleniu. Rozważania errologiczne*, Bel Studio Sp. z o.o., Warszawa.
- [35] Madsen P. M., Desai V. (2010), *Failing to Learn? The Effects of Failure and Success on Organizational Learning in the Global Orbital Launch Vehicle Industry*, „Academy of Management Journal”, Vol. 53, No. 3, pp. 451–479.
- [36] Morrison E. W. (2014), *Employee Voice and Silence*, „The Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior”, Vol. 1, pp. 173–197.
- [37] Nijstad B. A., Stroebe W., Lodewijkx H. F. M. (2002), *Cognitive Stimulation and Interference in Groups: Exposure Effects in an Idea Generation Task*, „Journal of Experimental Social Psychology”, Vol. 38, No. 6, pp. 535–544.
- [38] Ou A. Y., Tsui A. S., Kinicki A. J., Waldman D. A., Xiao Z., Song L. J. (2014), *Humble Chief Executive Officers' Connections to Top Management Team Integration and Middle Managers' Responses*, „Administrative Science Quarterly”, Vol. 59, No. 1, pp. 34–72.
- [39] Pluta A. (2018), *Kształtowanie sprawności pracowników wiedzy działających pod presją czasu*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Szczecińskiego, Szczecin.
- [40] Pluta A. (2020), *Błąd to porażka i organizacyjne tabu, czy powód do uczenia się*, [w:] R. Tomaszewska (red.), *Praca i kariera w warunkach nowego milenium. Implikacje dla edukacji*, Wyd. UKW, Bydgoszcz, s. 220–230.
- [41] Schneider B., Salvaggio A. N., Subirats M. (2002), *Climate Strength: A New Direction of Climate Research*, „Journal of Applied Psychology”, Vol. 87, pp. 220–229.
- [42] Seckler C., Fischer S., Rosing K. (2021), *Who Adopts an Error Management Orientation? Discovering the Role of Humility*, „Academy of Management Discoveries”, Vol. 7, No. 4, pp. 461–481.
- [43] Sridharan M. (2021), *BANI – How To Make Sense of a Chaotic World? Think Insights*, <https://thinkinsights.net/leadership/bani/>, access date: 01.03.2023.
- [44] Steinmann H., Schreyögg G. (1995), *Zarządzanie. Podstawy kierowania przedsiębiorstwem*, Oficyna Wydawnicza Politechniki Wrocławskiej, Wrocław.
- [45] Swart J., Kinnie N., van Rossenberg Y., Yalabik Z. Y. (2014), *Why Should I Share My Knowledge. A Multiple Foci of Commitment Perspective*, „Human Resource Management Journal”, Vol. 24, No. 3, pp. 269–289.
- [46] Syed M. (2017), *Metoda czarnej skrzynki. Zaskakująca prawda o błędach i naturze sukcesu*, Insignis Media, Kraków.
- [47] Szulanski G. (1996), *Exploring Internal Stickiness: Impediments to the Transfer of Best Practice within the Firm*, „Strategic Management Journal”, Vol. 17, No. 2, pp. 27–43.
- [48] Ursachi G., Horodnic I. A., Zait A. (2015), *How Reliable are Measurement Scales? External Factors with Indirect Influence on Reliability Estimators*, „Procedia Economics and Finance”, Vol. 20, pp. 679–686.
- [49] van der Rijt J., van de Wiel M. W. J., van den Bossche P., Segers M. S. R., Gijsselaers W. H. (2012), *Contextual Antecedents of Informal Feedback in the Workplace*, „Human Resource Development Quarterly”, Vol. 23, No. 2, pp. 233–257.
- [50] van Dyck C., Baer M., Frese M., Sonnentag S. (2005), *Organizational Error Management Culture and Its Impact on Performance: A Two-study Replication*, „Journal of Applied Psychology”, Vol. 90, No. 6, pp. 1228–1240.
- [51] van Steenbergen E., van Dijk D., Christensen C., Coffeng T., Ellemers N. (2019), *Learn to Build an Error Management Culture*, „Journal of Financial Regulation and Compliance”, Vol. 28, No. 1, pp. 57–73.
- [52] Varella P., Javidan M., Waldman D. A. (2012), *A Model of Instrumental Networks: The Roles of Socialized Charismatic Leadership and Group Behavior*, „Organization Science”, Vol. 23, pp. 582–595.





- [53] Waitley D. (1996), *Podwójne zwycięstwo*, Logos, Warszawa.
- [54] Wontorczyk A. (2020), *Błędy w procesie pracy i sposoby im zapobiegania*, [w:] B. Rożnowski, P. Fortuna (red.), *Psychologia biznesu*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa, s. 173–191.

## **Kształtowanie kultury uczenia się na błędach – analiza możliwości i zagrożeń**

---

### **Streszczenie**

Celem artykułu jest odpowiedź na pytania: jak budować kulturę, w której możliwe jest uczenie się na błędach? Czy organizacje są zdolne do uczenia się na błędach? Co stanowi możliwość, a co blokadę do takich zachowań? Podstawą do udzielenia odpowiedzi na pytania jest analiza literatury przedmiotu i weryfikacja wyciągniętych wniosków w badaniu empirycznym. Wzięto pod uwagę informacje od 116 pracowników administracyjnych czterech organizacji

produkcyjno-usługowych działających w północno-zachodniej Polsce. W wyniku przeprowadzonego badania stwierdzono, że kulturę uczenia się na błędach można oprzeć na trzech filarach: bezpieczeństwie psychologicznym, otwartości komunikacyjnej i współpracy między pracownikami. Największą barierę stanowi budowanie otwartości organizacyjnej. Stwierdzono, że wsparciem w procesie budowania kultury uczenia się na błędach mogą być praktyki kadrowe nakierowane na zaangażowanie organizacyjne. Konieczne jest większe propagowanie idei uczenia się na błędach, ponieważ uzyskane wyniki wskazują, że tylko część pracowników dostrzega symptomy takich inicjatyw w organizacji. Systemowe wsparcie pracowników musi opierać się na modernizacji zorientowanych na zaangażowanie rozwiązań kadrowych.

### **Słowa kluczowe**

błąd, kultura uczenia się na błędach, środowisko pracy, praktyki kadrowe, zaangażowanie organizacyjne

---