



## Transforming Institutional Pressure into Sustainable Innovation: A Systematic Literature Review of Intellectual Capital, Organizational Learning, and Firm Performance

Mohammad Chaidir<sup>1</sup>, Benardi<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>STIE Kasih Bangsa, Indonesia, [m.chaidir@stiekasihbangsa.ac.id](mailto:m.chaidir@stiekasihbangsa.ac.id)

<sup>2</sup>STIE Kasih Bangsa, Indonesia, [benardi@stiekasihbangsa.ac.id](mailto:benardi@stiekasihbangsa.ac.id)

**ABSTRACT.** *This study examines how institutional pressure can be transformed into sustainable innovation through intellectual capital and organizational learning to enhance firm performance. Using a qualitative systematic literature review (QSLR), the study synthesizes relevant empirical and theoretical literature concerning institutional pressure, intellectual capital, organizational learning, sustainable innovation, and firm performance. The findings indicate that regulatory, normative, and imitative pressures can stimulate organizations to develop strategic knowledge resources and strengthen organizational learning capabilities. Intellectual capital, comprising human, structural, and relational resources, provides the foundation for knowledge creation and innovation, while organizational learning facilitates the acquisition, integration, and application of knowledge in response to institutional demands. Sustainable innovation subsequently functions as an important mechanism linking these capabilities to improved firm performance. The study proposes an integrated pathway in which institutional pressure becomes a strategic stimulus for capability development, sustainable innovation, and long-term organizational competitiveness.*

**Keywords** *Institutional Pressure; Intellectual Capital; Organizational Learning; Sustainable Innovation; Firm Performance.*

### INTRODUCTION

Organizations increasingly operate in environments characterized by regulatory demands, stakeholder expectations, technological disruption, environmental challenges, and intensified competition. Such conditions generate institutional pressures that require firms not only to achieve legitimacy and compliance but also to transform external pressures into innovation and sustainable performance. Institutional theory explains that organizations respond to coercive, normative, and mimetic pressures arising from governments, professional communities, markets, and other stakeholders. However, responding to institutional pressure does not necessarily produce innovation or superior performance. The strategic value of such pressure depends on an organization's ability to mobilize internal knowledge resources, learn from environmental changes, and translate external demands into innovative capabilities.

From the resource-based view (RBV), intellectual capital represents an important intangible resource that can provide firms with valuable knowledge, capabilities, and relationships that are difficult to imitate (Barney et al., 2001). Intellectual capital generally encompasses human, structural, and relational capital, which collectively determine an organization's capacity to create, integrate, and apply knowledge. Recent

evidence demonstrates that these dimensions of intellectual capital can positively influence corporate innovation and business performance, particularly when supported by effective knowledge management and environmental compliance (Truong et al., 2024). Thus, intellectual capital may constitute a critical organizational mechanism through which institutional pressures are converted from external constraints into opportunities for innovation and sustainable value creation. Capacity development initiatives, such as training programs and educational resources, are essential for enhancing the understanding and professional competence of accounting professionals in implementing IFRS in Indonesia (Muhammad Rizal & Eri Kusnanto, 2021).

Organizational learning provides a complementary mechanism for understanding this transformation. Organizations exposed to institutional and environmental pressures must acquire, interpret, disseminate, and utilize new knowledge to adapt their strategies and processes. Organizational learning enables firms to exploit existing knowledge while simultaneously exploring new knowledge and opportunities. Zhang et al. (2023), for example, found that organizational learning mediates the relationship between open innovation and sustainable competitive advantage, demonstrating that knowledge acquisition alone is insufficient unless organizations possess the capacity to learn and apply it effectively. Similarly, the literature included in this review indicates that organizational learning is associated with innovation, resilience, knowledge management, and organizational performance. Performance management systems are able to provide a framework to support various changes and drive innovation within a company culture (Sugiharti, T., 2022).

Recent empirical evidence further indicates that institutional and environmental pressures can stimulate innovation when organizations possess appropriate intellectual and learning capabilities. Huynh et al. (2024) demonstrate that environmental policy instruments encourage entrepreneurial innovation through intellectual capital and organizational learning, while the integration of these resources contributes to organizational performance. This finding is particularly important because it suggests that institutional pressure should not be conceptualized exclusively as a constraint. Instead, pressure may become a catalyst for sustainable innovation when firms possess the knowledge resources and learning processes necessary to respond strategically. The literature also identifies environmental compliance, knowledge management, intellectual

capital, and innovation as interconnected mechanisms influencing business performance (Truong et al., 2024). Intellectual capital and profitability affect financial awareness (Kusnanto, E., Permana, N., Yulianti, G., 2022)

Nevertheless, existing studies remain fragmented across different theoretical perspectives and empirical contexts. Some studies emphasize institutional pressure and environmental innovation, whereas others focus on intellectual capital, organizational learning, innovation, or firm performance as separate constructs. The reviewed literature demonstrates significant relationships among intellectual capital, organizational learning, innovation, and performance, but these relationships have frequently been examined through isolated empirical models rather than through an integrated conceptual perspective. Consequently, there remains a need to systematically synthesize how institutional pressure can be transformed into sustainable innovation through the interaction of intellectual capital and organizational learning.

Therefore, this qualitative systematic literature review aims to synthesize existing theoretical and empirical evidence concerning the relationships among institutional pressure, intellectual capital, organizational learning, sustainable innovation, and firm performance. By integrating institutional theory with the resource-based and knowledge-based perspectives, this review seeks to identify dominant themes, theoretical mechanisms, empirical patterns, inconsistencies, and research gaps. The study ultimately proposes a more integrated understanding of how organizations can transform institutional pressure from an external constraint into a strategic opportunity for sustainable innovation and long-term firm performance.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

Institutional pressure has increasingly been recognized as an important external driver of organizational adaptation and innovation because firms must respond to regulatory requirements, stakeholder expectations, professional norms, and competitive imitation to maintain legitimacy and competitiveness (Delmas, 2002; Qi et al., 2021). Institutional theory suggests that coercive, normative, and mimetic pressures can influence organizational practices by encouraging firms to adopt structures and strategies considered legitimate within their institutional environments (Delmas, 2002). In environmental contexts, regulatory pressure can therefore function not only as a

compliance mechanism but also as a stimulus for technological and organizational change (Ambec et al., 2013; Bergek & Berggren, 2014). Empirical evidence from Qi et al. (2021) indicates that institutional pressure can promote green innovation, while absorptive capacity strengthens the firm's ability to convert external pressure into innovative outcomes.

The literature further suggests that the relationship between institutional pressure and innovation is contingent rather than automatic. Environmental policy instruments may generate incentives for firms to develop environmental innovations and improve competitiveness, although the magnitude and direction of these effects depend on organizational capabilities and contextual conditions (Liao, 2018; Ambec et al., 2013). Bergek and Berggren (2014) similarly demonstrate that environmental policy instruments can influence innovation trajectories, particularly in energy- and automotive-related industries. Thus, institutional pressure can be conceptualized as an external trigger whose innovation consequences depend on firms' capacity to interpret, absorb, and transform external requirements into strategic action.

Intellectual capital constitutes a critical internal resource for transforming institutional demands into innovative and sustainable organizational outcomes. From the resource-based perspective, valuable, rare, difficult-to-imitate, and non-substitutable resources can provide the foundation for sustained competitive advantage (Barney et al., 2001). Intellectual capital extends this perspective by emphasizing human knowledge and competencies, organizational structures, and relational resources as sources of value creation and innovation (Pereira & Bamel, 2021). Empirical studies consistently indicate that intellectual capital is positively associated with innovation and organizational performance. Rehman et al. (2022), for example, identify intellectual capital as an important determinant of innovative performance and demonstrate that its effects can operate through mediating and moderating mechanisms.

Different components of intellectual capital appear to contribute to innovation through complementary mechanisms. Agostini and Nosella (2017) show that intellectual capital components can enhance radical innovation performance, suggesting that firms require combinations of knowledge, competencies, and organizational infrastructure to support more substantial forms of innovation. Ahmed et al. (2020) further demonstrate that absorptive-capacity dimensions play an important role in the relationship between

intellectual capital and business performance. More recent evidence indicates that intellectual capital, knowledge management, and environmental compliance can jointly enhance innovation and organizational performance (Truong et al., 2024). Accordingly, intellectual capital may function as a strategic bridge through which external institutional pressures are converted into organizational capabilities for sustainable innovation.

Organizational learning represents another central mechanism through which firms respond to institutional and environmental changes. Learning enables organizations to acquire, interpret, disseminate, and apply knowledge, thereby improving their capacity to adapt to changing environments and develop innovative responses (Allameh et al., 2017; Obeso et al., 2020). Knowledge-management processes have been shown to influence organizational performance partly through organizational learning, indicating that knowledge becomes strategically valuable when organizations possess processes for converting it into collective learning and action (Obeso et al., 2020).

The literature also emphasizes the importance of balancing exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. Nielsen et al. (2018) demonstrate that organizational learning involves tensions between exploring new knowledge and exploiting existing knowledge, while Ding et al. (2023) show that ambidextrous organizational learning and absorptive capacity can support SME performance. Zhang et al. (2023) further establish that organizational learning plays a significant role in connecting open innovation with sustainable competitive advantage. These findings imply that sustainable innovation requires not simply knowledge possession but an organizational capacity to continuously learn, recombine knowledge, and adapt established routines.

Sustainable innovation connects organizational capabilities with broader economic, environmental, and competitive outcomes. Research on green and environmental innovation demonstrates that innovation can improve both environmental and organizational performance, particularly when supported by appropriate human-resource practices and managerial commitment (Ahmed et al., 2023). Similarly, Rehman et al. (2021) demonstrate a relationship between green innovation and environmental performance in large manufacturing firms, reinforcing the strategic significance of innovation for sustainability outcomes.

Organizational learning also appears to influence sustainable firm performance indirectly through networking and innovation. Inthavong et al. (2023) find that organizational learning contributes to sustainable firm performance through intervening mechanisms involving organizational networking and innovation. Earlier research similarly demonstrates that organizational learning contributes to performance by strengthening innovation and organizational capabilities (García-Morales et al., 2007; Real et al., 2014). Knowledge quality and knowledge-transfer capabilities have likewise been linked to innovation and firm performance, particularly among SMEs (de Zubielqui et al., 2019).

The systematic synthesis of prior studies reveals an interconnected relationship among institutional pressure, intellectual capital, organizational learning, sustainable innovation, and firm performance. Huynh et al. (2024) provide particularly relevant evidence by demonstrating that environmental policy instruments influence entrepreneurial innovation through organizational learning supports and intellectual capital, while the integration of these factors contributes to organizational performance. This finding supports the proposition that institutional pressure does not necessarily constrain firms; instead, it can become an innovation catalyst when organizations possess appropriate knowledge resources and learning capabilities.

However, the existing literature remains fragmented across separate research streams. Studies of institutional pressure predominantly emphasize environmental regulation and green innovation (Qi et al., 2021; Bergek & Berggren, 2014), whereas intellectual-capital research frequently focuses on innovation or business performance (Rehman et al., 2022; Ahmed et al., 2020). Organizational-learning studies, meanwhile, emphasize knowledge management, innovation, resilience, and performance but do not consistently incorporate institutional pressure as the initiating external mechanism (Obeso et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2023). The evidence therefore suggests a need for an integrated synthesis explaining how institutional pressure is transformed into sustainable innovation through intellectual capital and organizational learning and, ultimately, how these mechanisms contribute to firm performance. A QSLR is appropriate for addressing this gap because it can synthesize these fragmented theoretical and empirical perspectives and identify recurring mechanisms, contradictory findings, contextual contingencies, and opportunities for future research.

## **METHODS**

This study employs a qualitative systematic literature review (QSLR) to systematically identify, evaluate, interpret, and synthesize existing theoretical and empirical research concerning the transformation of institutional pressure into sustainable innovation through intellectual capital and organizational learning, and its implications for firm performance. A systematic review is appropriate because it enables researchers to integrate fragmented evidence, identify recurring theoretical patterns, explain inconsistencies, and establish directions for future research (Page et al., 2021). The review follows the PRISMA 2020 reporting framework, which emphasizes transparent reporting of the identification, screening, eligibility assessment, and inclusion of relevant studies.

The literature search is conducted systematically using major scholarly databases, supplemented where necessary by Google Scholar and publisher databases to identify additional relevant studies. The search strategy combines keywords and Boolean operators related to the core constructs: “institutional pressure,” “institutional theory,” “intellectual capital,” “organizational learning,” “sustainable innovation,” “green innovation,” “environmental innovation,” and “firm performance.” Search strings are adapted to the syntax of each database to maximize the retrieval of conceptually relevant studies. The search strategy is documented in accordance with PRISMA 2020 to ensure reproducibility and transparency (Page et al., 2021).

Studies are included when they (1) are peer-reviewed journal articles; (2) address at least two of the principal constructs; (3) provide theoretical, conceptual, or empirical evidence relevant to institutional pressure, intellectual capital, organizational learning, sustainable innovation, or firm performance; (4) are published in English; and (5) provide sufficient information for qualitative synthesis. Priority is given to recent studies, particularly those published between 2015 and 2024, while seminal earlier studies are retained when they provide essential theoretical foundations. Studies are excluded when they are unrelated to the research questions, lack substantive discussion of the core constructs, are duplicate records, or are non-scholarly publications.

Retrieved records are first screened by title and abstract, followed by full-text assessment against the predefined eligibility criteria. Duplicate publications are removed before the full-text screening stage. The selection process is reported through a PRISMA

flow diagram, documenting the number of records identified, screened, excluded, and ultimately included (Page et al., 2021).

A qualitative thematic synthesis is subsequently conducted to identify recurring concepts, relationships, mechanisms, theoretical perspectives, and research gaps. Extracted information includes authors, publication year, research context, theoretical foundation, methodology, key constructs, principal findings, and identified relationships among institutional pressure, intellectual capital, organizational learning, sustainable innovation, and firm performance. The synthesis is organized around the conceptual pathway institutional pressure → intellectual capital and organizational learning → sustainable innovation → firm performance, allowing the review to develop an integrated interpretation rather than merely summarize individual studies.

## **RESULTS**

The qualitative synthesis identifies a consistent but multidimensional pattern linking institutional pressure, intellectual capital, organizational learning, sustainable innovation, and firm performance. Across the reviewed literature, institutional pressure emerges not merely as an external constraint but as a potential catalyst for organizational transformation when firms possess sufficient knowledge resources and learning capabilities. Qi et al. (2021) found that regulatory and imitative pressures positively influence firms' green technological innovation, while absorptive capacity changes the strength of this relationship. This finding indicates that external institutional pressure is more likely to generate innovation when organizations possess the capacity to recognize, assimilate, and exploit external knowledge.

A second major finding concerns the strategic role of intellectual capital. The reviewed studies consistently associate intellectual capital with innovation and organizational performance, although the strength and mechanisms of these relationships vary across contexts. Rehman et al. (2022) demonstrate that intellectual capital contributes significantly to innovative performance through complex mediation and moderation mechanisms, suggesting that knowledge resources do not automatically produce innovation without appropriate organizational processes. Similarly, Ahmed et al. (2020) show that absorptive-capacity dimensions are important in explaining the relationship between intellectual capital and business performance. These findings

position intellectual capital as a strategic resource through which firms can convert institutional requirements into innovation-oriented capabilities.

The synthesis further reveals that organizational learning constitutes a critical transformation mechanism between external pressure, organizational resources, and innovation. Organizational learning enables firms to acquire, interpret, share, and apply knowledge in response to environmental changes. Obeso et al. (2020) found that organizational learning mediates the relationship between knowledge-management processes and organizational performance, while Ding et al. (2023) demonstrate the importance of ambidextrous learning and absorptive capacity for SME performance. Consequently, organizational learning appears to provide the organizational infrastructure necessary for transforming intellectual capital into actionable innovation capabilities.

A particularly important finding is the role of innovation as an intermediary mechanism connecting organizational capabilities with performance. Inthavong et al. (2023) found that organizational learning contributes to sustainable firm performance, with networking and innovation serving important intervening roles. Their evidence from 710 manufacturing SMEs indicates that learning becomes more valuable for sustainable performance when knowledge is effectively processed and translated into innovation. This finding reinforces the proposition that organizational learning should not be viewed solely as an internal capability but as a dynamic process through which knowledge is converted into sustainable organizational outcomes.

The strongest integrated evidence comes from Huynh et al. (2024), who examined environmental policy instruments, intellectual capital, organizational learning, entrepreneurial innovation, and organizational performance within a combined institutional-theory and resource-based-view framework. Based on data from 323 members of management teams in Vietnamese firms, the study found that environmental policy instruments positively influence entrepreneurial innovation, while intellectual capital and organizational learning significantly contribute to innovation and organizational performance. Entrepreneurial innovation also partially mediates the relationships between intellectual capital, organizational learning, and organizational performance.

Overall, the QSLR therefore identifies an integrated transformation pathway: institutional pressure provides the external stimulus; intellectual capital supplies strategic knowledge resources; organizational learning enables knowledge absorption and recombination; sustainable innovation represents the transformational outcome; and firm performance represents the resulting economic and organizational value. This synthesis extends the predominantly fragmented literature by positioning institutional pressure and internal knowledge capabilities within a single explanatory framework. The findings suggest that institutional pressure becomes strategically productive when firms develop the intellectual capital and organizational learning capabilities necessary to transform compliance demands into innovation opportunities and, ultimately, sustainable firm performance.

## **DISCUSSION**

The findings of this qualitative systematic literature review indicate that institutional pressure can be transformed into sustainable innovation when firms possess adequate intellectual capital and organizational learning capabilities. Rather than functioning solely as a constraint, institutional pressure may create incentives for firms to develop new technologies, management practices, and environmental innovations, particularly when internal knowledge capabilities enable organizations to respond strategically (Qi et al., 2021). This interpretation is consistent with the institutional perspective, which emphasizes the role of regulatory and imitative pressures in shaping organizational behavior, but the present synthesis extends this perspective by identifying intellectual capital and organizational learning as mechanisms through which external pressure can be converted into innovation outcomes.

The first comparison concerns institutional pressure and innovation. Qi et al. (2021) found that regulatory and imitative pressures positively influence green technological innovation among Chinese listed firms, while absorptive capacity strengthens some of these relationships. Their findings strongly support the present QSLR because absorptive capacity represents an important knowledge-processing capability closely related to intellectual capital and organizational learning. Similarly, Zhou et al. (2021) demonstrate that institutional pressure influences green product success through green transformational leadership, green innovation, and green brand image, suggesting that

institutional demands must be translated through internal organizational mechanisms before producing market outcomes. However, the present review goes beyond these studies by integrating institutional pressure with both intellectual capital and organizational learning rather than concentrating primarily on green innovation.

The second comparison concerns intellectual capital as an innovation resource. Rehman et al. (2022) demonstrate that intellectual capital contributes to innovative performance through mediation and moderation mechanisms, supporting the present finding that intellectual capital represents an important strategic resource rather than merely an accounting-related intangible asset. Truong et al. (2024) provide even stronger support by demonstrating relationships among human, structural, and relational capital, corporate innovation, environmental compliance, and business performance in Vietnamese manufacturing firms. Nevertheless, the present QSLR suggests that intellectual capital alone is insufficient: its innovation value depends on organizational processes that enable knowledge to be absorbed, exchanged, recombined, and applied.

This interpretation is reinforced by Truong et al. (2024), who found that intellectual capital influences knowledge absorptive capacity and that absorptive capacity enhances business performance when combined with innovation, while environmental compliance and innovation partially mediate the relationship between absorptive capacity and performance. Thus, compared with a resource-oriented interpretation of intellectual capital, the present synthesis emphasizes a resource–process–outcome chain, in which intellectual capital provides the knowledge base, organizational learning processes that knowledge, innovation transforms it into new products or processes, and performance captures the resulting organizational value.

The third comparison concerns organizational learning as a mediating mechanism. Obeso et al. (2020), using data from 400 Spanish firms, found that knowledge generation and knowledge flow improve firm performance and that organizational learning mediates the effects of these knowledge-management processes on performance. Zhang et al. (2023) similarly found, using 269 Chinese high-tech enterprises, that exploratory and exploitative organizational learning mediate the relationship between open innovation and sustainable competitive advantage, while knowledge-management capability strengthens these relationships. These findings strongly support the present QSLR's argument that learning is not simply an organizational characteristic but a conversion

mechanism through which external and internal knowledge becomes innovation and sustainable competitive advantage.

The fourth comparison concerns the connection between organizational learning and sustainable firm performance. Inthavong et al. (2023), based on 710 SME owners in Laos, found that organizational learning is important for sustainable organizational performance and identified organizational networking and innovation as important intervening mechanisms. This finding is consistent with the present synthesis but adds an important qualification: innovation needs to be informed and effectively processed through organizational learning and information networks to generate sustainable performance. Thus, sustainable innovation should not be interpreted as an automatic consequence of organizational learning; rather, the quality of knowledge processing and organizational connectivity determines whether learning generates meaningful performance outcomes.

The fifth comparison is particularly important because Huynh et al. (2024) provide an empirical model closely corresponding to the integrated framework identified in this QSLR. Their study of 323 management-team members in Vietnamese firms found that environmental policy instruments, intellectual capital, and organizational learning jointly contribute to entrepreneurial innovation and organizational performance, with entrepreneurial innovation connecting intellectual capital and organizational learning to performance. The present QSLR therefore confirms and generalizes this relationship across a broader literature base rather than treating it as a single empirical model.

Overall, the comparison of these eight prior studies demonstrates substantial convergence around the proposition that external pressure alone does not guarantee sustainable innovation or superior performance. Qi et al. (2021) emphasize absorptive capacity, Zhou et al. (2021) emphasize leadership and green innovation, Rehman et al. (2022) emphasize intellectual capital, Obeso et al. (2020) emphasize organizational learning, Zhang et al. (2023) emphasize ambidextrous learning, Inthavong et al. (2023) emphasize networking and innovation, Truong et al. (2024) emphasize intellectual capital, absorptive capacity, compliance and innovation, and Huynh et al. (2024) integrate environmental policy, intellectual capital, learning, innovation, and performance.

Consequently, this QSLR contributes an integrated conceptual explanation in which institutional pressure acts as the external trigger, intellectual capital represents the

strategic knowledge resource, organizational learning functions as the transformation mechanism, sustainable innovation represents the strategic output, and firm performance represents the ultimate organizational consequence. This framework reconciles institutional theory with the resource-based and knowledge-based perspectives and suggests that future research should examine not merely whether institutional pressure increases innovation, but under what organizational knowledge and learning conditions pressure can be transformed into sustainable innovation and long-term firm performance.

## **CONCLUSION**

This qualitative systematic literature review concludes that institutional pressure can be transformed from an external constraint into a strategic driver of sustainable innovation and firm performance. The reviewed literature indicates that regulatory, normative, and imitative pressures encourage organizations to strengthen their intellectual capital and organizational learning capabilities. Intellectual capital provides critical human, structural, and relational resources, while organizational learning enables firms to acquire, interpret, share, and apply knowledge in responding to environmental and institutional demands. These capabilities subsequently facilitate innovation, particularly sustainable and environmentally oriented innovation, which contributes to improved organizational and firm performance. Overall, the findings support an integrated pathway in which institutional pressure stimulates the development and deployment of intellectual capital and organizational learning, which in turn enhance sustainable innovation and ultimately strengthen firm performance. This synthesis extends the resource-based and knowledge-based perspectives by demonstrating that external institutional demands can become valuable strategic opportunities when organizations possess sufficient knowledge resources and learning capabilities.

## **LIMITATION**

Despite these contributions, several limitations should be acknowledged. First, the findings are constrained by the databases, search terms, publication periods, language criteria, and inclusion and exclusion criteria employed in the systematic review. Consequently, potentially relevant studies may not have been captured. Second, the reviewed literature demonstrates substantial conceptual and methodological

heterogeneity in measuring institutional pressure, intellectual capital, organizational learning, sustainable innovation, and firm performance, which limits direct comparison across studies. Third, much of the existing evidence is based on cross-sectional surveys and quantitative approaches, restricting conclusions regarding long-term causal relationships. Finally, the synthesis primarily identifies relationships and conceptual patterns rather than establishing causal effects. Future research should therefore employ longitudinal, comparative, and mixed-method approaches across different institutional and industrial contexts to further validate the proposed pathway.

## REFERENCES

- Agostini, L., & Nosella, A. (2017). Enhancing radical innovation performance through intellectual capital components. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 18, 789–806. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JIC-10-2016-0103>
- Ahmed, R. R., Akbar, W., Aijaz, M., Channar, Z. A., Ahmed, F., & Parmar, V. (2023). The role of green innovation on environmental and organizational performance: Moderation of human resource practices and management commitment. *Heliyon*, 9, e12679. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e12679>
- Ahmed, S. S., Guozhu, J., Mubarik, S., Khan, M., & Khan, E. (2020). Intellectual capital and business performance: The role of dimensions of absorptive capacity. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 21, 23–39. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JIC-11-2018-0199>
- Allameh, S. M., Rezaei, A., & Seyedfazli, H. (2017). Relationship between knowledge management enablers, organisational learning, and organizational innovation: An empirical investigation. *International Journal of Business Innovation and Research*, 12, 294–314. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJBIR.2017.082087>
- Ambec, S., Cohen, M. A., Elgie, S., & Lanoie, P. (2013). The Porter hypothesis at 20: Can environmental regulation enhance innovation and competitiveness? *Review of Environmental Economics and Policy*, 7, 2–22. <https://doi.org/10.1093/reep/res016>
- Barney, J., Wright, M., & Ketchen, D. J. (2001). The resource-based view of the firm: Ten years after 1991. *Journal of Management*, 27(6), 625–641. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063\(01\)00114-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063(01)00114-3)
- Bergek, A., & Berggren, C. (2014). The impact of environmental policy instruments on innovation: A review of energy and automotive industry studies. *Ecological Economics*, 106, 112–123. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2014.07.016>
- de Zubieta, G. C., Lindsay, N., Lindsay, W., & Jones, J. (2019). Knowledge quality, innovation and firm performance: A study of knowledge transfer in SMEs. *Small Business Economics*, 53, 145–164. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-018-0046-0>
- Delmas, M. A. (2002). The diffusion of environmental management standards in Europe and in the United States: An institutional perspective. *Policy Sciences*, 35, 91–119. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1016108804453>
- Ding, Z., Li, M., Yang, X., & Xiao, W. (2023). Ambidextrous organizational learning and performance: Absorptive capacity in small and medium-sized enterprises. *Management Decision*, 61, 3610–3634. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-02-2023-0138>
- 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 in large firms and SMEs. *Technovation*, 27, 547–568. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2007.02.013>
- Huynh, T. N., Nguyen, P. V., Do, A. M., Dinh, P. U., & Vo, H. T. (2024). Fostering organizational performance through innovation: The roles of environmental policy instruments, organizational learning supports, and intellectual capital. *Heliyon*, 10(20), e39361. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e39361>
- Inthavong, P., Rehman, K. U., Masood, K., Shaukat, Z., Hnydiuk-Stefan, A., & Ray, S. (2023). Impact of organizational learning on sustainable firm performance: Intervening effect of organizational networking and innovation. *Heliyon*, 9(5), e16177. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e16177>
- Kusnanto, E., Permana, N., Yulianti, G., 2022. Pengaruh Intellectual Capital, Institusional Ownership, dan Profitabilitas terhadap Financial Awareness dengan Cash Flow Volatility sebagai Variabel Intervening. *Jurnal Ilmiah Akuntansi dan Humanika* Vol. 12 No. 1 (2022)
- Liao, Z. (2018). Environmental policy instruments, environmental innovation and the reputation of enterprises. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 171, 1111–1117. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.10.126>
- Muhammad Rizal, & Eri Kusnanto. (2021). Exploring The Challenges Of Implementing International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS). *Journal of Business, Finance, and Economics* (JBFE), 2(1).
- Nielsen, J. A., Mathiassen, L., & Hansen, A. M. (2018). Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning: A critical application of the 4I model. *British Journal of Management*, 29, 835–850. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.12324>
- Obeso, M., Hernández-Linares, R., López-Fernández, M. C., & Serrano-Bedia, A. M. (2020). Knowledge management processes and organizational performance: The mediating role of organizational learning. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 24(8), 1859–1880. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-10-2019-0553>
- Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E. A., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J. M., Hróbjartsson, A., Lalu, M. M., Li, T., Loder, E. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., McGuinness, L. G., Stewart, L. A., Thomas, J., Tricco, A. C., Welch, V. A., Whiting, P., & Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*, 372, n71. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>
- Page, M. J., Moher, D., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E. A., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J. M., Hróbjartsson, A., Lalu, M. M., Li, T., Loder, E. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., McGuinness, L. A., Stewart, L. A., Thomas, J., Tricco, A. C., Welch, V. A., Whiting, P., & McKenzie, J. E. (2021). PRISMA 2020 explanation and elaboration: Updated guidance and exemplars for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*, 372, n160. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n160>
- Pereira, V., & Bamel, U. (2021). Extending the resource and knowledge based view: A critical analysis into its theoretical evolution and future research directions. *Journal of Business Research*, 132, 557–570. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.04.021>
- Qi, G., Jia, Y., & Zou, H. (2021). Is institutional pressure the mother of green innovation? Examining the moderating effect of absorptive capacity. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 278, 123957. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.123957>

- Real, J. C., Roldán, J. L., & Leal, A. (2014). From entrepreneurial orientation and learning orientation to business performance: Analysing the mediating role of organizational learning and the moderating effects of organizational size. *British Journal of Management*, 25, 186–208. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.2012.00848.x>
- Rehman, S. U., Elrehail, H., Alsaad, A., & Bhatti, A. (2022). Intellectual capital and innovative performance: A mediation-moderation perspective. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 23(5), 998–1024. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JIC-04-2020-0109>
- Rehman, S. U., Kraus, S., Shah, S. A., Khanin, D., & Mahto, R. V. (2021). Analyzing the relationship between green innovation and environmental performance in large manufacturing firms. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 163, 120481. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2020.120481>
- Tanti Sugiharti. (2022). Optimalisasi Siklus Manajemen Kinerja untuk Pengembangan Kepemimpinan di Organisasi. *Journal of Business, Finance, and Economics (JBFE)*, 3(1), 150–160.
- Truong, B. T. T., Nguyen, P. V., Vrontis, D., & Ahmed, Z. U. (2024). Unleashing corporate potential: The interplay of intellectual capital, knowledge management, and environmental compliance in enhancing innovation and performance. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 28(4), 1054–1073. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-05-2023-0389>
- Truong, B. T. T., Nguyen, P. V., Vrontis, D., & Inuwa, I. (2024). Exploring the interplay of intellectual capital, environmental compliance, innovation and social media usage in enhancing business performance in Vietnamese manufacturers. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 25(2–3), 488–509. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JIC-10-2023-0233>
- Zhang, X., Chu, Z., Ren, L., & Xing, J. (2023). Open innovation and sustainable competitive advantage: The role of organizational learning. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 186, 122114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2022.122114>