



TECHNIUM
SOCIAL SCIENCES JOURNAL

www.techniumscience.com



Vol. 67/2025
A New Decade for Social Changes

PLUS
COMMUNICATION



International
Communication & PR

Learning organization in social work institutions

Loredana-Ileana Vîșcu¹, Dana Rad², Ioana Eva Cădariu³, Florentina-Anica Pinte⁴

¹Faculty of Psychology, Tibiscus University of Timișoara; Institute of Psychotherapy, Psychological Counseling, and Clinical Supervision, Reșița, Romania, ²Center of Research Development and Innovation in Psychology, Faculty of Educational Sciences, Psychology, and Social Sciences, Aurel Vlaicu University of Arad, Romania, ³Faculty of Psychology, Tibiscus University of Timișoara; Institute of Psychotherapy, Psychological Counseling, and Clinical Supervision, ⁴Faculty of Computers and Applied Informatics, Tibiscus University of Timișoara; Multidisciplinary Informatics Research Center UTT; Institute of Psychotherapy, Psychological Counseling, and Clinical Supervision, florentina.pinte@tibiscus.ro

loredana.viscu@gmail.com, dana@xhouse.ro, cadariuioanaeva@yahoo.com, cadariuioanaeva@yahoo.com

Abstract. Organizational culture plays a critical role in shaping the values, behaviors, and operational dynamics of social work institutions. This paper explores the multifaceted nature of organizational culture, emphasizing its impact on institutional effectiveness, adaptability, and sustainability. Drawing on theoretical frameworks and empirical studies, the analysis highlights the interplay between organizational values, leadership, supervision, and innovation in fostering a learning-oriented and inclusive environment. Challenges such as resource constraints, resistance to change, and staff burnout are examined alongside opportunities for growth through technological integration and authenticity. The discussion underscores the need for a balanced approach that combines stability with innovation to address evolving societal needs. The findings offer valuable insights for policymakers, practitioners, and educators, providing a foundation for building resilient and adaptive social work institutions.

Keywords. organizational culture; social work institutions; learning organization; leadership and innovation

1. Introduction

Recent advancements in organizational culture, leadership, and resilience research have highlighted their critical roles in shaping effective learning organizations, particularly in social work institutions. Studies have examined the interplay between behavioral AI (Rad, 2025), digital education resources (Mara et al., 2024), humanistic approaches to technology (Lile et al., 2024), and innovative pedagogical strategies (Rad et al., 2024a; Rad et al., 2024b). Comprehensive reviews have explored learning organizations (Rad & Bocoș, 2024), cognitive emotion regulation (Marici et al., 2024), and problem-solving strategies (Purcar et al., 2024). Empirical research has focused on feedback mechanisms (Câmpean et al., 2024), aversion loss

(Marcu et al., 2024), and supervision processes in social work (Vişcu & Rad, 2024a, 2024b, 2024c, 2024d). Advances in psychological modeling have been applied to decision adoption systems (Rad et al., 2023a), deception detection (Rad et al., 2024c), and physiological profiling (Rad et al., 2024d). Related studies have addressed students' academic success (Gana et al., 2023), network analysis of narcissism (Runcan et al., 2023), and maladaptive cognitive schemas (Delcea et al., 2023). In addition, graph theory applications (Venkatraman et al., 2021) and polygraph testing models (Rad et al., 2024e) have provided novel insights into behavioral patterns and predictive frameworks. Together, these works form a robust foundation for analyzing how social work institutions can integrate resilience, innovation, and organizational learning to adapt to contemporary challenges.

The concept of the learning organization has evolved as a cornerstone of modern organizational theory and practice, particularly in dynamic and uncertain environments. Social work institutions, situated at the confluence of complex societal issues and rapid systemic changes, exemplify the necessity for adaptability and continuous learning. These institutions operate in a context that demands responsiveness to evolving client needs, policy shifts, and socio-economic transformations. A learning organization framework enables them to not only navigate these complexities but also to thrive by fostering a culture of shared learning, innovation, and resilience (Örtenblad, 2018; Rowley & Gibbs, 2008).

In essence, a learning organization integrates individual and collective learning processes into its structural and operational fabric. It is characterized by its ability to adapt swiftly, correct errors proactively, and pursue continuous improvement (Argyris & Schön, 1996). This paradigm is particularly relevant for social work institutions, where the stakes involve human welfare, social justice, and community well-being. By embracing the principles of a learning organization, these institutions can build adaptive capacities that align with their mission to address diverse and often unpredictable challenges.

At its core, the idea of a learning organization is rooted in the interplay between individual learning and its collective manifestation within an institutional context (Edmondson & Moingeon, 1998). Individual learning becomes organizational learning when knowledge, insights, and practices are systematically shared and integrated across the institution (Huysman, 2000). This interconnection facilitates a shift from isolated problem-solving to a cohesive strategy of innovation and change. In social work institutions, this is reflected in the way practitioners, administrators, and stakeholders collaboratively generate solutions informed by both empirical evidence and experiential wisdom (Palos & Veres Stancovici, 2016).

Organizational learning is not merely a response to external stimuli; it also involves internal processes that challenge assumptions, foster critical reflection, and encourage experimentation. These processes are particularly vital in social work, where ethical dilemmas, cultural diversity, and systemic inequalities necessitate nuanced and informed approaches. A learning organization thrives on its capacity to balance stability with adaptability, ensuring that its core values remain intact while its methods evolve in response to emerging realities (Örtenblad & Koris, 2014).

Leadership plays a pivotal role in cultivating a learning organization. Effective leaders in social work institutions act as facilitators, mentors, and visionaries who inspire a culture of trust, openness, and mutual respect (Ponnuswamy & Manohar, 2016). They empower individuals to contribute their insights and foster an environment where mistakes are viewed as opportunities for growth rather than as failures. In this way, leadership transcends traditional hierarchies and becomes a catalyst for collective learning (Coopey, 1995).

Moreover, leaders in social work must navigate the inherent tensions between immediate service delivery and long-term capacity building. By adopting a learning organization approach, they can integrate strategic thinking into daily operations, ensuring that the institution remains both responsive and sustainable. This requires a commitment to professional development, interdisciplinary collaboration, and the alignment of organizational goals with broader societal objectives (Bowen et al., 2007).

Knowledge management is a critical component of a learning organization, particularly in fields such as social work that rely heavily on information exchange and evidence-based practice. In this context, knowledge is not only a resource to be utilized but also a dynamic process that involves the creation, dissemination, and application of insights (Gagnon et al., 2015). Social work institutions benefit from systems that enable the documentation of best practices, the evaluation of program outcomes, and the continuous refinement of interventions.

The integration of knowledge management into the organizational culture of social work institutions ensures that learning is not confined to individual experiences but is institutionalized as a collective asset. This process enhances decision-making, supports effective resource allocation, and fosters innovation (Rowley & Gibbs, 2008). Furthermore, it bridges the gap between theory and practice, enabling practitioners to translate academic research into actionable strategies.

While the concept of a learning organization offers a compelling vision, its implementation in social work institutions is not without challenges. Structural barriers such as limited resources, bureaucratic constraints, and resistance to change can impede the adoption of learning-oriented practices (Örtenblad, 2018). Additionally, the emotional and psychological demands of social work can create burnout and reduce the capacity for reflective practice (Palos & Veres Stancovici, 2016). Recent developments in Artificial Intelligence research have brought major changes in most areas of human activity and interaction. It holds immense potential to revolutionize how we live, work, and communicate. (Ciorba & Pinte, 2020).

Despite these challenges, the transition to a learning organization presents significant opportunities. By prioritizing learning, social work institutions can enhance their adaptability, foster a sense of community among staff and clients, and improve service quality (Bowen et al., 2007). Furthermore, a commitment to learning aligns with the ethical imperatives of social work, including the pursuit of social justice, the promotion of human dignity, and the empowerment of marginalized groups.

From a philosophical perspective, the learning organization embodies a commitment to growth, self-awareness, and interconnectedness. It reflects a worldview that values curiosity, humility, and the recognition of human fallibility (Argyris & Schön, 1996). In social work, this translates into an approach that embraces complexity, honors diverse perspectives, and seeks holistic solutions to societal challenges.

The learning organization also challenges traditional notions of authority and expertise, emphasizing instead the collective intelligence of the group. This democratization of knowledge resonates with the core principles of social work, which advocate for participatory decision-making, empowerment, and inclusivity (Edmondson & Moingeon, 1998). By fostering a learning organization culture, social work institutions not only enhance their effectiveness but also model the values they seek to promote in society.

In the ever-changing landscape of social work, the concept of a learning organization provides a robust framework for addressing complexity, fostering innovation, and promoting resilience. By integrating individual and collective learning processes, these institutions can

navigate challenges with agility and purpose. Leadership, knowledge management, and a commitment to continuous improvement are essential components of this transformation.

Ultimately, the learning organization represents more than an operational strategy; it is a philosophical commitment to growth, adaptability, and shared purpose. For social work institutions, this commitment aligns seamlessly with their mission to create a more equitable, compassionate, and empowered society. Through the principles of a learning organization, social work can continue to evolve as a dynamic and transformative field.

2. Organizational culture in social work

Organizational culture is the backbone of any institution, guiding the behavior, decision-making processes, and overall goals of its members. In social work, organizational culture becomes even more critical as it directly impacts the delivery of services, the effectiveness of interventions, and the satisfaction of both employees and beneficiaries. As Serrat and Serrat (2017) noted, a robust organizational culture fosters resilience, adaptability, and continuous improvement, particularly in fields that require a high degree of emotional labor and responsiveness to societal challenges.

Organizational culture is often described as "the way we do things here," reflecting its function as an integrative framework (Schein, 1999). This definition captures both its tangible and intangible elements, from visible artifacts like policies and office layouts to deeply ingrained values and assumptions that drive organizational behavior. Wei Choo (2001) emphasized that organizational culture is essential in creating learning environments where knowledge is not only shared but also used as a resource for continuous improvement.

In social work institutions, this cultural framework supports the organization's mission of promoting human dignity, social inclusion, and equity. As Runcan and Iovu (2020) argued, organizational culture is central to fostering environments that empower professionals and clients alike, ensuring that social work institutions remain aligned with their ethical commitments and societal responsibilities.

Values and principles form the foundation of organizational culture. In social work, these include commitments to social justice, client autonomy, and cultural sensitivity. These values are not only theoretical but are actively practiced through policies, service delivery models, and staff interactions. For example, Candy (1996) highlighted the importance of lifelong learning as a value within organizations, advocating for continuous professional development as a means to adapt to evolving societal needs.

These principles are further reinforced by norms that shape day-to-day behavior. According to Bowen, Rose, and Ware (2006), norms act as the unwritten rules of engagement within an organization, fostering consistency and mutual respect among team members. In social work, these norms guide interactions with clients and colleagues, ensuring ethical practice and the maintenance of professional boundaries.

Social work organizations often encompass various subcultures, formed around specific roles, client populations, or professional disciplines. While these subcultures can contribute to innovation, they may also create tension if their values or practices diverge from the dominant organizational culture. Bui and Baruch (2010) highlighted the importance of integrating these subcultures into a cohesive organizational framework to harness their strengths without compromising unity.

For instance, departments focused on children's services may prioritize different strategies than those working with elderly populations. Effective leadership is essential in

managing these differences, ensuring alignment with the organization's overarching mission while respecting the unique contributions of each subculture (Malik & Garg, 2020).

Organizational culture does not exist in a vacuum; it is shaped by both internal and external contexts. Internally, the physical environment, organizational structure, and resource availability all play a role in defining cultural norms. Externally, societal attitudes, policy frameworks, and funding models exert significant influence. As Runcan, Marici, and Rad (2024) observed, social work organizations must navigate these contextual factors to remain effective and responsive.

Physical environments, such as open office layouts, can promote collaboration and transparency, while isolated workspaces may hinder communication. Similarly, policies that emphasize inclusivity and equity reinforce cultural values, creating a supportive environment for both staff and clients (Sackmann, Eggenhofer-Rehart, & Friesl, 2009).

Organizational culture and climate are often interrelated, yet distinct concepts. While culture represents the deeper, enduring values and norms of an organization, climate refers to the collective perception of the work environment at a given time. In social work, a positive organizational climate can enhance job satisfaction, reduce burnout, and improve service delivery outcomes (Jamali & Sidani, 2008).

Roper and Pettit (2002) suggested that fostering a learning organization can significantly impact organizational climate by promoting adaptability, innovation, and employee engagement. In social work settings, this might involve creating spaces for reflection, encouraging collaborative problem-solving, and providing ongoing professional development opportunities.

Measuring organizational culture poses unique challenges due to its complex, multilayered nature. Traditional quantitative tools, such as surveys, may capture aspects of organizational climate but often fall short in assessing deeper cultural elements. Sackmann et al. (2009) recommended qualitative methods, such as structured interviews and observations, to uncover the shared values and assumptions that define an organization's culture.

In social work, cultural change is particularly challenging given the deeply ingrained values and practices that underpin the profession. However, as Malik and Garg (2020) noted, organizations that adopt a learning orientation are better positioned to navigate these changes. For example, integrating trauma-informed care principles requires not only training but also shifts in organizational policies, communication styles, and leadership approaches.

Leadership plays a pivotal role in shaping and sustaining organizational culture. Effective leaders act as stewards of the organization's values, modeling ethical behavior and fostering an environment of trust and inclusivity. As Confessore and Kops (1998) emphasized, leaders must also be facilitators of learning, encouraging staff to engage in self-directed professional development and reflective practice.

In social work, this involves balancing the need for stability with the imperative for change. Leaders must navigate complex challenges, such as integrating evidence-based practices or responding to policy shifts, while maintaining alignment with the organization's core mission (Rad & Bocoş, 2024).

Philosophically, organizational culture in social work embodies a commitment to humanistic values, collective purpose, and ethical integrity. It challenges practitioners and organizations alike to critically examine their assumptions, embrace diversity, and strive for transformative social change. Starkey (1998) highlighted the role of reflection in fostering a culture that is both resilient and adaptive, enabling social work institutions to address systemic inequities effectively.

Furthermore, organizational culture serves as a mirror of the society it operates within. As Runcan and Goian (2013) argued, social work organizations are both products of their context and agents of change, tasked with promoting social cohesion and addressing structural barriers to inclusion. Organizational culture is a dynamic and multifaceted construct that profoundly influences the effectiveness, adaptability, and sustainability of social work institutions. By fostering values such as social justice, collaboration, and continuous learning, these institutions can navigate the complexities of their work while maintaining ethical and professional integrity.

As Serrat and Serrat (2017) noted, building a strong organizational culture requires deliberate effort, visionary leadership, and a commitment to learning. By embracing these principles, social work organizations can create environments that support their mission and contribute to a more equitable and inclusive society. Through effective leadership, contextual awareness, and the integration of learning-oriented practices, organizational culture becomes a powerful tool for transformative social work.

3. Conclusions and discussions

The exploration of organizational culture in social work institutions reveals a multidimensional and dynamic framework that underpins the efficiency, adaptability, and sustainability of these organizations. This section synthesizes key insights from the research and theoretical frameworks, contextualizing their relevance to social work while addressing challenges, opportunities, and implications for practice and policy.

Organizational culture plays a pivotal role in shaping social work institutions by influencing their values, norms, and operational strategies. As Jamali and Sidani (2008) emphasized, the process of diagnosing and measuring organizational culture is particularly complex in developing country contexts, where systemic and resource constraints often interact with cultural idiosyncrasies. Their work highlights the importance of culturally sensitive approaches to foster learning organizations that can adapt to local needs while maintaining global standards of excellence.

In the Romanian context, studies by Runcan and Goian (2013) and Runcan et al. (2012) demonstrate that the socio-communicational styles of professionals in social work are heavily influenced by organizational norms and the need for supervision. Supervision emerges as a critical mechanism not only for professional development but also for reinforcing organizational culture and aligning individual goals with institutional values.

The intersection of organizational culture with education and training is another significant theme. As Runcan and Iovu (2020) noted, advancing social work education through programs such as PhDs enhances the sector's capacity to address complex social issues. This aligns with Rad and Bocoş's (2024) findings on the evolution of learning organizations, which underscore the role of continuous professional development and knowledge sharing in fostering adaptive and resilient cultures.

One of the major challenges in cultivating a strong organizational culture is balancing stability with the need for innovation. Runcan and Lupşa (2020) analyzed the long-term effectiveness of social work programs and found that rigid adherence to traditional practices can hinder progress. Similarly, Rad and Rad (2021) argued that adopting agile paradigms in organizational psychology can help institutions become more flexible and responsive to change.

The issue of staff burnout and turnover remains a persistent challenge, as highlighted by Watkins et al. (2021). Supervision and mentorship are identified as critical tools for mitigating these risks, promoting well-being, and ensuring continuity in organizational

knowledge and values. However, the integration of supervision into organizational culture requires deliberate effort and resources, which may not always be readily available in resource-constrained settings.

Despite these challenges, significant opportunities exist for strengthening organizational culture in social work. One such opportunity lies in the integration of technology and innovative practices. Rad et al. (2022, 2023) demonstrated how the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) can be applied to social work education and practice, enabling organizations to leverage digital tools for enhanced service delivery and professional development.

Another avenue for growth is the emphasis on authenticity within organizational culture. Runcan (2020) highlighted how authenticity in social work fosters trust, transparency, and ethical practice, creating a foundation for meaningful and impactful interventions. Authenticity also aligns with the principles of lifelong learning, as articulated by Candy (1996), encouraging professionals to continually refine their skills and adapt to changing societal needs.

The theoretical implications of this research emphasize the need for a holistic understanding of organizational culture that integrates psychological, sociological, and managerial perspectives. Rad and Rad (2021) introduced the concept of agile psychology as a framework for organizational transformation, bridging the gap between theory and practice in dynamic environments. This perspective is particularly relevant for social work, where flexibility and responsiveness are essential for addressing the multifaceted needs of clients and communities.

From a practical standpoint, fostering a learning organization requires deliberate strategies that prioritize collaboration, innovation, and inclusivity. Watkins et al. (2020, 2022) provided valuable insights into the role of supervision in nurturing these qualities, advocating for structured yet flexible approaches that align with the diverse needs of social work professionals.

Future research should focus on exploring the intersection of organizational culture with emerging trends such as digital transformation, sustainability, and equity. For instance, the findings by Rad et al. (2023) on predictive analytics in social work suggest that data-driven approaches can complement traditional methods, enabling organizations to anticipate and respond to challenges more effectively.

Additionally, there is a need for longitudinal studies that examine the long-term impact of cultural interventions on organizational performance and client outcomes. Jamali and Sidani's (2008) work provides a foundational framework for such investigations, emphasizing the importance of context-specific metrics and adaptive methodologies.

Organizational culture is both a reflection of and a driver for the values, behaviors, and strategies of social work institutions. By fostering a culture that prioritizes learning, authenticity, and innovation, these organizations can navigate complex challenges while remaining true to their mission of promoting social justice and human well-being.

The research synthesized here highlights the centrality of leadership, supervision, and technological integration in shaping and sustaining effective organizational cultures. As social work continues to evolve in response to societal changes, the insights from these studies provide a roadmap for building resilient, adaptive, and inclusive institutions. By aligning organizational culture with broader goals of equity and empowerment, social work can continue to serve as a catalyst for transformative change in communities worldwide.

References

- [1] Bocoș, M., Mara, D., Roman, A., Rad, D., Crișan, C., Balaș, E., ... & Purcar, A. M. (2023). Mentoring and metacognition—Interferences and interdependencies. *Journal of Infrastructure, Policy and Development*, 8(2), 2859.
- [2] Bowen, G. L., Rose, R. A., & Ware, W. B. (2006). The reliability and validity of the school success profile learning organization measure. *Evaluation and program planning*, 29(1), 97-104.
- [3] Bowen, G. L., Ware, W. B., Rose, R. A., & Powers, J. D. (2007). Assessing the functioning of schools as learning organizations. *Children & Schools*, 29(4), 199-208.
- [4] Bui, H., & Baruch, Y. (2010). Creating learning organizations in higher education: applying a systems perspective. *The Learning Organization*, 17(3), 228-242.
- [5] Câmpean, A., Bocoș, M., Roman, A., Rad, D., Crișan, C., Maier, M., ... & Roman, C. E. (2024). Examining Teachers' Perception on the Impact of Positive Feedback on School Students. *Education Sciences*, 14(3), 257.
- [6] Candy, P. C. (1996). Promoting lifelong learning: Academic developers and the university as a learning organization. *The International Journal for Academic Development*, 1(1), 7-18.
- [7] Ciorba, V. L & Pinteaa, F. A. (2020). Creative and Cognitive Explorations in the New Media. *International Conference "Supervision in psychotherapy" 2nd edition, Vol.2*, 207-214.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/348565063_Creative_and_Cognitive_Explorations_in_the_New_Media
- [8] Confessore, S. J., & Kops, W. J. (1998). Self-directed learning and the learning organization: Examining the connection between the individual and the learning environment. *Human resource development quarterly*, 9(4), 365-375.
- [9] Coopey, J. (1995). The learning organization, power, politics and ideology introduction. *Management learning*, 26(2), 193-213.
- [10] Delcea, C., Bululoi, A. S., Gyorgy, M., & Rad, D. (2023). Psychological distress prediction based on maladaptive cognitive schemas and anxiety with random forest regression Igorithm. *Pharmacophore*, 14(5), 62-69.
- [11] Dinu, V., Cuc, D.L., Rad, D., Wysocki, D., Pantea, M.F., Batca-Dumitru, G.C. (2024), "How "Accountant" Are You on the Bean Counter Scale? A Validation Study", *Transformations in Business & Economics*, Vol. 23, No 3 (63), pp.44-65.
- [12] Edmondson, A., & Moingeon, B. (1998). From organizational learning to the learning organization. *Management learning*, 29(1), 5-20.
- [13] Edward Watkins Jr, C., Vișcu, L. I., Cădariu, I. E., & Žvelc, M. (2022). Problematic self-efficacy inferences in beginning psychotherapy supervises: Identification and management. *Journal of Contemporary Psychotherapy*, 52(2), 109-116.
- [14] Finger, M., & Brand, S. B. (1999). The concept of the learning organization applied to the transformation of the public sector: Conceptual contributions for theory development. *Organizational learning and the learning organization: Developments in theory and practice*, 130-156.
- [15] Gagnon, M. P., Payne-Gagnon, J., Fortin, J. P., Paré, G., Côté, J., & Courcy, F. (2015). A learning organization in the service of knowledge management among nurses: A case study. *International Journal of Information Management*, 35(5), 636-642.

- [16] Gana, M., Rad, D., & Stoian, C. D. (2023). Family functioning, parental attachment and students' academic success. *Journal of Infrastructure, Policy and Development*, 8(1), 2565.
- [17] Huysman, M. (2000). An organizational learning approach to the learning organization. *European Journal of work and organizational psychology*, 9(2), 133-145.
- [18] Jamali, D., & Sidani, Y. (2008). Learning organizations: diagnosis and measurement in a developing country context: The case of Lebanon. *The Learning Organization*, 15(1), 58-74.
- [19] Kearney, J., & Zuber-Skerritt, O. (2012). From learning organization to learning community: Sustainability through lifelong learning. *The Learning Organization*, 19(5), 400-413.
- [20] Khamis Ali, A. (2012). Academic staff's perceptions of characteristics of learning organization in a higher learning institution. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 26(1), 55-82.
- [21] Lile, R., Cuc, L. D., Pantea, M. F., & Rad, D. (2024). A Humanistic Approach to Recommender Systems: Implications for 5.0 Marketing Management. In *Romanian Management Theory and Practice: Navigating Digitization and Internationalization in the New Global Economy* (pp. 163-178). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.
- [22] Malik, P., & Garg, P. (2020). Learning organization and work engagement: The mediating role of employee resilience. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 31(8), 1071-1094.
- [23] Mara, D., Mara, E.-L., Bocoş, M., Rad, D., Hunyadi, D., Vanu, A., & Marcu, R. (2024). Are Digital Education Resources Meeting the Preliminary Needs of „R.E.D. Teacher EDucation” Project?. *Revista Romaneasca Pentru Educatie Multidimensionala*, 16(4), 70-96. <https://doi.org/10.18662/rrem/16.4/908>
- [24] Marcu, R., & Rad, D. (2024). The domino effect of teacher cognitive presence triggering events and resolution on student's grit. *Technium Social Sciences Journal*, 59, 147-173.
- [25] Marcu, R., Rad, G., & Rad, D. (2024). Exploring aversion loss: a theoretical perspective over behavioral positive and negative markers. *Technium Social Sciences Journal*, 60, 156-176.
- [26] Marici M, Rad D, Runcan P, et al. (2024). Investigating the indirect effects of appearance-related anxiety on instagram addiction: A sequential mediation analysis. *Journal of Infrastructure, Policy and Development*. 8(14), 9259. <https://doi.org/10.24294/jipd9259>
- [27] Marsick, V. J., & Watkins, K. E. (2003). Demonstrating the value of an organization's learning culture: the dimensions of the learning organization questionnaire. *Advances in developing human resources*, 5(2), 132-151.
- [28] Örtenblad, A. (2015). Towards increased relevance: context-adapted models of the learning organization. *The learning organization*, 22(3), 163-181.
- [29] Örtenblad, A. (2018). What does “learning organization” mean?. *The Learning Organization*, 25(3), 150-158.
- [30] Örtenblad, A., & Koris, R. (2014). Is the learning organization idea relevant to higher educational institutions? A literature review and a “multi-stakeholder contingency approach”. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 28(2), 173-214.
- [31] Palos, R., & Veres Stancovici, V. (2016). Learning in organization. *The Learning Organization*, 23(1), 2-22.

- [32] Ponnuswamy, I., & Manohar, H. L. (2016). Impact of learning organization culture on performance in higher education institutions. *Studies in Higher Education*, 41(1), 21-36.
- [33] Purcar, A. M., Bocoş, M., Pop, A. L., Roman, A., Rad, D., Mara, D., ... & Triff, D. G. (2024). The Effect of Visual Reasoning on Arithmetic Word Problem Solving. *Education Sciences*, 14(3), 278.
- [34] Rad, D. (2025). Advancements in Behavioral AI: A Bibliometric Analysis. In *AI Technologies and Advancements for Psychological Well-Being and Healthcare* (pp. 37-52). IGI Global.
- [35] Rad, D., & Bocoş, M. (2024). Advancements in Learning Organizations: A Comprehensive Narrative Review. *Revista Romaneasca pentru Educatie Multidimensionala*, 16(2), 418-446.
- [36] Rad, D., & Bocoş, M. (2024). Advancements in Learning Organizations: A Comprehensive Narrative Review. *Revista Romaneasca pentru Educatie Multidimensionala*, 16(2), 418-446.
- [37] Rad, D., & Rad, G. (2021). Going agile, a post-pandemic universal work paradigm-a theoretical narrative review. *Postmodern Openings*, 12(4), 337-388.
- [38] Rad, D., & Rad, G. (2021). Theories of change in Agile Psychology. *Technium Soc. Sci. J.*, 21, 570.
- [39] Rad, D., Balas, V. E., Redeş, A., Kiss, C., & Rad, G. (2024). An RBF Neural Network Approach to Predict Preschool Teachers Integrative-Qualitative Intentional Behavior Based on Marzano's Model of Teaching Effectiveness. In *Decision Making and Decision Support in the Information Era: Dedicated to Academician Florin Filip* (pp. 213-234). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.
- [40] Rad, D., Egerau, A., Roman, A., Dughi, T., Balas, E., Maier, R., ... & Rad, G. (2022). A preliminary investigation of the technology acceptance model (TAM) in early childhood education and care. *BRAIN. Broad Research in Artificial Intelligence and Neuroscience*, 13(1), 518-533.
- [41] Rad, D., Egerău, A., Roman, A., Dughi, T., Kelemen, G., Balaş, E., ... & Kiss, C. (2023). On the technology acceptance behavior of Romanian preschool teachers. *Behavioral Sciences*, 13(2), 133.
- [42] Rad, D., Kiss, C., Paraschiv, N., & Balas, V. E. (2024). Automated comparative predictive analysis of deception detection in convicted offenders using polygraph with random forest, support vector machine, and artificial neural network models. *Studies in Informatics and Control*, 33(3), 39-48. <https://doi.org/10.24846/v33i3y202404>
- [43] Rad, D., Magulod Jr, G. C., Balas, E., Roman, A., Egerau, A., Maier, R., ... & Chis, R. (2022). A radial basis function neural network approach to predict preschool teachers' technology acceptance behavior. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 880753.
- [44] Rad, D., Paraschiv, N., & Kiss, C. (2023). A Scoping Review on the Use of Artificial Neural Networks (ANNs) in Decision Adoption Systems (DAS) for Psychological Data Interpretation. *Technium: Romanian Journal of Applied Sciences and Technology*, 13, 102–116. <https://doi.org/10.47577/technium.v13i.9626>
- [45] Rad, D., Paraschiv, N., Kiss, C., Balas, V. E., & Barna, C. (2024). Physiological Reactions Profiling in Polygraph Testing: Insights from Fuzzy C-Means Clustering Analysis. *Acta Polytechnica Hungarica*, 21(10), 365-377.

- [46] Rad, D., Roman, A., Marcu, R., & Bennett, R. T. (2024). Revisiting prompting in the age of digital pedagogy: a theoretical analysis of pedagogical techniques in contemporary educational technologies. *Technium Social Sciences Journal*, 61, 52-63.
- [47] Roper, L., & Pettit, J. (2002). Development and the learning organisation: an introduction. *Development in practice*, 12(3-4), 258-271.
- [48] Rowley, J., & Gibbs, P. (2008). From learning organization to practically wise organization. *The learning organization*, 15(5), 356-372.
- [49] Runcan, P. L. (2020). Authenticity in social work. *Revista de Asistență Socială*, 19(3), 23-35.
- [50] Runcan, P. L., & Goian, C. (2013). Career aspirations of social work students from Romania. *Revista de Asistența Socială*, (1), 103-112.
- [51] Runcan, P. L., Goian, C., & Laurentiu, T. (2012). The socio-communicational style and the need for supervision of professionals from the social services. *Revista de cercetare si interventie sociala*, 37, 180.
- [52] Runcan, P., & Iovu, M. B. (2020). Advancing social work education in Romania: Developing a PhD program. *Revista de Asistența Socială*, (1), 7-16.
- [53] Runcan, R. (2021). Social Work: Defining the Risk of Social Exclusion. *Revista de Asistență Socială*, 20(3), 7-14.
- [54] Runcan, R., & Lupșa, R. (2020). Analysis of the Effectiveness of the Teen Challenge Programme after 13 Years of Social Work in Recovering Romanian Addicts. *Social Work Review/Revista de Asistența Socială*, 19(1), 53-67.
- [55] Runcan, R., Marici, M., & Rad, D. (2024). Descriptive Overview and Social Work Perspectives on NEET People. *Social Work Review/Revista de Asistența Socială*, (1), 37-49.
- [56] Runcan, R., Rad, D., Runcan, P., & Măduța, C. (2023). A Network Analysis Approach toward Adaptive Overt Narcissism Network. *Behavioral Sciences*, 13(6), 468.
- [57] Sackmann, S. A., Eggenhofer-Rehart, P. M., & Friesl, M. (2009). Sustainable change: Long-term efforts toward developing a learning organization. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 45(4), 521-549.
- [58] Serrat, O., & Serrat, O. (2017). Building a learning organization. *Knowledge solutions: Tools, methods, and approaches to drive organizational performance*, 57-67.
- [59] Starkey, K. (1998). Book review: What can we learn from the learning organization?. *Human Relations*, 51(4), 531-546.
- [60] Venkatraman, Y., Balas, V. E., & Rad, D. (2021). Graph theory applications to comprehend epidemics spread of a disease. *BRAIN. Broad Research in Artificial Intelligence and Neuroscience*, 12(2), 161-177.
- [61] Vișcu, L. I., & Rad, D. (2024). Internal and external supervision in social work-outline framework for intervention in supervision. *Technium Education and Humanities*, 10, 90-98.
- [62] Vișcu, L. I., & Rad, D. (2024). Towards a process model of supervision in social work—a bibliometric analysis. *Technium Education and Humanities*, 10, 99-114.
- [63] Vișcu, L., & Rad, D. (2024). Reflective supervision and the strategic integrative model in social work supervision. *Technium Social Sciences Journal*, 66, 365-380.
- [64] Vișcu, L., & Rad, D. (2024). The impact of abusive supervision on the functions of supervision in social work. *Technium Social Sciences Journal*, 66, 354-364.

- [65] Watkins Jr, C. E., Vişcu, L. I., & Cadariu, I. E. (2021). Psychotherapy supervision research: On roadblocks, remedies, and recommendations. *European Journal of Psychotherapy & Counselling*, 23(1), 8-25.
- [66] Watkins, C. E., Callahan, J. L., & Vişcu, L. I. (2020). The common process of supervision process: the supervision session pyramid as a teaching tool in the beginning supervision seminar. *Journal of Contemporary Psychotherapy*, 50, 15-20.
- [67] Wei Choo, C. (2001). The knowing organization as learning organization. *Education+ Training*, 43(4/5), 197-205.