



PLANNING MALAYSIA:

Journal of the Malaysian Institute of Planners

VOLUME 24 ISSUE 5 (2026), Page 933 – 947

LEARNING ORGANISATION FOR ORGANISATIONAL RESILIENCE IN TIMES OF UNCERTAINTY: EVIDENCE FROM QUANTITY SURVEYING CONSULTANT FIRMS IN MALAYSIA

**Nur Mardhiyah Aziz^{1*}, Loo Siaw Chuing², Nurshuhada Zainon³,
Zafira Nadia Maaz⁴, Izatul Laili Jabar⁵**

*^{1,2,3,4} Department of Quantity Surveying, Faculty of Built Environment,
UNIVERSITI MALAYA*

*⁵ Studies for Building Surveying, Faculty of Built Environment,
UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGI MARA*

Abstract

In today's rapidly changing business environment, organisations must navigate through various disruptions, including pandemics, geopolitical conflicts, economic uncertainties, and other unforeseen events. These challenges highlight the need for resilience, adaptability, and continuous learning to maintain business continuity. For Quantity Surveying (QS) consultant firms, valuable knowledge and expertise are often embedded within experienced professionals. Therefore, developing a Learning Organisation is essential to support knowledge sharing, employee development, and organisational improvement. This study examines the key characteristics, critical success factors, and benefits of Learning Organisation practices among QS consultant firms in Malaysia. A quantitative approach was adopted using a questionnaire survey distributed to QS consultant firms registered with the Board of Quantity Surveyors Malaysia (BQSM). The survey achieved a 38% response rate, providing sufficient data for analysis. The findings identified Dynamic Learning as the most prominent characteristic, high personal competencies as the key success factor, and continuous improvement and innovation as the main organisational benefit. This study contributes to existing knowledge by providing empirical evidence on Learning Organisation practices within the QS profession, which remains limited in current research. The findings also provide industry practitioners with key areas to strengthen organisational resilience, particularly through employee capability development, knowledge sharing, and continuous improvement.

Keywords: Learning Organisation; Organisational Resilience; Quantity Surveying Consultant Firms; Organisational Learning; Knowledge Sharing; Innovation

¹ Corresponding author. Email: nurmardhiyah@um.edu.my

INTRODUCTION

In today's rapidly changing business environment, organisations are increasingly exposed to various disruptions, including economic uncertainty, technological advancements, geopolitical conflicts, natural disasters, and other unforeseen events. These challenges require organisations to become more resilient, adaptable, and committed to continuous learning in order to sustain their performance and remain competitive. The construction industry is no exception. Quantity Surveying (QS) consultant firms play a vital role in delivering professional services related to cost management, procurement, and contractual administration throughout the project lifecycle (Yap & Aziz, 2020). As knowledge-intensive organisations, QS firms depend heavily on the expertise, experience, and professional judgement of their employees. However, workforce challenges such as employee turnover, changing career expectations, and early retirement have increased the risk of knowledge loss, making it more difficult for organisations to maintain their expertise and organisational performance (Fuller & Kerr, 2022; Gaines, 2022).

In response to these challenges, developing a Learning Organisation (LO) culture has become increasingly important. A Learning Organisation promotes continuous learning, knowledge sharing, collaboration, and innovation, enabling organisations to adapt more effectively to changing business conditions while preserving valuable organisational knowledge. Such culture helps organisations strengthen employee capabilities, improve organisational resilience, and sustain long-term performance in an increasingly volatile business environment. Despite the growing importance of organisational learning, studies examining Learning Organisation culture within Malaysian QS consultant firms remain limited, highlighting the need for further investigation in this context.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Learning Organisation (LO)

Despite decades of research, there is still no universally accepted definition of a learning organisation. The concept was first popularised by Senge (1990), who described a learning organisation as one in which individuals continuously expand their capabilities, develop new ways of thinking, and learn collectively to achieve shared aspirations. Marquardt (1996) defined a learning organisation as an organisation that continuously acquires, creates, and applies knowledge to improve its performance and achieve business success. Similarly, Pedler (1991) viewed a learning organisation as one that facilitates the learning of all its members and continuously transforms itself, while Dulaimi & Ang, (2009) emphasised an organisation's ability to embed learning, adaptation, and change into its culture and operations.

Although the terms *learning organisation* and *organisational learning* are often used interchangeably, they represent different concepts. Tsang (1997) distinguished learning organisation as the desired state or characteristic of an organisation, whereas organisational learning refers to the processes and activities through which learning occurs. In other words, organisational learning is the mechanism that enables an organisation to become a learning organisation.

Among the various learning organisation models proposed in the literature, Marquardt's (1996) Systematic Learning Organisation Model is widely recognised for its comprehensive and practical approach. The model consists of five interrelated dimensions: dynamic learning, people empowerment, knowledge management, organisational transformation, and technology application. These dimensions collectively promote continuous learning, knowledge sharing, innovation, and adaptability, enabling organisations to respond effectively to changing business environments. In addition, successful implementation of a learning organisations is influenced by several critical success factors, including shared goals, a supportive learning environment, teamwork, personal competencies and dynamic leadership. Previous studies have also associated learning organisation practices with numerous organisational benefits such as continuous improvement, innovation, effective problem solving, stronger collaboration, employee retention and long-term organisational sustainability.

For professional service organisations such as quantity surveying (QS) consultant firms, developing a learning organisation culture has become increasingly important in navigating uncertainty and maintaining competitiveness. The construction industry continues to face rapid technological advancement, evolving client expectations, economic fluctuations, and unexpected disruptions, which place increasing demands on firms to develop appropriate organisational capabilities. Given these challenges, this study adopts Marquardt's (1996) Systematic Learning Organisation Model to examine the significance of learning organisation practices among Malaysian QS consultant firms. The model provides a suitable theoretical foundation for understanding how learning capabilities can strengthen organisational resilience and support long-term business performance.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study adopted a quantitative research approach to examine the significance of learning organisation practices among Quantity Surveying (QS) consultant firms in Malaysia. The target population comprised QS consultancy firms registered with the Board of Quantity Surveyors Malaysia (BQSM), including sole proprietorships, partnerships, body corporates, joint ventures, and multidisciplinary practices. These firms were selected as the unit of analysis due

to their role as professional service organisations that require continuous learning, knowledge sharing, and adaptation to respond to changes within the construction industry. Based on the list provided by BQSM website in 2026), a total of 424 registered QS consultancy firms were identified as the study population. The required sample size was determined using the sample size guideline proposed by Krejcie and Morgan (1970).

Data were collected through a structured questionnaire survey developed based on the extensive review of previous literature on learning organisation practices. The questionnaire consisted of four sections. Section A collected respondents' demographic and organisational background information using nominal-scale questions. Sections B, C, and D measured the significance of learning organisation dimensions, critical success factors, and organisational benefits, respectively. A five-point Likert scale was employed, where Section B measured significance levels (1 = Not Significant to 5 = Very Significant), while Sections C and D assessed respondents' agreement levels (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree).

A reliability analysis was carried out to assess the internal consistency of the questionnaire items in Section B, C and D. Cronbach's alpha was used to assess the reliability of each section, where a value of more 0.70 is considered acceptable. The results show that section B had a Cronbach's alpha value of 0.91, Section C recorded a value of 0.88, and Section D recorded a value of 0.93. Overall, the results indicate good internal consistency across all three sections, suggesting the questionnaire items were sufficiently reliable for further analysis.

The questionnaire survey was conducted over a four-week period from March 2026 to April 2026 to provide sufficient time for participation. The collected data were analysed using descriptive statistics, including mean ranking and the Relative Importance Index (RII), to determine the relative significance of each learning organisation element. The RII method has been widely applied in construction management research to rank factors according to their perceived importance (Tan & Aziz, 2022). The RII was calculated using the following formula:

$$RII = \Sigma W / (A \times N)$$

where:

W = weighting assigned by respondents based on the five-point Likert scale;
A = highest possible weighting (5); and
N = total number of respondents.

The calculated RII values were interpreted using five importance levels: high (H) ($0.8 \leq RII \leq 1.0$), high-medium (H-M) ($0.6 \leq RII < 0.8$), medium (M) ($0.4 \leq RII < 0.6$), medium-low (M-L) ($0.2 \leq RII < 0.4$), and low (L) ($0 \leq RII < 0.2$).

0.2) (Tan & Aziz, 2022). This approach enabled the ranking and comparison of learning organisation dimensions, critical success factors, and benefits perceived by QS consultant firms in Malaysia.

In addition to the descriptive analysis, Spearman's rank correlation was conducted to show the strength of linear relationship between the three main construct of the study; learning organisation dimensions, critical success factors and organisational benefits. This analysis was used to determine whether there were significant relationships between the constructs. The correlations coefficient indicates the direction strength of the relationship between each pair of constructs.

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Respondents' Background

This study achieved a response rate of 38%, with a total of 161 responses. The responses obtained from QS consultant firms provided the basis for analysing the significance of learning organisation practices within the Malaysian QS consulting context. Table 1 presents the background characteristics of the respondents.

Table 1: General respondent's background

Parameters	Percentage
Types of QS Consulting Practice	
Sole Proprietorship	43
Body Corporate	24
Partnership	33
Organisation Size	
1-50 Employees (Small Scale)	95
51-200 Employees (Medium Scale)	5
Job Position	
Director	19
Associate Director	14
Team Leader	5
Senior Project Executive	14
Project Executive	9
Quantity Surveyor	38
Opinion Level on Significance of LO	
Agree	100.0
Disagree	-

In terms of the type of QS consulting practice, the majority of respondents were from sole proprietorship firms (43%), followed by partnership firms (33%) and body corporate firms (24%). No responses were received from joint venture or multidisciplinary QS practices.

Regarding organisational size, the majority of participating firms were classified as small-scale organisations with 1–50 employees (95%), while the remaining firms were categorised as medium-scale organisations with 51–200 employees (5%). This classification is consistent with previous studies that recognise employee size as one of the key indicators in distinguishing organisational scale, particularly within the context of Malaysian organisations (Ramdan et al., 2022).

The respondents represented various professional positions within QS firms, with Quantity Surveyors forming the largest group (38%), followed by Directors (19%), Associate Directors and Senior Project Executives (14% each), Project Executives (9%), and Team Leaders (5%).

In terms of respondents' perception of the significance of learning organisation practices, all respondents (100%) agreed that learning organisation is significant within QS consulting firms. This reflects the recognition among QS professionals regarding the importance of continuous learning, knowledge development, and organisational adaptability in sustaining firm performance.

Natures of Learning Organisation

Section B of the questionnaire examined the significant natures of learning organisation practices among QS consultant firms in Malaysia. Table 2 summarises the highest and lowest ranked practices under each dimension based on the Relative Importance Index (RII). Overall, all dimensions recorded a high level of importance, with RII values ranging from 0.733 to 0.905. This indicates that QS professionals generally recognise the importance of developing a learning-oriented culture to support continuous improvement and organisational adaptability. This suggests that Malaysian QS consultant firms recognise that continuous learning is essential to remain competitive in an increasingly complex and uncertain construction environment. Recent studies have similarly argued that organisations with stronger learning capabilities are better equipped to respond to technological change, market uncertainty, and evolving client expectations (Broekema et al., 2026; Basten & Haamann, 2018; Tortorella et al., 2020).

Table 2: Ranking of Significant Natures of Learning Organisation

Learning Organisation Dimension	Highest Ranked Practice	RII	Lowest Ranked Practice	RII
Dynamic Learning	Encouraging employees to openly discuss experiences, successes, and mistakes to facilitate learning	0.905	Viewing continuous learning as a high business priority	0.790

Learning Organisation Dimension	Highest Ranked Practice	RII	Lowest Ranked Practice	RII
Organisational Transformation	Employees understand the importance of becoming a learning organisation	0.848	Learning from mistakes and failures is encouraged	0.733
Empowering People	Employees are empowered to coach, mentor, and facilitate learning with management support	0.829	Decentralised decision-making	0.771
Knowledge Management	Providing accessible systems to identify and collect information	0.829	Knowledge coding and systematic job rotation practices	0.781
Technology Application	Access to information technologies and digital connectivity	0.848	Use of groupware technology to support group processes	0.733

Among all practices, encouraging employees to openly discuss experiences, successes, and mistakes recorded the highest RII value (0.905). This suggests that QS firms place strong emphasis on knowledge sharing and learning through daily work experiences. This finding supports Senge's (1990) view that learning organisations are built through collective learning and shared knowledge. Similarly, Liao et al. (2017) highlighted that knowledge transfer between experienced and new employees contributes to organisational learning. The result is consistent with recent studies confirming that knowledge exchange, open communication, and collaborative learning strengthen organisational learning capability and improve organisational performance (Broekema et al., 2026; Basten & Haamann, 2018; Hoa et al., 2022). Within professional service organisations such as QS firms, much technical expertise is developed through project experience rather than formal training. Therefore, creating opportunities for employees to exchange practical knowledge enables firms to retain valuable tacit knowledge and improve future project delivery (Orych, & Patora-Wysocka, 2026).

Although continuous learning is a fundamental element of a learning organisation, viewing continuous learning as a high business priority recorded the lowest ranking under the dynamic learning dimension (RII = 0.790). This may indicate that while QS firms acknowledge the value of learning, continuous learning activities may not yet be fully integrated into their strategic priorities. Similar observations have been reported by Tortorella et al. (2020), who found that many organisations encourage operational learning but struggle to institutionalise learning through formal strategic initiatives, structured training programmes, and long-term capability development. For many small and medium-sized QS firms, business priorities often focus on project delivery, client satisfaction, and cost management, leaving fewer resources for formal learning

initiatives. Challenges such as resistance to change, uncertainty, and lack of confidence may influence employees' acceptance of continuous learning initiatives (Piderit, 2000; Furxhi, 2021).

For organisational transformation, understanding the importance of becoming a learning organisation was ranked highest (RII = 0.848). This highlights that awareness among employees and management is an important foundation for developing a learning culture. However, learning from mistakes and failures received the lowest ranking (RII = 0.733). Although mistakes can provide valuable learning opportunities, QS firms may perceive failures as having negative impacts on project outcomes, cost, and client satisfaction.

The findings also show that empowerment and knowledge accessibility are important elements of learning organisation practices. Employees being empowered to coach, mentor, and facilitate learning achieved the highest ranking under empowering people (RII = 0.829), indicating the importance of management support in encouraging employee development. This supports recent evidence that leadership support and employee empowerment create psychological safety, encourage knowledge sharing, and improve organisational learning capability (Hoa et al., 2022; Orych, & Patora-Wysocka, 2026). Similarly, providing accessible systems to identify and collect information was ranked highest under knowledge management (RII = 0.829), showing that QS firms recognise the need for effective information management to support learning and decision-making.

Technology application was also viewed as an important enabler of learning, particularly through access to information technologies and digital connectivity (RII = 0.848). This finding aligns with recent construction digitalisation research, which highlights that digital technologies improve knowledge accessibility, collaboration, and organisational learning (S Kannan & Abd Rahim, 2025). However, the use of groupware technology recorded the lowest ranking (RII = 0.733). This suggests that QS firms are more focused on using technology for information access rather than advanced collaborative learning platforms. The finding may be influenced by the characteristics of the participating firms, as most respondents were from small-scale QS organisations where investment in advanced technologies may require additional resources.

Overall, the findings indicate that learning within Malaysian QS consultant firms is primarily driven by interpersonal knowledge sharing, mentoring, and accessible information rather than formal organisational systems such as decentralised decision-making, systematic job rotation, or advanced collaborative technologies. This contrasts with the findings from larger multinational organisations, where formal learning structures and digital collaboration platforms play a greater role in organisational learning (Basten & Haamann, 2018). The results therefore suggest that Malaysian QS firms have

established a positive learning culture but still have opportunities to institutionalise learning through more structured organisational practices.

Critical Success Factors of Learning Organisation

Section C of the questionnaire examined the critical success factors for establishing a learning organisation among Quantity Surveying (QS) consultant firms. As shown in Table 3, all factors recorded high RII values (above 0.80), indicating that respondents generally agreed that these factors are important in developing a learning organisation. However, the ranking shows the different levels of importance perceived by the respondents.

The highest-ranked factor was “having a high level of personal competencies”, with the highest mean score ($\bar{x} = 4.571$) and RII value (0.914). This finding reflects the knowledge-intensive nature of QS consultancy, where service quality depends heavily on employees' technical expertise, professional judgement, and continuous skills development. Recent studies similarly conclude that employee competence remains one of the strongest determinants of organisational learning and innovation because knowledgeable employees are better able to acquire, share, and apply new knowledge (Broekema et al., 2026; Basten & Haamann, 2018; Hoa et al., 2022).

The second highest-ranked factor was “led by inspirational leaders who promote continuous learning” ($\bar{x} = 4.476$, RII = 0.896). This finding aligns with Hoa et al. (2022), who demonstrated that transformational leadership strengthens organisational learning by encouraging knowledge sharing, employee motivation, and innovation. Leaders who actively support mentoring, learning opportunities, and knowledge exchange help establish an environment where employees feel confident to develop professionally.

The lowest-ranked factor was “encourage employees to have a feeling of interdependence among themselves” ($\bar{x} = 4.143$, RII = 0.829). Although it remained an important factor, the lower ranking may be due to the working structure of QS consultant firms, where many employees are required to work independently and manage multiple responsibilities. Excessive dependency between team members may also create coordination issues, especially when delays in one task affect other related activities. Therefore, respondents may perceive individual competency as more critical than interdependence in supporting organisational learning.

Overall, the findings suggest that developing a learning organisation in QS consultant firms relies mainly on competent employees and supportive leadership. While collaboration and shared goals remain important, organisations should first focus on strengthening individual capabilities and creating an environment that encourages continuous learning.

Table 3: Ranking of Critical Success Factors for Establishing a Learning Organisation

Critical Success Factors	Mean	RII	Rank
Have a high level of personal competencies	4.5714	0.914	1
Led by inspirational leaders who promote continuous learning	4.4762	0.896	2
Create a learning environment that is engaging, participatory, hassle-free, and appreciative	4.3810	0.876	3
Have a mission statement that is widely displayed and regularly referenced	4.2857	0.857	4
Have common goals with all personnel	4.1905	0.838	5
Encourage employees to have a feeling of interdependence among themselves (e.g., cross-training/staff rotation)	4.1429	0.829	6

Significant Benefits of Learning Organisation

Section D of the questionnaire assessed the benefits of implementing a learning organisation among Quantity Surveying (QS) consultant firms. As presented in Table 4, all benefits achieved high RII values (above 0.80), showing that respondents generally recognised the positive impact of a learning organisation. However, the ranking reveals that QS firms prioritise improvements in organisational capability over employee-related benefits.

The highest-ranked benefit was “continuous improvement and innovation” ($\bar{x} = 4.476$, $RII = 0.895$). This indicates that respondents view learning organisation practices as an important approach to encourage employees to share ideas, improve work processes, and adapt to changes. Similar findings have been reported by Tortorella et al. (2020), who concluded that organisational learning directly enhances innovation capability and organisational adaptability. For QS firms, where project requirements, technology, and industry practices continuously evolve, the ability to learn and innovate is essential for maintaining competitiveness.

Other highly rated benefits include building stronger teams ($\bar{x} = 4.429$, $RII = 0.886$) and improving problem-solving capability ($\bar{x} = 4.381$, $RII = 0.876$). These findings support research demonstrating that organisational learning enhances collective problem-solving by encouraging employees to share experiences, integrate diverse knowledge, and develop more effective solutions (Broekema et al., 2026; Basten & Haamann, 2018). In QS consultancy, where projects often involve complex contractual, financial, and technical decisions, collaborative learning contributes directly to improved decision quality. These findings suggest that respondents appreciate learning organisations as a platform to improve internal knowledge sharing and decision-making.

Interestingly, better collaboration and teamwork and employee retention were ranked lowest ($RII = 0.848$). This partially differs from studies conducted in other knowledge-intensive industries, where learning opportunities significantly influence employee retention and organisational commitment (Hoa et al., 2022). The difference may be explained by the characteristics of Malaysian

QS consultant firms. Employee retention often hinges primarily on external variables such as remuneration, career progression, and labour market opportunities than on organisational learning initiatives alone. Similarly, smaller firms may already experience close day-to-day collaboration, reducing the perceived additional benefit of learning organisation practices in improving teamwork (Orych, & Patora-Wysocka, 2026).

Overall, the findings indicate that respondents perceive Learning Organisation primarily as a strategic capability that enhances innovation, organisational adaptability, and continuous improvement rather than solely as a mechanism for improving employee satisfaction or retention. This reinforces the growing importance of organisational learning in enabling professional service firms to remain competitive under increasingly uncertain business environment.

Table 4: Ranking of Significant Benefits of Learning Organisation

Benefits	Mean	RII	Rank
Continuous improvement and innovation through employee learning, idea sharing, and feedback	4.4762	0.895	1
Building a strong team and strengthening relationships among personnel	4.4286	0.886	2
Improving problem-solving through discussion and new solutions	4.3810	0.876	3
Ensuring business longevity through continuous improvement and innovation	4.3333	0.867	4
Better collaboration and teamwork through shared understanding and involvement	4.2381	0.848	5
Retaining talented and loyal employees through employee growth and development	4.2381	0.848	5

Correlation Analysis

To further examine the findings, a Spearman's correlation analysis was conducted to determine the relationships between learning organisation dimensions, critical success factors and organisational benefits. This analysis provides a clearer view of how these three aspects are related based on the responses from the 161 respondents. The results are presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Spearman's correlation analysis

	Learning Organisation (B)	Critical Success Factors (C)	Organisational Benefits (D)
Learning Organisation (B)	1.000	.650	.667
Critical Success Factors (C)	.650	1.000	.625
Organisational Benefits (D)	.667	.625	1.000

Note: Spearman's rank order correlation; N= 161. $p < 0.001$ (2-tailed).

The results show positive and significant relationships among all three dimensions. Learning organisation had a strong positive relationship with critical success factors ($\rho = 0.650$, $p < 0.001$) and organisational benefits ($\rho = 0.667$, $p < 0.001$). Critical success factors also showed a strong positive relationship with organisational benefits ($\rho = 0.625$, $p < 0.001$). Overall, the findings suggest that learning practices, the factors that support them, and the benefits perceived by the organisations are closely related. However, these relationships should be understood as associations and do not indicate that one construct directly causes another.

Overall Significance of Learning Organisation in QS Firms

The findings of this study show that the elements of a Learning Organisation are already present and applicable in Quantity Surveying (QS) consultant firms. Table 5 presents the ranking of Learning Organisation categories based on respondents' perceptions. Among the five categories, Dynamic Learning was ranked the highest, with the highest group mean score ($\bar{x} = 4.274$) and RII value (0.855). This indicates that QS firms place strong emphasis on learning from experiences, sharing knowledge, and improving through continuous learning. This finding supports Marquardt (1996), who identified dynamic learning as one of the key foundations of a learning organisation.

Three core themes consistently manifested across the findings in this study. First, learning is primarily facilitated through open communication and knowledge sharing among employees. Second, developing highly competent professionals supported by inspirational leadership is considered essential for sustaining organisational learning. Third, organisations perceive continuous improvement and innovation as the most valuable outcomes of adopting Learning Organisation practices. Together, these findings align with recent organisational learning literature, which emphasises that sustainable organisational performance depends on integrating knowledge sharing, leadership support, employee capability, and innovation into everyday organisational practice (Basten & Haamann, 2018; Hoa et al., 2022; Tortorella et al., 2020).

Nevertheless, the study also reveals several areas where Malaysian QS firms can further strengthen their learning capability. Formal learning mechanisms, including structured learning strategies, systematic job rotation, collaborative digital platforms, and learning from organisational failures, received relatively lower rankings than interpersonal knowledge sharing. This suggests that while a positive learning culture already exists, many firms have yet to institutionalise learning through formal organisational systems (Stewart (2019). Strengthening these areas would enable QS consultant firms to build greater organisational resilience, enhance innovation capability, and improve long-term competitiveness in an increasingly dynamic construction industry.

Table 5: Ranking of Learning Organisation Categories in QS Firms

Dimension	Key Finding	Mean/RII	Contribution
Nature of LO	Dynamic Learning	4.274 / 0.855	Encourages knowledge sharing and learning from experience
	High Personal Competencies	4.571 / 0.914	Strengthens employee capability and professional performance
Success Factor	Continuous Improvement and Innovation	4.476 / 0.895	Improves adaptability and organisational performance

In this study, 95% of the respondents were from small firms, while only 5% were from medium-sized firms. Therefore, the findings largely reflect the experiences and practice of small QS consultant firms and may not fully capture the situation in larger firms, which may have different organisational structures, resources and approached to learning. Future studies could include more firms of different sizes to provide a broader view of Learning Organisation practices in the QS consulting sector.

CONCLUSION

This study was conducted to establish the relevance and significance of Learning Organisation practices among Quantity Surveying (QS) consultant firms in Malaysia. The findings demonstrate that the key elements of a Learning Organisation are already present and applicable within QS firms.

The study identified Dynamic Learning as the most prominent nature of Learning Organisation, particularly through encouraging employees to openly discuss experiences, successes, and mistakes as opportunities for learning. This highlights the importance of knowledge sharing and continuous improvement in developing a learning culture. In addition, high personal competencies among employees were identified as the most important success factor, showing that capable and motivated employees are the foundation of organisational learning. The main benefit of Learning Organisation was found to be continuous improvement and innovation, indicating that learning practices can help QS firms adapt and improve their performance in a changing construction environment.

Overall, the findings confirm that Learning Organisation is a relevant approach for QS consultant firms in Malaysia. The study highlights that developing a learning culture is not only about implementing new systems or technologies, but also about strengthening employee capabilities, encouraging knowledge exchange, and creating an environment that supports continuous improvement. These findings provide a better understanding of how QS firms can embrace Learning Organisation practices to enhance their long-term competitiveness and sustainability.

From a practical perspective, the findings can benefit several stakeholders in the QS professions. Professional bodies like Board of Quantity

Surveyors Malaysia (BQSM) could use these findings as input when planning professional development and continuous professional development activities. QS firms could encourage regular knowledge sharing, discussion of project experiences, monitoring and skills development among their staff. Education and training providers could also develop programmes that promote knowledge sharing, teamwork, problem-solving and continuous learning. These efforts can help QS firms develop a stronger learning culture and support the continued development of the QS profession.

REFERENCES

- Abd Rahim, M. H. I., & S Kannan, A. (2025). Digital Technology Empowerment for the Future Construction Industry. *PaperASIA*, 41(4b), 494–507. <https://doi.org/10.59953/paperasia.v41i4b.744>
- Basten, D., & Haamann, T. (2018). Approaches for Organizational Learning: A Literature Review. *SAGE Open*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244018794224>
- Board of Quantity Surveyors Malaysia. (n.d.). Board of Quantity Surveyors Malaysia. Retrieved March 14, 2026, from <https://www.bqsm.gov.my/en/>
- Broekema, W., Louisa, H., & Schmidt, E. (2026). Why organizations forget or retain lessons learned from a crisis over time: Tracking COVID-19 lessons in an academic hospital in the Netherlands. *BMC Health Services Research*, 26. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-026-14429-x>
- Dulaimi, M., & Ang, A. F. (2009). Elements of Learning Organisations in Singapore's Construction Industry. *Emirates Journal of Engineering Research*.
- Furxhi, G. (2021). Employee's Resistance and Organisational Change Factors. *European Journal of Business and Management Research*. <https://doi.org/10.24018/ejbmr.2021.6.2.759>
- Gaines, J. (2022). Pandemic driving older workers to call it quits early. Retrieved from <https://www.dayton.com/what-to-know/pandemic-driving-older-workers-to-call-it-quits-early/VECSRKRIDJERBA5YTYJEPC2ZWQ/>
- Hoa, D., Pawan, B., Helen, S., Hai-Dang, N., & Bach, N. (2022). Building organizational resilience, innovation through resource-based management initiatives, organizational learning and environmental dynamism. *Journal of Business Research*, 141, 808–821.
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30(3), 607–610.
- Marquardt, M. J. (1996). *Building the learning organisation: A system approach to quantum improvement*. New York: McGraw-Hill Co.
- Orych, M., & Patora-Wysocka, Z. (2026). The Impact of Organizational Learning on Dealing with Crisis Situations in a Logistics Company: Toward Organizational Change. *Journal of Intercultural Management*, 17, 80–116. <https://doi.org/10.2478/joim-2025-0016>
- Piderit, S. K. (2000). Rethinking resistance and recognizing ambivalence: A multidimensional view of attitudes toward an organisational change. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(4), 783–794. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2000.3707722>

- Ramdan, M. R., Abd Aziz, N. A., Abdullah, N. L., Samsudin, N., Singh, G. S. V., Zakaria, T., Fuzi, N. M., & Ong, S. Y. Y. (2022). SMEs Performance in Malaysia: The Role of Contextual Ambidexterity in Innovation Culture and Performance. *Sustainability*, 14(3), 1679. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14031679>
- Senge, P. M. (1990). *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organisation*. London, United Kingdom: Cornerstone.
- Stewart, K. (2019). The importance of becoming a learning organisation. Retrieved from <https://www.cuinsight.com/the-importance-of-becoming-a-learning-organisation/>
- Tan, J. L., & Aziz, N. M. (2022). Embracing the Digital Twin for Construction Monitoring and Controlling to Mitigate the Impact of COVID-19. *Journal of Design and Built Environment*, 22(3), 40–59. <https://doi.org/10.22452/jdbe.vol22no3.3>
- Teece, D. J. (1998). Capturing value from knowledge assets: The new economy, markets for know-how, and intangible assets. *California Management Review: Special Issue on Knowledge and the Firm*, 40(3), 55–79.
- Tortorella, G., Fettermann, D., Cauchick-Miguel, P., & Sawhney, R. (2019). Learning organisation and lean production: An empirical research on their relationship. *International Journal of Production Research*, 58. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2019.1633028>
- Tsang, E. W. K. (1997). Organisational learning and the learning organisation. *Human Relations*, 50(1), 73–89.
- Yap, P. X., & Aziz, N. M. (2020). Teaching Strategies in Integrating BIM Education for the Quantity Surveying Courses in Malaysian Higher Education Institution. *Malaysian Construction Research Journal*, 9(1), 126–133. https://www.cream.my/data/cms/files/MCRJ%20Special%20Issue%20_Volume%209%20No_1%202020.pdf

Received: 31st July 2026. Accepted: 9th September 2026