

Table 1. *Factor correlations, means and standard deviations*

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>s.d.</i>	<i>Exp</i>	<i>Risk</i>	<i>Env</i>	<i>Dia</i>	<i>Part</i>	<i>Con</i>	<i>Acc</i>	<i>For</i>	<i>Ease</i>	<i>Time</i>	<i>RI</i>
<i>Exp</i>	3.99	0.56	1										
<i>Risk</i>	3.37	0.85	0.31**	1									
<i>Env</i>	3.69	0.67	0.18**	0.27**	1								
<i>Dia</i>	4.13	0.55	0.40**	0.28**	0.35**	1							
<i>Part</i>	3.47	0.68	0.33**	0.32**	0.36**	0.50**	1						
<i>Con</i>	4.26	0.57	0.27**	0.17**	0.11	0.32**	0.29**	1					
<i>Acc</i>	4.19	0.66	0.30**	0.17**	0.09	0.29**	0.28**	0.82**	1				
<i>For</i>	4.19	0.64	0.28**	0.21**	0.14*	0.31**	0.36**	0.79**	0.83**	1			
<i>Ease</i>	4.26	0.62	0.32**	0.21**	0.11	0.29**	0.32**	0.79**	0.84**	0.83**	1		
<i>Time</i>	4.22	0.65	0.30**	0.21**	0.12	0.33**	0.32**	0.78**	0.83**	0.83**	0.86**	1	
<i>RI</i>	3.79	0.45	0.25**	0.15*	0.16**	0.33**	0.24**	0.25**	0.21**	0.18**	0.18**	0.18**	1

Notes: For the standard deviations and factor correlations, we used the mean of the items making up each dimension. Cronbach's alpha coefficients are given in parenthesis.

** Significant correlation ($p < 0.05$). Other correlations not marked with an asterisk present a significant correlation at $p < 0.01$.*

Note: EXP = Experimentation; RISK= Acceptance of risk; ENV= Interaction with the external environment; DIA = Dialogue; PART = Participative decision-making; CON= Content; ACC= Accuracy; FOR= Format; Ease= Ease of use; TIME= Timeliness; RI= Radical innovation.

Table 2. Reliability of the measurement scales

<i>Construct</i>	<i>Composite reliability</i>	<i>Cronbach's alpha</i>
<i>Experimentation (2 items)</i>	<i>0.81</i>	<i>0.80</i>
<i>Acceptance of risk (2 items)</i>	<i>0.85</i>	<i>0.84</i>
<i>Interaction with the external environment (3 items)</i>	<i>0.84</i>	<i>0.83</i>
<i>Dialogue (4 items)</i>	<i>0.85</i>	<i>0.85</i>
<i>Participative decision-making (3 items)</i>	<i>0.88</i>	<i>0.87</i>
<i>Content (4 items)</i>	<i>0.66</i>	<i>0.88</i>
<i>Accuracy (2 items)</i>	<i>0.73</i>	<i>0.84</i>
<i>Format (2 items)</i>	<i>0.70</i>	<i>0.82</i>
<i>Ease of use (2 items)</i>	<i>0.79</i>	<i>0.85</i>
<i>Timeliness (2 items)</i>	<i>0.87</i>	<i>0.93</i>
<i>Radical innovation (5 items)</i>	<i>0.81</i>	<i>0.80</i>

Table 3. Discriminant validity

	<i>Exp</i>	<i>Risk</i>	<i>Env</i>	<i>Dia</i>	<i>Part</i>	<i>Con</i>	<i>Acc</i>	<i>For</i>	<i>Ease</i>	<i>Time</i>	<i>RI</i>
<i>Exp</i>	(0.68)										
<i>Risk</i>	0.10	(0.73)									
<i>Env</i>	0.03	0.07	(0.63)								
<i>Dia</i>	0.16	0.08	0.12	(0.59)							
<i>Part</i>	0.11	0.10	0.13	0.25	(0.71)						
<i>Con</i>	0.07	0.03	0.01	0.10	0.08	(0.89)					
<i>Acc</i>	0.09	0.03	0.00	0.08	0.08	0.67	(0.85)				
<i>For</i>	0.08	0.04	0.02	0.10	0.13	0.62	0.48	(0.83)			
<i>Ease</i>	0.10	0.04	0.01	0.08	0.10	0.62	0.71	0.69	(0.88)		
<i>Time</i>	0.09	0.04	0.01	0.11	0.10	0.61	0.69	0.69	0.74	(0.93)	
<i>RI</i>	0.06	0.02	0.03	0.11	0.06	0.06	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.03	(0.47)

Note: In parentheses, extracted mean variance. EXP = Experimentation; RISK= Acceptance of risk; ENV= Interaction with the external environment; DIA = Dialogue; PART = Participative decision-making; CON= Content; ACC= Accuracy; FOR= Format; Ease= Ease of use; TIME= Timeliness; RI= Radical innovation.

Table 4. Structural equations to test the hypothesis that organizational learning capability mediates in the relationship between EUCS and radical innovation.

<i>Structural equation</i>	<i>R²</i>
<i>Direct effect model</i>	
$RI = 0.235*EUCS + 0.08*SIZE + 0.04*SECTOR$	0.063
$(t = 2.960)$ $(t = 1.034)$ $(t = 0.681)$	
<i>Mediation effect model</i>	
$RI = 0.032*EUCS + 0.434*OLC + 0.092*SIZE + 0.027*SECTOR$	0.212
$(t = 0.350)$ $(t = 3.018)$ $(t = 1.374)$ $(t = 0.435)$	
$OLC = 0.472*EUCS$	0.222
$(t = 4.096)$	