

MANAGERS PERCEPTIONS ABOUT KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT AND ORGANISATIONAL WISDOM

Raysa Geaquinto Rocha

raysa.geaquinto@gmail.com | NECE Research Unit in Business Sciences, University of Beira Interior, Covilhã, Portugal

Paulo Gonçalves Pinheiro

pgp@ubi.pt | NECE Research Unit in Business Sciences, University of Beira Interior, Covilhã, Portugal

ABSTRACT

Accumulating knowledge does not guarantee better problem solving; thus, success is not about knowing more. The lack of success of Knowledge Management in generating the expected value and competitive advantages opened doors to Organisational Wisdom. Wisdom can be defined as the capacity to put into action the most suitable behaviour, considering what is known and what does the most good. The purpose of this article is to understand the perception of managers about Knowledge Management and Organisational Wisdom. The research conducted was exploratory on a qualitative method. The interviews were developed electronically in organisations located in Brazil, Portugal, Bulgaria, Serbia, Angola, Argentina, Australia, and China. There is a disparity between the advancement of theory and practice in organisations. It concludes that managers have a simplistic notion of what Knowledge Management is, they do not understand the idea of "*ba*" and are focused on explicit knowledge, they still fail to understand in a global way knowledge and how it should be managed and have almost no notion of what organisational wisdom is. They understand the importance of the leader, mainly because they are leaders, giving importance to their function.

KEYWORDS: Wisdom; Organisational Wisdom; Knowledge Sharing; Knowledge Creation; *ba*.

1. INTRODUCTION

Accumulating knowledge does not guarantee better problem-solving. Thus success is not about knowing more (Rooney & Mckenna, 2007). In addition to managing existing knowledge and creating new knowledge, the organisation needs to ensure that it is used correctly, in terms of efficiency and effectiveness. It is necessary not only to create economic value but also to create social value is required for the long-term survival of the organisation (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 2011).

Thus, the lack of success of Knowledge Management in generating the expected value and competitive advantages opened doors to Organisational Wisdom. Possessing and knowing how to use knowledge does not mean being wise (Bierly, Kessler, & Christensen, 2000; Rooney & Mckenna, 2007; Rowley, 2006a) because wisdom is greater than knowledge itself that intelligence, experience and transcends organisational learning (Hays, 2007).

Wisdom is a recent construct in the area of management, and still has several concepts, it can be perceived as the ability to choose the most efficient and beneficial knowledge to be used in a given situation and put it into practice (Bennet & Bennet, 2008; Hays, 2007; Nonaka & Takeuchi, 2011; Rowley, 2006) by doing the least harm possible (Hays, 2007). It also can be perceived as the ability to make better use of the knowledge possessed and considering what is needful to the organisation and society (Bierly *et al.*, 2000; Kessler, 2006).

The purpose of this article is to understand the perception of managers about Knowledge Management and Organisational Wisdom. The research conducted was exploratory, on a qualitative method, which is of outstanding importance in the social sciences (Alvesson & Söldberg, 2000), to achieve the objective purposed. The interviews were developed electronically with managers of organisations located in Brazil, Argentina, Portugal, Bulgaria, Serbia, Angola, Australia, and China.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT

Following the Knowledge Management model of Jordan and Jones (1997), in which there are five categories, knowledge acquisition, problem-solving, dissemination, ownership, and

memory, this article highlights the acquisition of knowledge, through the creation and sharing.

Knowledge, tacit (it is inherent to the individual, related to intuition, it is not possible to express it formally) and explicit (it is codifiable knowledge) (Polanyi, 1966), will be created through conversion, either through socialisation, externalisation, combination or internalisation (Nonaka, 1994). In the SECI model, tacit knowledge sharing occurs through interaction, which can occur without the use of language, by observation and/or practice (socialization); by the conversion of tacit knowledge into explicit knowledge (externalization); by the reconfiguration of explicit knowledge through social interaction (combination); and by the conversion of explicit knowledge into tacit, which occurs through actions, the use of knowledge (internalization). Thus, through the dynamic interaction of tacit and explicit knowledge, knowledge is created and shared (Nonaka, 1994).

Knowledge sharing is a critical point of Knowledge Management (Nonaka, 1994), then the absorptive capacity of the member of acquiring, understand, transform and apply the knowledge in benefit of the organisation (Zahra & George, 2002), and the influences it receives from the environment must be considered (Erden, von Krogh, & Nonaka, 2008; Nonaka & Konno, 1998). Therefore, the "*ba*", a shared space, an appropriate place, is the foundation for knowledge creation and sharing, it must be developed, whether mental, virtual or physical (Nonaka & Konno, 1998).

Each stage of the SECI model has a type of "*ba*": in Socialization, there is the Originating "*ba*" - Existential (face-to-face), where the members share feelings, experiences, emotions, where the process begins, with the arises of love, trust, care, and commitment. In Externalization, there is the Interacting "*ba*" - Reflective (peer-to-peer), where the member knowledge began to be universal. In the Combination, there is the Cyber "*ba*" - Systemic (group-to-group), which is a virtual place of interaction, and in the Internalization, there is the Exercising "*ba*" – Synthetic, where the explicit knowledge is practised daily (Nonaka & Konno, 1998).

2.2 ORGANISATIONAL WISDOM

Wisdom is the object of study of Philosophy and other areas for centuries, is currently the object of interest of Management (Hays, 2007; Rowley, 2006; Schmit, Muldoon, & Pounders, 2012). The principles of wisdom apply to several areas of Management, including the area of

knowledge (Rooney & McKenna, 2007). Organisational Wisdom is a step beyond Knowledge Management, once that organisational decisions are also made based on psychological and spiritual factors, not only rational ones (Izak, 2013).

In a specific context, it is necessary to choose and apply proper knowledge; it is necessary to be the capacity of judgment and action in a given situation (Bierly *et al.*, 2000). There are three foundations to this ability, experience, spirituality, and passion for learning (Bierly *et al.*, 2000; Hays, 2007). They are intuitive, sensory and unscientific because the experience is the integration between old and new knowledge; it is the accumulation of knowledge beyond the context of that issue that helps in decision making through intuition. The spirituality develops the understanding of the soul, the position in the universe, leads to self-reflection and formulation of deeper goals. Passion, in turn, is promoted by spirituality, is the force of belief to make it happen, is to believe that the work is significant (Bierly *et al.*, 2000).

There are several concepts around this construct, such as “the ability to make right use of knowledge, or the capacity to judge rightly in matters relating to life and conduct” (Ostenfeld, 2003). The ability to solve problems and accomplish new tasks influences the organisation's efficiency and effectiveness (North & Pöschl, 2003; Pinheiro, Raposo, & Hernández, 2012). “The capacity to put into action the most appropriate behaviour, taking into account what is known (knowledge) and what does the most good (ethical and social considerations)” (Rowley, 2006a, p. 1250). Wisdom is essentially doing the right thing. The wise act judiciously and prudently in the appreciation of the fullness of context, respond to complex problems in contentious circumstances in a far-sighted and appropriate manner, and care about and prepare for a future that matters (Hays, 2007). Organisational Wisdom involves the integration and sharing of wisdom among the members of the organisation (Bierly *et al.*, 2000; Nonaka & Takeuchi, 2011; Schmit *et al.*, 2012).

Wisdom has dimensions that must be clarified (Schmit *et al.*, 2012): i) Reflective, is the ability to remember the past, to reflect on weak and strong points to mitigate and strengthen, respectively; ii) Openness refers to creativity, imagination and intellectual curiosity that leads the sage to be more tolerant of other points of view; iii) Interactive attitude, is the ability to regulate their own emotions and expressions, in addition to understanding the behaviour and emotions of others; iv) Practice, knowing what and why to apply a principle, how to filter what disperses in the organisation and focus on the relevant points; v) Ethical sensitivity, refers to

the capacity for ethical judgment, values, concern for others; vi) Paradoxical tolerance, wise leader ability to take a long term view, how to tolerate with uncertainty; vii) Experience, not any experience, but morally challenging ones that allow the development of wisdom.

The role of the leader in the development and fostering of Knowledge Management and Organisational Wisdom must be emphasised. Thus, the six abilities of phronetic leaders are i) the wise leader is able to judge goodness; ii) manages to capture the essence behind the situation before deciding; iii) creates contexts of sharing among members; iv) communicates the essence, i.e., can transmit and be understood, as they are able to use figures of speech; v) exercise political power, that is, are able to bring the knowledge and efforts of members to achieve their goals; vi) foster practical wisdom in all members of the organisation, not only in top managers (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 2011).

2.3. CULTURE

Each human group (society or nations) has its own culture, collective programming of the mind which distinguishes its members from other groups, a system of values held collectively. Thus, the culture of an individual will affect their behaviour, which is not random and can be recognised by members of other societies (Hofstede, 1980).

Research on Knowledge Management should consider variables as culture (Usono & Abiagam, 2018). Cultural differences are more evident in institutions such as organisations because it affects their structures and functioning, for example, their power structures, their goals and objectives, their decision-making process, their reward systems, their formal procedures and the values of their members (Hofstede, 1980).

3. METHODOLOGY

There are phenomena in the human sciences that are little known about and cannot be fully quantified, in these case the method indicated for analysing and interpreting deep, complex and highly subjective phenomena, as knowledge and wisdom, is the qualitative method (Godoy, 1995; Günther, 2006; Marconi & Lakatos, 2011; Fassinger & Morrow, 2013), its use intends to answer "how" and "why" the social phenomena happen, describe the complexity of human behaviour (Marconi & Lakatos, 2011; Yin, 2013). In addition to the data, their collection and

analysis are also different from quantitative methods (Marconi & Lakatos, 2011; Silverman, 2001).

The researched phenomena, Knowledge Management and Organisational Wisdom, have recent literature, with few secondary data and many theoretical articles. That is why this article seeks to find new knowledge, habits, and answers to particular questions through primary data obtained through interviews (Flick, 2005; Marconi & Lakatos, 2011; Silverman, 2001; Yin, 2013). The choice of the script was based on the freedom of expression granted to the interviewee, as well as the possibility of extracting deeper and more complex responses to the phenomenon studied (Flick, 2005). The script was based on the literature review and was submitted to two pre-tests (Marconi & Lakatos, 2011).

The unit of analysis is the managers. The interviews were conducted electronically, between June and September 2019, Computer-assisted telephone interviewing – CATI (Couper & Hansen, 2001), by audio recording on the WhatsApp application and by e-mail, in Portuguese, English, and Spanish, in Brazil, Argentina, Portugal, Bulgaria, Serbia, Angola, Australia and China. The interview made by telephone has advantages such as reduce interviewer effects, bring better interviewer uniformity in delivery, greater standardisation of questions, researcher safety and greater cost-efficiency (Shuy, 2001).

The organisations were selected among the social network of the interviewer, according to the possibility of access to their managers and the availability of their response. Regarding the delimitation of the sample, there is no focus on specific areas of activity. Thus, there were intrinsic and collective reasons for choosing the sample (Marconi & Lakatos, 2011). They have an outstanding utility as a discovery strategy, corresponding to the essence of the qualitative method. Even if partially with the simplicity of a routine conversation, they will be used to understand in detail the contexts and events of the phenomena investigated (Marconi & Lakatos, 2011; Moreira, 2007; Yin, 2013).

The audio-recorded interviews were transcribed as soon as they happen, because their reading and coding are necessary to evaluate and adjust, if necessary, the interviewer's performance. To save time and make the text comprehensible, all words were transcribed, without indicating speech changes of the participants; repeated words, sounds (mm, uh-huh) were ignored; uncertain and inaudible passages were indicated; only the conventional score will be reported,

without pauses, volumes, intonations, stress (Macnaghten & Myers, 2007). As well, so that there is an early reflection on the collected data. Moments in which notes were taken, and articles were reviewed since analysing the data is not a mechanical process (Ezzy, 2002; Macnaghten & Myers, 2007). The relevant interventions for the discussion were categorised according to the criteria based on the literature that was established during the analysis of the responses (Macnaghten & Myers, 2007).

The collected data were analysed by the explanation building technique (Yin, 2013). This analysis occurred through a series of iterations, which are: i) An initial proposition about a social behaviour; ii) The comparison of the data with the initial proposition; iii) Review of the propositions; iv) Compare other details of the interviews with the literature review; v) Compare the literature review with the other interviews; vi) Repeat the process (Yin, 2013).

4. RESULTS ANALYSES AND DISCUSSION

4.1. INTERVIEWER

The interviewing was made with computer-assisted telephone data collection, with a reduced role of the interviewer (Couper & Hansen, 2001). The purpose of that choice was to lessen factors that influence respondents, like the characteristics of the interviewer, such as gender, age, race, nationality, social class, and appearance. Other factors, such as errors of the interviewer, must be considerate (Johnson, 2001; Warren, 2001).

4.2. INTERVIEWEES

Finding people willing to answer the interview can a problem (Warren, 2001), considering the theme, which even the interviewees perceived as complex. Seventeen interviews were conducted, three were rejected, because of the lack of connection between the answers and the theme searched. Even, some interviewees present more elaborated answers than others, not only regarding the theoretical content but also because of the motivation to respond, the time spent in the interview, the ability to express themselves on the subject, and the insights that can provide the interviewer (Johnson, 2001). The table below presents the profile of the interviewees and the organisations.

Table 1: Profile of Interviewees and Organisations

Identification	Age	Gender	Time in the Organisation	Country	Number of Employees	Organisation
Interviewee 1	38 years old	Female	20 years	Brazil	420	Brand representation with carrier
Interviewed 2	29 years old	Female	9 years	Serbia	10	Tourism Agency
Interviewee 3	40 years old	Male	4 years	Bulgaria	40	Business Development Outsourcing Solutions
Interviewee 4	65 years old	Male	31 years	Argentina	360	Claims settlement company
Interviewed 5	40 years old	Female	19 years	Brazil	80.000	State Bank
Interviewed 6	41 years old	Female	20 years	Brazil	150	Family group with radio, soccer team and college
Interviewee 7	33 years old	Male	10 years	Brazil	1.600	Hospital
Interviewee 8	41 years old	Male	9 years	Brazil	300	Oil Extraction
Interviewed 9	23 years old	Female	1 year	Portugal	29	Nursing home
Interviewed 10	40 years old	Male	2 years	Angola	10	Commerce, Health Services, and Services.
Interviewee 11	31 years old	Male	13 years	Brazil	65	Automation, Energy, Telecommunications, Information, and Technology
Interviewed 12	58 years old	Male	28 years	Portugal	770	Public Entity
Interviewee 13	37 years old	Male	1 year	Australia	3	Sports School
Interviewee 14	54 years old	Male	20 years	China	10	Pharmacy

The sex of the interviewees is unavoidably relevant because it influences their answers, although it is not possible to generalise the importance of this influence and, also, depends on the type of question (Johnson, 2001; Shuy, 2001). These different results were predictable (Heidari, Babor, Castro, Tort, & Curno, 2016) and shows that the five women interviewed gave longer and more detailed answers, presenting greater familiarity with intangible concepts and ease in discussing their perceptions about the relationship between theory and practice.

The cultural origin of the interviewees is also a distinguishing factor (Hofstede, 1980), but with the small sample of this study, it was not possible to verify the differences between them.

4.3. ANSWERS

4.3.1. *Units of meaning*

Key points, words, and expressions most commonly cited in the answers of the interviewees were identified. Next, the units of meaning were determined, which group the main ideas transmitted by the interviewees to understand how the interviewees perceived the questions and

the constructs in the organisation itself. The grouping was due to the similarity of answers (Bardin, 1977). In the table below are the units of meaning obtained.

Table 2: Units of meaning

Knowledge Management	Creation/Sharing	Conversations (e.g., phone calls and social networks) Meetings (e.g., face-to-face and online) Training (e.g., face-to-face and online) Documents (e.g., logbooks, technical notes, e-mails) Tutoring
	<i>Ba</i>	Living room and common areas (e.g., dining-room, cafeteria, and cloakroom) Auditoriums and meeting rooms Online (e.g., social networks and emails)
Organisational Wisdom		Efficiency and continuous improvement Emotional aspects (e.g., alignment, sense of belonging and commitment) Knowledge Management (sharing knowledge and the correct use of knowledge) Leadership Generate social good and ethics

4.3.2. Knowledge Management: Creation and Knowledge Sharing

The first question was: “How does your organisation create/share knowledge?”. The answers demonstrate that the interviewees observe the Creation and Knowledge Sharing by two main perspectives, an inner vision, focused on production, and an external vision focused on the relationship with customers and profit generation. The interviewees gave some examples of how they create and share knowledge, training (face-to-face and online), meetings, calls e-mails, and social media.

“The knowledge is shared daily, in our specific case, weekly meetings are held where they exchange specific situations and problems that arise daily and those who, after an analysis of each problem, make a conclusion based on knowledge and experience gained over the years.” (Interviewee 4)

“My company promotes knowledge creation through classroom and online training. To do so, we have a Corporate University, classrooms, auditoriums, and partnerships with companies specialised in employee training.” (Interviewee 5)

“Currently, our company operates in a totally decentralised way with 11 subsidiaries spread throughout the country; consequently, we tend to use technology to develop and share the knowledge of the entire team. We use the means of communication, such as WhatsApp and Skype, to unify knowledge and routine meetings to share experiences, innovations, and knowledge. We act very closely between direction, management, and production.” (Interviewee 11)

“knowledge sharing is daily in our company. Our company does not live without knowledge, because everyone must be speaking the same language. I cannot go there and instruct a student in a way, and the other instructor will give a totally different instruction, we have to be speaking the same language even to be creating this strong link of the company of a bond of the student-teacher, but not only the student-teacher but student-company.” (Interviewee 13)

The interviewees did not mention activities to manage organisational knowledge, as the existence of knowledge vision, management of conversations, mobilisation of knowledge activists, the variation of the appropriate context, nor globalisation of local knowledge (Erden *et al.*, 2008). Although, they can understand the need to exchange knowledge between the members to create new knowledge with the existent knowledge (Ipe, 2003; Nonaka, 1994; Wilkesmann & Wilkesmann, 2011). The answers demonstrate the limitation of the perception of the interviewees of other forms of knowledge creation and sharing besides training and meetings (in person or online). For example, Knowledge Spillover (Acs, Braunerhjelm, Audretsch, & Carlsson, 2009) it is not known, and the simple way to share knowledge, the socialization (Nonaka, 1994), was mentioned only by the interviewees 1, 9 and 11.

4.3.3. *Ba*

The “*ba*” is a space of transcendence and a platform of Knowledge conversion (Nonaka, Toyama, & Konno, 2000), to facilitate the understanding of managers the question did not use the name of the construct: “Does your organisation have sites that are conducive to knowledge creation/sharing? Describe them.”. Even though the interviewees 2, 3, 10, and 14 did not understand the question. Interviewees who responded positively to the question gave examples

such as an living rooms, cafeteria, dressing room (Originating "*ba*"), meeting rooms, auditoriums, training room (Interacting "*ba*"), social media (Cyber "*ba*"), and open workplace (Exercising "*ba*") (Nonaka & Konno, 1998).

“We do not have (...)” (Interviewee 14)

“For now, my organisation has no place to create or share knowledge, for now, it has not” (Interviewee 10)

Even though the interviewees have given examples of all stages, it is noted that only stages Interacting “*ba*” and Cyber “*ba*” are present on a reoccurring level. The first *ba*, which is the basis for the others (Nonaka & Konno, 1998), is slight mentioned. Thus, it is possible to understand in which area of the *ba* these managers could improve their place for knowledge sharing.

“It has an auditorium with a reasonable audio-visual resource for approximately 50 people.” (Interviewee 7)

“Currently the sharing is done "online", workshops and internal meetings” (Interviewee 11)

“In the process of knowledge sharing, there is the construction of an environment of trust, acting as a facilitator in processes and relationships, through the empowerment of people, stimulating the sharing of knowledge. Finally, in the process of using knowledge, an environment is promoted, based on authentic relationships, that values and stimulates self-awareness and the development of followers, facilitating the use of organisational knowledge.” (Interviewee 12)

Regarding the answers about the “*ba*”, it is noted the focus on physical location, which demonstrates difficulty in understanding the construct, and the second point of view, in which they perceive that it can be anywhere (Nonaka & Konno, 1998). The interviewees 5, 12 and 13 are closer to understand the meaning of the construct. It is possible to understand that there is difficulty in recognising the need to foster the intangible aspects that precede the sharing of

knowledge. For instance, the interviewees did not mention the mental “*ba*” (Nonaka & Konno, 1998). No answer presented the individual time of inspiration, creativity, or reflexion.

4.3.4. *Wisdom*

The first questions about organisational wisdom did not use the name of the construct to understand the perception of the managers of the organisational wisdom results: “How does your organisation generate value and social good?”. The answers were related to other constructs, such as Corporate social responsibility, sustainability, appreciation, recognition, and well-being of employees, social actions with the community and members of the organisation, improvement of the work environment, and accountability.

“The company has a strong social responsibility structure, worrying about the well-being of its internal and external public. Thus, adopting attitudes and actions with the firm purpose of contributing to collective interests, we have as a basis that it is not to practice assistance, but to have a practical and constant involvement within actions that generate value and personal growth for its employees. So, we realise through actions in the community that we are involved, the gains are intangible and are moments experienced in a unique way, and that have no way to calculate why these gains are not materialised.” (Interviewee 1)

“Through innovation, developing new technologies and systems for the common good.” (Interviewee 11)

“We usually make donations.” (Interviewee 14)

“In the company's view, the social value it generates is to maintain the physical fitness of the workforce, aiming at the well-being of all employees and in the same way the waste generated by our activity, it segregates and gives an appropriate destination, in order to preserve the environment and reverse logistics, performing reverse logistics, which generates social welfare for the whole country, for the whole society.” (Interviewee 8)

The answers present a lack of theoretical knowledge of what would be "social good", most of which is limited to welfare, i.e., charity and financial rewards for employees. These perceptions of "social good" is a cultural difference among them (Hofstede, 1980).

"Wisdom is defined as the capacity to put into action the most appropriate behaviour, taking into account what is known (knowledge) and what does the most good (ethical and social considerations)". Do you consider your organisation wise? What are the most visible aspects of your organisation?". Two of the interviewees (7 and 3) do not consider their organisations wise, while the rest believe in the wisdom of their organisation.

"Wise, I say No. The board has a lot of experience under their belt; however, it is run by human beings and for as much, and we do not want to admit it there is an emotional factor and political power plays. Shark eats shark."
(Interviewee 3)

"I see an abyss between the hierarchical levels, so the information and actions are dispersed. I cannot see the wisdom in this." (Interviewee 7)

The perception of interviewee 2 that the organisation may become even wiser disentangled the others.

"Well, like, wise, wise, yes, we think, but you always can be wiser."
(Interviewee 2)

Managers who considered their organisation wise identified leadership, ethics, the efficiency of the organisation, commitment and engagement of employees to generate social good, knowledge management (sharing and correct use of knowledge), and emotional aspects as the most visible aspects of wisdom.

"I consider my organisation very wise, especially because what makes the difference between our organisation and others is the knowledge and because it is very great competitiveness in this environment, what makes the difference is precisely this knowledge, this knowledge sharing of the company." (Interviewee 13)

Managers who did not consider their organisations wise identified emotional and political factors, and inefficient knowledge management as aspects of wisdom that their organisation does not have. In the answers of the interviewees are possible to perceive that they have difficulties to talk about emotions, feelings, and how it affects the organisations. They know that is important, but they do not know how to manage it, and how to create value and social good with the intangible level of their organisations.

In the question “Do you see the relationship between knowledge creation/sharing and Organisational Wisdom?” there is a significant disparity in the answers because some interviewees claim not to notice the connection between the constructs (interviewee 7 and 14), while others notice not only the relationship as the dependence on knowledge sharing for the existence of organisational wisdom.

“I don’t see a relationship between this two because it is the same thing, because without knowledge you can’t be wisdom, so it is like that two thinks support each other, so as much you improve your knowledge you will be much more wisdom and I think that work of improving your knowledge is a good thing so we in our company, organisation, whatever you want, as I told before, we share our knowledge (...)” (Interviewee 2)

“The relationship between Organisational wisdom and knowledge sharing is very important because the one who has knowledge or wisdom in one subject is transferred to another. The meetings that are carried out in the company serve to consolidate the knowledge and, at the same time, the human relationship between the members, offering them continuously norms of coexistence and tolerance that will make that each idea is finished with the best-acquired knowledge.” (Interviewee 4)

“I usually say you cannot do anything without willing. I can know without, and I can explain to the other person without, but if he does not have the will and if he mainly does not want to, it is as if I do not say anything. We can create, share, explain everything, all knowledge that we know we can share with the other, but if that other does not have the will to continue that knowledge, to share it, and to apply it, it is not worth it. Organisational wisdom is the basis of everything. We must be

a little bit more than the work thus demands of us, we must have a little bit of insight, without that it does not work. (...) what I mean, that relationship between knowledge and wisdom is the basis, it is the basis, and in my opinion organisational wisdom is even more important than sharing knowledge, for a little but a little bit more important.” (Interviewee 9)

In these questions, that involves organisational wisdom, most of the interviewees demonstrated that they did not fully understand the concept of this construct. The answers indicate that there is still an old view of management theory, they are still attached to the concept of doing what is right, without absorbing the other constructs, only solving problems (Nonaka *et al.*, 2000).

The last question, “What is indispensable for achieving Organisational Wisdom?”, wants to understand if the previous answers of the interviewees are coherent with their belief (consider their organisations wise) actions and perceptions about the construct. Their answers demonstrated that there is no coherence among their perceptions and organisational actions that would lead them to a wise organisation.

“It is fundamental that the company is always updating itself, there is no knowledge without the search for knowledge, knowledge it is very relative, if you acquire knowledge and do not practice knowledge, this knowledge it falls by the wayside, especially in this industry you have a speedy updating of equipment, knowledge, in all the ways that you can think in a technical and physical part. We have to be always improving, and this way that we transmit and sustain this organisational wisdom.” (Interviewee 13)

“It is desirable that the organisation uses actions to rescue values that reinforce the importance and the need to qualify and motivate all members of its team of employees, aiming at improving the organisational climate and culture. Providing opportunities to improve the interpersonal relationship between employees, managers, and customers, for the promotion of a more productive environment, consequently, more profitable.” (Interviewee 12)

“The most important thing for organisational wisdom is that all employees feel part of the organisation and find their greatest potential, their talent, and the wisdom to

create a wise and sustainable organisation.” (Interviewee 4)

“It is necessary to align the soul of the organisation with its employees, creating connectivity, which motivates them to seek to adapt to organisational values and interests.” (Interviewee 6)

“For a company to achieve Organisational Wisdom, there must be an environment in which individual characteristics are respected, and there is mutual cooperation between employees. The Wisdom of the Organisation is a set of individual skills and wisdom, which, when united, generates harmony, and the organisation, as a whole, wins.” (Interviewee 5)

The answers emphasise the need for continuous improvement (Bierly *et al.*, 2000; Nonaka & Takeuchi, 2011; Schmit *et al.*, 2012), alignment between personal and organisational values, the sense of belonging (Crossman, 2016; Konz & Ryan, 1999), the intellectual capital of the organisation, Knowledge Management (Rowley, 2006b; Rowley & Gibbs, 2008), the need for wise individuals in the organisation, as well as the development of the skills and knowledge of its members to reach and foster organisational wisdom (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 2011; Schmit *et al.*, 2012).

5. CONCLUSION

The interviewees 02, 03, 07, 08, 10, and 14 demonstrated that they are far from understanding the main constructs. On the other hand, the interviewees 01, 04, 05, 06, 09, 11, 12, and 13 showed greater theoretical awareness about the main constructs. The interviewees 01, 04, 05, and 06 have a similar understanding of the constructs. The interviewees 09 and 13 share the same vision of Knowledge Sharing and its importance to the organisation. The interviewees 02, 03, and 14 have the same absence of perception of the organisational wisdom theory and practice.

Although the interviewees showed some practice of the phases three and four of "Ba", it is the construct that is furthest from the theoretical knowledge of the interviewees, while knowledge sharing is the construct best known by them. Regarding Organisational Wisdom, as the theme of wisdom is transversal to several areas, including being present in the main religions (Gugerell

& Riffert, 2011), it was developed moderately by the interviewees. Then, the manager must develop the concept and the elements of Organisational Wisdom itself and the immaterial part of Knowledge Management (“*ba*” and tacit knowledge) in their organisations.

There is a disparity between the advancement of theory and practice in organisations. It is possible to conclude that managers interviewed have a simplistic notion of what knowledge management is, they do not understand the notion of “*ba*” and are focused on explicit knowledge, for example, they still fail to understand in a global way knowledge and how to manage it, and have almost no notion of what is organisational wisdom. They understand the importance of the leader, mainly because they are leaders, giving importance to their function.

Conversely to the contributions, it should be mentioned the limitations of this research. First, the sample is small, only 14 organisations. Second, the influence of constructs such as culture, age, and gender, are not adequately perceived. Third, the subjectivity of the interviewer (Warren, 2001). Fourth, the interviews were not conducted in person, which influences the answers (Shuy, 2001). Moreover, fifth, the lack of theoretical knowledge of interviewees about the area, even if it is the reality of organisations.

Finally, as future studies suggest, the possibility of another survey with a larger sample could be tested, as investigations with other methodologies, such as questionnaire with quantitative analyses. Also, the opportunity to deepen the study about the influences of the organisation size, industry, and constructs such as culture, gender, and age on the perception of managers about knowledge management and organisational wisdom.

REFERENCES

- Acs, Z. J., Braunerhjelm, P., Audretsch, D. B., & Carlsson, B. (2009). The knowledge spillover theory of entrepreneurship. *Small Business Economics*, 32, 15–30.
- Alvesson, M., & Söldbberg, K. (2000). *Reflexive Methodology: New Vistas for Qualitative Research*. SAGE Publications Inc.
- Bardin, L. (1977). *Análise de Conteúdo*. Lisboa: Editora 70.
- Bennet, A., & Bennet, D. (2008). Moving from knowledge to wisdom, from ordinary consciousness to extraordinary consciousness. *Vine*, 38(1), 7–15.
- Bierly, P. E., Kessler, E. H., & Christensen, E. W. (2000). Organizational learning,

- knowledge and wisdom. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 13(6), 595–618. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09534810010378605>
- Couper, M. P., & Hansen, S. E. (2001). Computer-Assisted Interviewing. In J. F. Grubrium & J. A. Holstein (Eds.), *Handbook of Interview Research: Context & Method* (1st ed., pp. 557–601). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications Inc.
- Crossman, J. (2016). Alignment and Misalignment in Personal and Organizational Spiritual Identities. *Identity*, 16(3), 154–168. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15283488.2016.1190726>
- Erden, Z., von Krogh, G., & Nonaka, I. (2008). The quality of group tacit knowledge. *Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 17(1), 4–18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2008.02.002>
- Ezzy, D. (2002). *Qualitative Analysis: Practice and Innovation*. London: Routledge.
- Fassinger, R., & Morrow, S. L. (2013). Toward best practices in quantitative, qualitative, and mixed-method research: A social justice perspective. *Journal for Social Action in Counseling and Psychology*, 5(2), 69–83.
- Flick, U. (2005). *Métodos Qualitativos na Investigação Científica* (1st ed.; L. Monitor - Projectos e Edições, ed.). Lisboa.
- Godoy, A. S. (1995). Pesquisa Qualitativa Tipos Fundamentais. *Revista de Administração de Empresas*, 35(3), 20–29.
- Gugerell, S. H., & Riffert, F. (2011). On Defining “Wisdom”: Baltes, Ardel, Ryan, and Whitehead. *Interchange*, 42(3), 225–259. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10780-012-9158-7>
- Günther, H. (2006). Pesquisa qualitativa versus pesquisa quantitativa: esta é a questão? *Psicologia: Teoria E Pesquisa*, 22(2), 201–209.
- Hays, M. J., & Martin, J. (2007). Dynamics Of Organizational Wisdom. *Business Renaissance Quartely*, 2(4), 77–122.
- Heidari, S., Babor, T. F., Castro, P. De, Tort, S., & Curno, M. (2016). Sex and Gender Equity in Research: rationale for the SAGER guidelines and recommended use. *Research Integrity and Peer Review*, 1(2), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41073-016-0007-6>
- Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture and Organizations. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 10(4), 15–41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00208825.1980.11656300>
- Ipe, M. (2003). Knowledge Sharing in Organizations: A Conceptual Framework. *Human Resource Development Review*, 2(4), 337–359.
- Izak, M. (2013). The foolishness of wisdom: Towards an inclusive approach to wisdom in organization. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 29(1), 108–115.
- Johnson, J. M. (2001). In-Depth Interviewing. In J. F. Gubrium & J. A. Holstein (Eds.), *Handbook of Interview Research: Context & Method* (1st ed., pp. 103–119). Thousand

Oaks: Sage Publications Inc.

- Jordan, J., & Jones, P. (1997). Assessing your company's Knowledge Management style. *Long Range Planning*, 30(3), 392–398.
- Kessler, E. H. (2006). Organizational wisdom: Human, managerial, and strategic implications. *Group and Organization Management*, 31(3), 296–299.
- Konz, G. N. P. P., & Ryan, F. X. (1999). Maintaining an organizational spirituality: No easy task. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 12(3), 200–210.
- Macnaghten, P., & Myers, G. (2007). *Qualitative Research Practice* (Paperback; C. Seale, G. Gobo, J. F. Gubrium, & D. Silverman, eds.). London: SAGE.
- Marconi, M. de A., & Lakatos, E. M. (2011). *Metodologia Científica* (5ª). São Paulo: Atlas.
- Moreira, C. D. (2007). *Teorias e Práticas de Investigação* (I. S. de C. S. e Políticas, ed.). Lisboa.
- Nonaka, I. (1994). A Dynamic Theory of Organizational Knowledge Creation. *Organization Science*, 5(1), 14–37. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.5.1.14>
- Nonaka, I., & Konno, N. (1998). The Concept of “Ba”: Building a Foundation for Knowledge Creation. *California Management Review*, 40(3), 40–54.
- Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (2011). The Wise Leader. *Harvard Business Review*, 89(5), 58–67.
- Nonaka, I., Toyama, R., & Konno, N. (2000). SECI, Ba and Leadership: a Unified Model of Dynamic Knowledge Creation. *Long Range Planning*, 33(1), 5–34.
- North, K., & Pöschl, A. (2003). Un test de inteligencia para las organizaciones. In R. Hernández-Mogollón (Ed.), *Dirección del conocimiento: Desarrollos teóricos y aplicaciones* (pp. 182–192). Trujillo: Ediciones La Coria.
- Ostenfeld, E. N. (2003). Socratic wisdom; the model of knowledge in Plato's early dialogues. *The Classical Review*, 53(1), 44–80.
- Pinheiro, P., Raposo, M., & Hernández, R. (2012). Measuring organizational wisdom applying an innovative model of analysis. *Management Decision*, 50(8), 1465–1487.
- Polanyi, M. (1966). *The tacit dimension*. Nova Iorque: Anchor Day.
- Rooney, D., & Mckenna, B. (2007). Wisdom in Organizations: Whence and Whither Wisdom in Organizations: Whence and Whither. *Social Epistemology: A Journal of Knowledge, Culture and Policy*, 21(March 2015), 37–41.
- Rowley, J. (2006a). What do we need to know about wisdom? *Management Decision*, 44(9), 1246–1257. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00251740610707712>
- Rowley, J. (2006b). Where is the wisdom that we have lost in knowledge? *Journal of*

- Documentation*, 62(2), 251–270. <https://doi.org/10.1108/0022041061065332>
- Rowley, J., & Gibbs, P. (2008). From learning organization to practically wise organization. *The Learning Organization*, 15(5), 356–372.
- Schmit, D. E., Muldoon, J., & Pounders, K. (2012). What is wisdom? The development and validation of a multidimensional measure. *Journal of Leadership*, ..., 9(2), 39–55. Retrieved from http://www.na-businesspress.com/JLAE/schmit_abstract.html
- Schmit, Dora E., Muldoon, J., & Pounders, K. (2012). What is wisdom? The development and validation of a multidimensional measure. *Journal of Leadership, Accountability and Ethics*, 9(2), 39–55. Retrieved from http://www.na-businesspress.com/JLAE/schmit_abstract.html
- Shuy, R. W. (2001). In-Person versus Telephone Interviewing. In J. F. Gubrim & J. A. Holstein (Eds.), *Handbook of Interview Research: Context & Method* (1st ed., pp. 537–555). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications Inc.
- Silverman, D. (2001). *Interpreting Qualitative Data: Methods for Analysing Talk, Text and Interaction* (Í. Sage, Ed.). London.
- Usoro, A., & Abiagam, B. (2018). Culture effect on knowledge management adoption in Nigerian hospitality industry. *VINE Journal of Information and Knowledge Management Systems*, 48(3), 314–332.
- Warren, C. A. B. (2001). Qualitative Interviewing. In J. F. Gubrium & J. A. Holstein (Eds.), *Handbook of Interview Research: Context & Method* (1st ed., pp. 83–101). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications Inc.
- Wilkesmann, M., & Wilkesmann, U. (2011). Knowledge transfer as interaction between experts and novices supported by technology. *Vine*, 41(2), 96–112.
- Yin, R. K. (2013). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (4th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Zahra, S. A., & George, G. (2002). Absorptive Capacity: A Review, Reconceptualization, and Extension. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(2), 185–203. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2002.6587995>