

How to Exchange Tacit Knowledge in Multicultural Discussion?

Yayoi Hirose

Toyo University, Tokyo, Japan

yayoi.hirose@iniad.org

Abstract: This qualitative study highlights the importance of considering the cultural gaps in interdisciplinary discussion, as people cannot transfer and exchange tacit knowledge without considering the cultural context. Past literature claims that the dialogue style of discussion is an effective approach for interdisciplinary discussion. However, specific cultures, such as collectivist and high-context cultures, do not accept conflict of opinions. The current study defines a two-part research question: How do cultural gaps affect the dialogue process among people who have different cultural values? How can tacit knowledge be exchanged in multicultural discussions? The study considers Japanese organisations which implemented dialogue-style workshops, as Japanese organisational members have cultural values, such as collectivism and high context, which do not match a dialogue style of discussion. Regarding the first question, the findings show that the participants do not understand tacit knowledge regarding dialogue when they are simply taught the process of how to conduct a dialogue style of discussion. Instead, they tend to use the discussion method based on their cultural context. The study clarifies that simple implementation of dialogue in organisations whose culture does not match it will not enable transfer of tacit knowledge, and participants will not use the dialogue method as expected. For the second question, the findings show that to exchange tacit knowledge, Japanese participants need a place where they feel safe to share tacit knowledge and build trust on others' personality rather than their ability. The tendency to trust is related to the Japanese cultural value of low assertiveness, while assertive people tend to build trust based on others' ability. This finding suggests that people will not exchange tacit knowledge with others who have different cultures without building a trust relationship. An organiser needs to provide a safe place, considering the difference in the trust-building process among people from different organizational cultures.

Keywords: Dialogue, tacit knowledge, trust, multicultural discussion

1. Introduction

As global competition grows more severe, a wide range of experts must constructively communicate with each other in order to generate new services or products. Past literature claims that the dialogue style of discussion is an effective approach for interdisciplinary discussion (Hyde & Bineham, 2000; Isaacs, 1999). Dialogue clarifies and accepts the conflict of opinions among participants through disclosure, questions the participants' assumptions, and generates a new idea by overcoming the conflict (Marquardt et al., 2018; Tsoukas, 2009).

However, the dialogue style needs to consider that the conflict may not be clarified among people who have different cultures. For example, in countries that have collectivist and high-context cultures, people tend not to clearly express their own opinions and to avoid conflict to maintain harmonious relationships (Hartog, 2004; Nisbett, 2003). Under this cultural value, people do not value dialogue and lively discussions because they may disrupt harmony.

Thus, even if the participants learn explicit knowledge on dialogue, they do not necessarily understand the tacit knowledge of the dialogue, such as how to draw out others' opinions and what questions can encourage other participants to challenge their conventional assumptions. The simple implementation of a dialogue style of discussion is not effective for knowledge exchange and creation among people who do not value dialogue. To promote the exchange of knowledge among different cultures, it is necessary to consider the cultural impediments and factors which promote the exchange of tacit knowledge.

This study adopts as its cases Japanese organisations that implemented dialogue-style workshops to develop management ability, as their cultures do not value the dialogue style of discussion. It aims to identify the cultural impediments to implementing dialogue in Japanese organisations and how Japanese participants overcame them to exchange tacit knowledge in the workshops.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Knowledge and Culture

Sveiby (2001) divides knowledge into "a justified true belief" and "capacity-to-act". People often develop ways to justify that their beliefs are true based on the ambient cultural norms and values, rather than questioning whether those beliefs hold true for changing circumstances. A capacity-to-act is an individual competence that

is shown in action and developed through experiences (Calhoun & Starbuck, 2003; Sveiby, 2001). People's capacity to act may be limited by the cultural norms and values that they have absorbed and rely on. Thus, even if they learn something new from a cognitive perspective, i.e. they understand it, it may be hard to put it into practice, and so they do not change their behaviour. Knowledge should be widely shared because a belief held by only one person would be subjective and result in just that person's action (Brunsson, 1982). Collective behaviour is generated when the collective tacitly accepts it as holding true for them and relies on it to guide collective behaviour (Calhoun & Starbuck, 2005). Polanyi (1966) distinguishes tacit knowledge from explicit knowledge (1967). He explains that while explicit knowledge can be transferred via writing and verbal expressions between people, tacit knowledge cannot, as this knowledge is produced based on human experiences associated with their contexts. Tacit knowledge consists of people's cultural values, beliefs, and assumptions, which cannot be clearly expressed, so people cannot easily obtain each other's tacit knowledge (Baumard, 1999; Nonaka, 1994; Polanyi, 1966).

Knowledge transfer can be defined as the process of transferring justified true beliefs and the capacity to act. Knowledge transfer cannot be just a process of putting new knowledge in the receiver's mind. It is important for a knowledge receiver to internalize the new knowledge (Inkpen & Tsang, 2005; Leonard & Swap, 2004). Nonaka (1994) and Carlile (2004) suggest ease of transfer depends on how tacit the knowledge is, and having the right conditions in which knowers feel able and disposed to share knowledge enables learners to understand and interpret what it means for them in their own context. It may also need to be transformed in order to apply it to a different context (Carlile, 2004). Thus, when knowledge is transferred between organizations with different cultures, the knowledge receiver should understand not only the new justified true beliefs but also the new organization's cultural norms and values to adapt to them (Reid et al., 2001) because the new knowledge has been created in a different culture.

Consequently, when the receiver learns the capacity to act, he or she also needs to change his or her practices and rules (Kumar & Nti, 1998). On the other hand, changing only practices and rules may be a slower process than changing the mental schema because it requires action to be put into practice. However, it is not easy to change a mental schema because of the stickiness of tacit knowledge. This means that the knowledge receiver needs to change his or her norms and values, upon which his or her practices are based. Thus, although past literature suggests that conventional cultural values may impede transfer of tacit knowledge, there are few discussions on how and what cultural factors can impede transfer of tacit knowledge and how to promote knowledge exchange among people with different cultural values.

2.2 Dialogue and Culture

Past literature suggests the effectiveness of a dialogue style of discussion for knowledge exchange and creation by offsetting the difference in background (Marquardt et al., 2018; Svare, 2016). Dialogue is a sustained and open-ended collective inquiry and challenge into processes, assumptions, and certainties that an individual composes based on everyday experiences, and it produces an environment where people consciously participate in the creation of shared meaning by mutual influence (Bohm, 1996; Isaacs, 1993; Senge, 1990; Shaw, 2002). In knowledge-productive dialogue, participants provide awareness to each other by questioning their conventional assumptions (Mintzberg, 2004; Tsoukas, 2009). Dialogue is frequently used as an effective tool for collective knowledge generation to solve a problem or improve business performance (Heikka & Carayannis, 2016; Marquardt et al., 2018; Ratner et al., 2017; Remnyi & Griffiths, 2009; Tsoukas, 2009).

The past literature on dialogue assumes the people who ask, answer, and clarify the conflict of opinions in a knowledge exchange process are from a low-context and individualistic culture (Brymer et al., 2018; Ferraro & Beunza, 2018; Isaacs, 1993; Peters & Besley, 2021; Walton, 1989). However, there are few discussions on dialogue between people who rely on high-context culture and collectivism, which value low assertiveness and avoid conflict of opinions.

Japanese culture, which values high-context and collectivism, does not see the value of dialogue, as it encourages participants to think independently and critically and reflect on that thinking (Remnyi & Griffiths, 2009). Japan is a unique country which, around AD 400–550, integrated Buddhism and Confucianism into its original religious philosophy, Shinto. Since then, the three philosophies have sometimes blended into each other as well as influencing Japanese society. Affected by Confucianism and Buddhism, Japanese people have constructed the image of a leader as a person who should be able to lead harmonious groups based on the value of collectivism in a hierarchical society (Inamori, 2009; Nitobe, 2014). They also value humility and low

assertiveness to construct a harmonious collective group and lead the group to reach sustainable success (Inamori, 2009).

Collectivist cultures encourage people to develop interdependent selves where people are interconnected and prioritize good human relationships rather than individual goals (Davis & Ikeno, 2002), while dialogue encourages people to develop an independent sense of self and accept conflict of opinions (Remnyi & Griffiths, 2009). A high-context culture makes people less specific in their communications, and people avoid saying “no” directly in order to maintain politeness (Davis & Ikeno, 2002; Hall, 1976; Kim et al., 1998; Petkova, 2015). As a result, Japanese people tend to believe people should not explicitly express individual opinions, so under normal circumstances they would superficially agree with others, even if they actually disagree, obscuring their own opinions (Davis & Ikeno, 2002). There are few discussions on how high-context culture and collectivism affect the dialogue process, and it is necessary to consider it as global discussions increase.

3. Research Method

This research adopts a case study of Japanese organisations which rely on Japanese cultural values and implemented a dialogue style of discussion for the first time. The researcher conducted semi-structured interviews with 25 middle managers and performed qualitative analysis. The managers are from various departments, such as sales, engineering, marketing, human resource, and accounting, in Japanese companies founded more than 40 years ago. This membership composition is expected to enable an effective analysis on knowledge exchange among different cultural backgrounds. Their companies adopted the Coaching Ourselves (CO) method in their series of 30 workshops to develop their management ability. In every session, a management topic is discussed among members by sharing their related experiences. CO adopts dialogue-style discussion, where a participant is supposed to be asked probing questions by team members, answer the questions, and self-reflect about his/her management (Mintzberg, 2004). CO was developed based on Mintzberg’s management discipline so that business leaders can develop in the context of their practical management and can significantly improve their effectiveness given the opportunity to learn thoughtfully from their own experience. Mintzberg calls for a more reflective approach to management education (Mintzberg & Gosling, 2002).

The participants are expected to conduct self-directed learning through reflection. The key point is that simply listening and accepting others’ experiences and opinions are not effective for their reflection (Mintzberg, 2004). They need to reflect on their conventional management style and challenge their conventional assumptions by being questioned by other members or themselves (Mintzberg, 1973).

The study analyses how Japanese cultural factors affect the process of dialogue and how the participants reflect on their management style. The reason that the study chose the CO workshop is that this workshop considers the characteristics of Japanese organisational factors. In many Japanese organisations, the decision-making style is based on the bottom-up system in which middle managers collect enough information and propose and proceed with new projects rather than the top-down system in which the employees strongly commit to the CEO’s clear strategic vision. The CO method emphasises that the empowerment of middle managers and workshop participants in Japanese organizations are limited, as they will not be able to express their opinions to their executive managers based on the Japanese seniority mindset. Furthermore, CO requires context-based dialogue among middle managers who have a certain degree of management experience. In other words, it encourages the sharing of tacit knowledge accumulated from managerial experiences in each field.

4. Findings

The findings suggest that the cultural gaps impeded learners’ understanding of tacit knowledge on dialogue. Twenty-two out of 25 participants stated that they did not understand why dialogue can be effective for self-reflection and development of management ability.

In the initial period of sessions, we were taught that we should ask good questions in this way or something like that. But I did not intend to consider how I should ask good questions in some particular situations. I was just told. (Interviewee 21)

As a result, although they learned the whole procedure of dialogue in the workshops based on the guide documents, they did not know what questions can be effective for self-reflection.

I actually listened well, but I felt it was difficult to understand what kind of question I should ask, how I should lead the discussion, and whether I should attain the conclusion. (Interviewee 16)

I did not understand what to ask as I had no experience. In my experience, I just listened and learned the contents of the session in the seminar. (Interviewee 14)

They did not understand that to carry out dialogue, they needed to transform their conventional Japanese cultural values and understand the other values based on which dialogue was generated. This suggests that simple implementation of a dialogue style of discussion is not enough for participants who have collectivist and high-context cultural values because they do not have the experience of self-directed learning needed to understand effective dialogue. They did not understand how dialogue had to be carried out to be effective in multidisciplinary discussions because they tended to avoid conflict of opinions, which may disrupt their harmonious mood. As a result, they understood this dialogue workshop based on their cultural values and collectivism, which value low assertiveness and encourage them to listen to others carefully rather than ask questions and clarify the conflict of opinions.

I realised that the most important thing in the CO is to listen to other members' opinions. After that, I tried to listen to their opinions and became able to both talk and listen to them. (Interviewee 3)

The participants thought that individual attainment of the CO was learning the other participants' experiences and opinions rather than providing the other participants with the opportunity for reflection. They were provided awareness by listening to others rather than being asked and clarifying the conflict of opinions. After every session, the participants were required to write down what they thought in 10 minutes, which was unique for a Japanese workshop. This opportunity encouraged the Japanese to reflect on their management style without accepting the conflict of opinions.

Through the workshops, most of the participants regarded the goal of this dialogue workshop as being to eliminate sectional barriers and create an open and harmonious atmosphere for collaboration in their companies.

(The main objective of the CO) I thought we needed to eliminate barriers between sections. I thought my role was managing capable people, so I tried to promote collaboration. In order to do so, I needed to talk to people in other departments. (Interviewee 13)

Like Interviewee 13, the participants changed their management style to collaborate with other departments instead of deeply reflecting on themselves and started thinking about how to create new business through collaboration based on harmonious relationships.

The purpose of the CO was to activate relationships among middle managers. Actually, after the CO sessions, I contacted my CO colleagues when I needed to collect related information. (Interviewee 12)

Most of the participants aimed to build a trust relationship among themselves for collaboration. Evans (2013) claimed that trust is one of the most important factors for sharing tacit knowledge, and 17 participants opened up with their tacit knowledge on the discussion topics after building trusting relationship with other participants.

When I had just joined the CO seminar, I hesitated to say anything to managers of other sections. I think this is because I did not know what kind of people they were. But I came to freely say what I was thinking. I think basically all staff members really like to speak, and when start talking, they do not stop. But we did not have any chance to say what we were really thinking. (Interviewee 6)

Trust is the willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other will perform a particular action important to the trustor (Mayer et al., 1995). It depends on the trustee's ability and personality. People who value low assertiveness emphasise tradition, seniority, and experience and value personality over ability (Hartog, 2004). It can be said that Interviewee 6 built trust based on others' predictability rather than their ability.

The findings show that participants who built trusting relationships with others felt that a CO workshop would be a safe place where nobody would take negative actions against each other. Trust depends on the expectation

of perceived outcomes and risks (Uzzi, 1997). The CO participants were limited to middle managers, and their direct bosses were not allowed to participate in the sessions. They felt safe when they felt sympathy from other participants, as they had the same status and the same kind of experiences.

He was shocked when he was required to transfer to another office alone. Even a senior person who was more than ten years older than me said the same thing as me. I felt sympathy for him as I thought everybody had the same kind of experiences and got the present status . . . Even if I said something embarrassing, I felt relaxed because other members might have the same experiences. (Interviewee 1)

He felt safe when he shared the same emotions and experiences with other participants. The findings suggest the importance of providing a safe environment that promotes participants' self-determination and interest in their work (Deci & Ryan, 1987). Through sharing them, participants started trusting others' personalities and expressing their thoughts.

We are the first six members, and we closely interacted with each other and created a new circumstance, WA. (Interviewee 6)

"WA" means harmonious relationship in Japanese. Interviewee 6 suggested that the participants built a trusting relationship based on collectivism, which encouraged them to feel safe and disclose their tacit knowledge on the discussion topic even if the other participants belonged to other organisations.

As a result, the safe place strengthened the co-worker relationships.

I also came to frequently and freely talk to my colleagues when I needed to think about new projects. Before attending the CO seminars, I had been thinking about new projects by myself. Now, I will first contact my colleagues, and we think together. (Interviewee 2)

I came into close contact with my colleagues. Before attending this seminar, I did not care even if a manager of another department talks to me. Now if a CO member asks for cooperation on his project, I am sure that I will support him. (Interviewee 4)

They intended to share tacit knowledge which was generated in their cultural or specialised context.

Table 1 summarises the findings. Most of the participants did not obtain tacit knowledge on dialogue, in which a cultural context dialogue was generated. As a result, they reflected on their management style by listening to others' experiences rather than being asked. Most of the participants did not directly ask in-depth questions regarding their management style, as they did not come up with any questions to provide awareness to others. Rather, they just talked about their own experiences and listened to others. The participants who were provided a safe place to have a close private conversation with other participants tended to build a trust relationship among themselves. Through conversation, they trusted others' personalities rather than their management ability, and after that, they started sharing tacit knowledge with other participants. For example, sales managers actively shared tacit knowledge on sales with managers from other departments.

Table 1 Summary of Findings

	Understand tacit knowledge on dialogue to encourage other participants' self-reflection on their management?	Opportunity to have a private conversation with others?	Build personal trust among other participants?	Share tacit knowledge on the discussion topic with other participants who belong to a different department?
Interviewee 1	No.	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Interviewee 2	No.	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Interviewee 3	No.	Yes	No	No. Differentiated his real intention and his statement.
Interviewee 4	No.	Yes	Yes	Yes

	Understand tacit knowledge on dialogue to encourage other participants' self-reflection on their management?	Opportunity to have a private conversation with others?	Build personal trust among other participants?	Share tacit knowledge on the discussion topic with other participants who belong to a different department?
Interviewee 5	No.	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Interviewee 6	No.	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Interviewee 7	No.	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Interviewee 8	No.	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Interviewee 9	No.	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Interviewee 10	No.	Yes	No	No. Did not mention sharing tacit knowledge with others.
Interviewee 11	Yes. Made effort to ask to promote others' reflection.	Yes	Yes.	Yes.
Interviewee 12	No.	No	No	No. Simply focused on listening to others' experiences.
Interviewee 13	No.	No	No	No. He just attended and stopped participating.
Interviewee 14	No.	No	No	No
Interviewee 15	No.	No	No	No
Interviewee 16	No.	No	No	No
Interviewee 17	No.	Yes	Yes	Yes
Interviewee 18	No.	Yes	Tried	Yes
Interviewee 19	Partially yes. Frankly asked questions	No	Yes.	Yes
Interviewee 20	No.	No.	No.	No
Interviewee 21	No.	Yes	Yes	Yes
Interviewee 22	Yes. Made effort to ask probing questions.	Yes	Yes	Yes
Interviewee 23	No.	Yes	Yes	Yes
Interviewee 24	No.	Yes	Yes	Yes
Interviewee 25	No.	Yes	Yes	Yes

5. Discussion and Conclusion

The findings show that to effectively implement a dialogue style of discussion in organisations whose cultural values do not match it, organisers need to transfer tacit knowledge, such as the cultural context. Although the participants learned the dialogue style through the documents regarding questions, they did not understand in which situation they should ask, what kind of questions would be effective, and why they should be effective. Because the participants did not change their "*justified true belief*" in Sveiby's definition (2001), they thought clarifying the conflict of opinions would disrupt their harmonious relationship, which should be valued in Japanese culture. As a result, they did not change their "*act*" as expected for the dialogue style.

Although previous discussions emphasise that related prior knowledge is necessary to implement new knowledge (Cohen & Levinthal, 1990; Todorova & Durisin, 2007; Zara & George, 2002), the findings show that more context-based knowledge, which considers differences in cultural values, is necessary. They show that without transferring tacit knowledge, the participants will use new knowledge based on their conventional cultural values. Thus, when organisations with an incompatible culture aim to implement dialogue for multidisciplinary knowledge exchange, participants first need to change their conventional cultural assumptions.

This study highlights the importance of building trust among participants who have different backgrounds in the continuous knowledge exchange. It shows how in organisations which value low assertiveness, people build trust based on others' personal predictability rather than their ability (Hartog, 2004) and tend to share tacit knowledge that has been accumulated in their culture and specialised fields. The study also shows that they need a safe place to trust others and share tacit knowledge.

On the other hand, in more assertive societies, such as the UK and the United States, trust-building processes are mostly based on either calculation of the intentions of others or estimates of their capabilities to fulfil their commitments (Doney et al., 1998). Thus, when organising knowledge exchange between assertive and not-so-assertive organisations, not only is some informal mechanism for building trust needed (Lepore & Spigarelli, 2018), but so is making participants aware of this gap in trust-building. This finding is also expected to support remote dialogue-style discussion where members have different backgrounds to work more effectively.

References

- Baumard, P. (1999). *Tacit knowledge in organizations*. Sage, London.
- Bohm, D. (1996). *On dialogue*. Routledge, New York.
- Brunsson, N. (1982). "The irrationality of action and action rationality: Decisions, ideologies and organizational actions", *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 19, No. 1, pp. 29–44.
- Brymer, A.L.B., Wulfhorst, J.D. and Brunson, M.W. (2018). "Analyzing stakeholders' workshop dialogue for evidence of social learning", *Ecology and Society*, Vol. 23, No. 1:42.
- Calhoun, W.H. and Starbuck, M.A. (2003). "Barrier to creating knowledge", In Easterby-Smith, M. and Lyles, M.A. (eds), *Handbook of organizational learning and knowledge management*. Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 473–492.
- Carlile, P.R. (2004). "Transferring, translating, and transforming: An integrative framework for managing knowledge across boundaries", *Organization Science*, Vol. 15, No. 5, pp. 555–568.
- Cohen, W.M. and Levinthal, D.A. (1990). "Absorptive capacity: A new perspective on learning and innovation", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 35, pp. 126–152.
- Deci, E.L. and Ryan, R.M. (1987). "The support of autonomy and the control of behaviour", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 53, pp. 1024–1037.
- Davis, R.J. and Ikeno, O. (2002). *The Japanese mind: Understanding contemporary Japanese culture*. Tuttle Publishing.
- Doney, P.M., Cannon, J.P. and Mullen, M.R. (1998). "Understanding the influence of national culture on the development of trust", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 23, No. 3, pp. 601–620.
- Evans, M.M. (2013). "Is Trust the most important factor influencing knowledge sharing in organisations?", *Journal of Information and Knowledge Management*, Vol. 12, No. 4, 1350038.
- Ferraro, F. and Beunza, D. (2018). "Creating Common Ground: A Communicative Action Model of Dialogue in Shareholder Engagement", *Organization Science*, Vol. 29, No. 6, pp. 989–1236.
- Hall, E.T. (1976). *Beyond culture*. Anchor Press, New York.
- Hartog, D.N.D. (2004). "Assertiveness", In House, R.J., Hanges, P.J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P.W. and Gupta, V. (Eds.) *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 countries*. SAGE Publications, pp. 395–436.
- Heikka, T. and Carayannis, E.G. (2018). "The role of journalism in dialogic innovation processes—the case of the Helsinki Deaconess Institute Multi-Stakeholder Workshops", *Journal of Knowledge Economy*, Vol. 9, pp. 1415–1441.
- Hyde, B. and Bineham, J.L. (2000). "From debate to dialogue: Toward a pedagogy of nonpolarized public discourse", *Southern Communication Journal*, Vol. 65, No. 2–3, pp. 208–223.
- Inamori, K. (2009). *A compass to fulfillment: Passion and spirituality in life and business*. Sunmark Publishing, Tokyo.
- Inkpen, A.C. and Tsang, E.W.K. (2005). "Social capital, networks, and knowledge transfer", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 30, No. 1, pp. 146–165.
- Isaacs, W.N. (1993). "Taking flight: Dialogue, collective thinking, and organizational learning", *Organizational Dynamics*, Vol. 22, No. 2, pp. 24–39.
- Kim, D., Pan, Y. and Part, H. (1998). "High- versus low-context culture: A comparison of Chinese, Korean, and American cultures", *Psychology and Marketing*, Vol. 15, pp. 507–521.
- Kumar, R. and Nti, K.O. (1998). "Differential learning and interactions in alliance dynamics: A process and outcome discrepancy model", *Organizational Science*, Vol. 9, pp. 356–367.
- Leonard, D.A. and Swap, W. (2004). "Deep smart", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 82, No. 9, pp. 88–97.

- Lepore D and Spigarelli, F. (2018). "Opportunities and challenges in collaborative governance for smart specialization strategies—a systematic review of the literature", *Economia Marche Journal of Applied Economics*, Vol. 37, No. 2, pp. 1–27.
- Marquardt, M.J., Banks, S., Cauwelier, P. and Seng Ng, C. (2018). *Optimizing the power of action learning: Real-time strategies for developing leaders, building teams and transforming organizations* (3rd ed). Nicholas Brealey Publishing, Boston.
- Mayer, R.C., Davis, J.H. and Schoorma, F.D. (1995). "An integrative model of organizational trust", *The Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 20, No. 3, pp. 709–734.
- Mintzberg, H. (2004). *Managers not MBA: A hard look at the soft practice of managing and management development*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers Inc., San Francisco.
- Mintzberg, H. and Gosling, J. (2002). "Educating managers", *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 64–75.
- Mintzberg, H. (1973). *The nature of managerial work*. Harper & Row, New York.
- Nisbett, R.E. (2003). *The geography of thought: How Asians and Westerners think differently, and why*. Free Press, New York.
- Nitobe, I. (2014). *Bushido, the soul of Japan*. The Winds of Japan Shop.
- Nonaka, I. (1994). "A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation", *Organizational Science*, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 14–37.
- Peters, M.A. and Besley, T. (2021). "Models of dialogue", *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, Vol. 53, No. 7, pp. 669–676.
- Petkova, D.P. (2015). "Beyond silence: A cross-cultural comparison between Finnish 'quietude' and Japanese 'tranquility'", *Eastern Academic Journal*, No. 4, December, pp. 1–14.
- Polanyi, M. (1966). *The tacit dimension*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Ratner, B.D. Burnley, C., Mugisha, S., Madzudzo, E., Mam, O.K., Rüttinger, L., Chilufya, L.N. and Adriázola, P. (2017). "Facilitating multistakeholder dialogue to manage natural resource competition: A synthesis of lessons from Uganda, Zambia, and Cambodia", *International Journal of the Commons*, Vol. 11, No. 2, pp. 733–753.
- Reid, D., Bussiere, D. and Greenway, K. (2001). "Alliance formation issues for knowledge-based enterprises", *International Journal of Management Reviews*, Vol. 3, No. 1, March, pp. 79–100.
- Remnyi, D. and Griffiths, P. (2009). "The Socratic dialogue in the work place: Theory and practice", *Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 155–164.
- Senge, P.M. (1990). *The fifth discipline*. Doubleday/Currency.
- Shaw, P. (2002). *Changing conversations in organizations: A complexity approach to change*. Routledge, London.
- Svare, H. (2016). "User-producer dialogue, workplace innovation, and knowledge in a regional innovation system", *Journal of Knowledge Economy*, Vol. 7, pp. 565–586.
- Sveiby, K. (2001). "A Knowledge-based theory of the firm to guide strategy formulation", *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, Vol. 2, No. 4, pp. 344–358.
- Todorova, G. and Durisin, B. (2007). "Absorptive capacity: Valuing a reconceptualization", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 32, pp. 774–786.
- Tsoukas, H. (2009). "A dialogical approach to the creation of new knowledge in organizations", *Organization Science*, Vol. 20, No. 6, pp. 941–957.
- Uzzi, B. (1997). "Social structure and competition in interfirm networks: The paradox of embeddedness", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 42, No. 1, pp. 35–67.
- Walton, D. (1989). "Dialogue theory for critical thinking", *Argumentation*, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 169–184.
- Zahra, S.A. and George, G. (2002). "Absorptive capacity: A review, reconceptualization, and extension", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 27, No. 2, pp. 185–203.