

Organizational Wisdom Elements: How Does it Work in the Organization?

Mirośław Wójcik¹, Agata Pierścieniak¹ and Monika Stelmaszczyk²

¹Warsaw University of Technology, Poland

²Jan Kochanowski University in Kielce, Poland

miroslaw.wojcik@gmail.com

agata.pierscieniak@gmail.com

m.stelmaszczyk@ujk.edu.pl

Abstract: This article aims to develop a comprehensive compilation of knowledge-related activities recognized in the literature as components of organizational wisdom. Contemporary organizations acknowledge that knowledge is the foundation of their development; however, the extensive theoretical framework concerning knowledge management processes often remains unclear to practitioners. We propose a new perspective on knowledge management processes, presented through the lens of organizational wisdom, understood as a mechanism for transforming employees' knowledge into organizational success. We conducted a systematic literature review using the SCOPUS and WOS databases, selecting papers for analysis describing theoretical and empirical organizational wisdom models. Applying methodological rigor, we analyzed these models and identified 24 elements, which we theoretically and practically defined, indicating specific activities within organizations. Our findings hold significant implications for scientific development. The added value of this study lies in developing a classification of 24 elements that organize and systematize the existing body of knowledge on the components of organizational wisdom. The research results are also relevant to practice, as they enable managers to understand which knowledge processes are essential for fostering organizational wisdom and managing wise organizations.

Keywords: Wisdom, Organizational wisdom, Wisdom model

1. Introduction

In pursuit of value creation, contemporary enterprises increasingly emphasize the growing importance of intangible resources such as knowledge, experience, and organizational wisdom (Czerniachowicz, 2016). Research indicates that organizations that effectively manage intangible assets in the context of dynamic changes in the business environment are more likely to achieve competitive advantage (Bontis, 1998; Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998). In a knowledge-based economy, traditional resources give way to an organization's ability to process information and make sound strategic decisions effectively (Pinheiro et al., 2012). Many authors often equate this capability with the concept of organizational wisdom (OW).

Despite the growing interest in this topic, the literature has not yet established a single, universally accepted definition of OW. Existing definitions vary, which complicates the operationalization of the concept. For example, Guo et al. (2017) define wisdom as the highest level in the knowledge hierarchy comprising data, information, knowledge, experience, and wisdom. Ramanauskas and Benevicius (2021) associate OW with specific characteristics of organizations, whereas Rowley (2006) reduces it to the ability to make appropriate decisions.

Given these conceptual divergences, there is a clear need for terminological and conceptual clarification of this phenomenon. Addressing the identified gap concerning organizational wisdom's components is essential for further developing scholarly research and a more comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon in theoretical and practical contexts. This article aims to identify and organize existing knowledge on the constituent elements of organizational wisdom. The following research question was posed to achieve this goal: What are the constituent elements of organizational wisdom models?

Due to the phenomenon's complexity and the multiplicity of its conceptualizations, a systematic literature review (SLR) was selected as the primary method of data analysis. Researchers widely use SLR to synthesize evidence and identify knowledge gaps (Farrukh & Sajjad, 2023). The SLR covered Scopus and Web of Science databases to ensure data heterogeneity. The very limited number of texts describing specific models of organizational wisdom effectively addressed the commonly noted drawback of SLR, its time-consuming nature (Booth, 2016). The synthesis of knowledge extracted through the SLR was conducted using thematic analysis, which allowed for the identification of three key groups of organizational wisdom elements. The undertaken study synthesizes existing knowledge and highlights contemporary key areas in which components of organizational wisdom have been identified.

2. Literature Review

The concept of wisdom is not new. It has long been explored in philosophical discourse (Izak, 2013), within the field of psychology (Sternberg, 1998), and in the management literature (Malan & Kriger, 1998). Pinheiro et al. (2012) argue that wisdom is not merely a philosophical concept but also a psychological phenomenon, allowing for a comprehensive understanding of wisdom as the capacity to make sound judgments and decisions based on knowledge and ethical considerations. To define the components of organizational wisdom models, it is helpful to examine the conceptual background and highlight key wisdom principles rooted in Hellenistic philosophy. These include the timeless principle of passing on wisdom and engagement in the common good, as derived from Socrates. Socrates emphasized the necessity of knowledge, skills, and judgment in governance, all directed toward the common good (Osbeck & Robinson, 2005). Plato introduced the idea of ethical reflection, going beyond mere accumulation of knowledge. He pointed to the harmony among the soul's virtues: reason, spirit, and desire as essential for wisdom. Aristotle further developed the idea of balance in applying wisdom, emphasizing that wisdom is not merely an intellectual exercise but a life experience that shapes ethical decisions and virtuous actions. While rooted in philosophy, this approach offers valuable insights for the study of organizations and management.

In contemporary discourse, wisdom is increasingly considered a key factor for organizational success. Radaelli and Sitton-Kent (2016) argue that wisdom enables individuals to approach problems from a broader perspective, contributing to more effective organizational outcomes. Leadership (i.e., managerial wisdom) is a leader's competence to act virtuously, discern new meanings in knowledge, and interpret it holistically (Malan & Kriger, 1998). Since the seminal study by Bierly et al. (2000), many scholars have viewed organizational wisdom as the application of knowledge rooted both in the Organization and revealed through practical experiences and actions. Nielsen et al. (2007) highlight that team wisdom is essential for resolving conflicts arising from competing priorities among team members and effectively managing their skills and knowledge.

From a process perspective, organizational wisdom includes the collection, transfer, and integration of individual wisdom (knowledge processes), as well as the use of institutional and social processes (e.g., organizational structure, culture, leadership) to support strategic decision-making (Kessler, 2006). This processual approach emphasizes the dynamics of developing and applying wisdom within organizations. It encompasses knowledge sharing, decision-making practices, and integrating ethical dimensions into organizational behavior (Pinheiro et al., 2012; Becker et al., 2017).

The competency-based approach highlights the need for individuals and teams to develop specific skills such as critical thinking, emotional intelligence, and ethical reasoning to foster the emergence of wisdom in organizational settings (Vitari & David, 2017; Vasconcelos, 2021). Both perspectives highlight the crucial role of continuous learning and adaptive capabilities in addressing complex managerial challenges.

However, despite their value, the processual and competence-based approaches fail to clarify how wisdom can be effectively managed and shaped within organizations. They do not provide clearly defined, measurable elements that allow this construct to be practically applied.

The resource-based approach offers valuable insights into which components may constitute organizational wisdom. It assumes that tangible and intangible organizational resources are key in shaping a company's ability to apply wisdom. For instance, integrating local wisdom and cultural values can significantly influence organizational behavior and decision-making processes (Radaelli et al., 2016; Mann et al., 2017).

In identifying the elements of organizational wisdom, one cannot overlook spiritual and ethical dimensions. Rocha et al. (2022) and Kodama (2021) emphasize the role of wisdom in knowledge management, suggesting that organizations must reconcile social, environmental, and economic goals to meet the diverse needs of stakeholders. This view aligns with the notion that wisdom is not purely cognitive but also encompasses ethical and spiritual dimensions that shape decision-making processes and organizational practices (Pierścieniak & Stelmaszczyk, 2020; Spiller et al., 2011).

Empirical studies on Māori organizational culture provide a compelling illustration. They highlight the role of values in managing Māori enterprises (Durie, 2001), integrating economic objectives with broader well-being. The concept of *kaitiakitanga* (guardianship leadership) introduces two critical contributions: first, it provides an indigenous Māori perspective on management that can help organizations transcend traditional Western paradigms (Bolman & Deal, 1995, p. 39); second, it creates a space for integrating organizational wisdom by bridging indigenous and Western viewpoints.

Another example of value-driven management is the governance model of Islamic Financial Institutions (IFIs), which is grounded in Sharia law. Research on wisdom in Islamic banking emphasizes the importance of the Shari'a Supervisory Board (SSB). Sharia regulations define principles for resource allocation, management, production, consumption, capital market activity, and the distribution of income and assets. The SSB has the right to participate in board meetings to discuss religious aspects of decision-making (Nathan & Ribièrè, 2007).

A further category that emerges in fragmented studies on wisdom involves the values held by internal and external stakeholders. In a large-scale study of American firms, Kotter and Heskett (1992) found that companies with strong organizational cultures based on shared values achieved significantly better results than those without such cultures. Researchers emphasize values as the foundation for guiding business behavior and decision-making (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005; Kotter & Heskett, 1992; Senge et al., 2004). Integrating values, including religious and cultural values, can facilitate decision-making that considers social, environmental, and economic well-being, thus embodying wisdom in the organizational context.

3. Research Methodology

To address the research problem and answer the research questions posed, the method of systematic literature review was chosen. This approach enabled a reliable analysis of the current state of knowledge (Czakoń, 2015). The systematic analysis of the components of various OW models was based on scholarly articles indexed in the prestigious Scopus and Web of Science (WOS) databases. The selection of these two databases was justified by their international reputation, broad temporal scope, and the richness of publications in the fields of business, management, and economics, which ensured the high quality and credibility of the data collected.

The same search strategy was applied to both databases, encompassing predefined publication selection criteria. These included database sources, time range, language, publication type, and thematic areas. The detailed selection criteria and the search strategy are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Search strategy

Position	Scopus	WoS
Key Words	"Organizational wisdom" OR "wisdom of an organization" OR "wisdom in an organization" OR "wisdom of organization" OR "wisdom in organization"	
The 1 level of inclusion criteria	Publication year: All years Document type: Article Language: English	
The 2 level of inclusion criteria	Scopus – Subject area: All - (nS=36) Web of Science – Categories: All – (nWob=32)	
The 3 level of exclusion criteria	Files cleaning (17 duplicate records removed) Abstract analysis (40 files deleted)	
The 4 level of exclusion criteria	Full text analysis (3 Files deleted)	
Final sample	N=(36+32)-(17+40+3)=8	

As a result of the adopted criteria, 36 records were retrieved from the Scopus database and 32 from the Web of Science. Among the 68 scientific articles, 17 duplicates were identified and removed. In addition, publication abstracts were analyzed to assess their relevance to the research objectives, and 40 more articles were excluded. The key exclusion criterion in this case was the absence of any reference to an OW model or its components.

Following the abstract analysis, 11 papers were selected for full-text analysis. Ultimately, 8 papers were retained for the study as they contained content describing OW elements. Of these, three articles were published more than a decade ago, while the remaining were published in 2019 (two articles), 2021 (two articles), and 2022 (one article). Regardless of whether they focused explicitly on OW models, the number of studies on wisdom in organizations appears to be increasing.

Content analysis of the selected articles began with identifying and extracting all elements of OW models mentioned by the authors. In total, 56 elements were identified, each assigned a definition or source description from the analyzed texts. Excel software was used to organize the collected material (functions and pivot tables). The initial analysis revealed inconsistencies in terminology and varying levels of generality among the elements.

Therefore, the researchers applied qualitative thematic analysis to analyze and identify common patterns among the reviewed OW models. This method was chosen for its flexibility and suitability for identifying patterns within and across data sets in relation to experiences, perspectives, behaviors, and practices (Clarke & Braun, 2016). It allows the analysis of various sources (e.g., theoretical and empirical research), providing a systematic and accessible procedure for generating codes and themes from qualitative data.

The first step of the procedure involved generating preliminary codes, brief, descriptive labels closely linked to the content of the OW model descriptions. These codes helped organize the data into meaningful units but were not yet complete themes, which are broader and may encompass several codes (Riger & Sigurvinsdottir, 2016).

After identifying the codes, they were grouped into potential themes. Theme organization may vary. The literature suggests hierarchical structures with main themes, subthemes, or networks of interrelated ideas (Attride-Stirling, 2001). This study selected themes related to the examined domain, representing concepts from knowledge management, organizational management, and human capital.

The essence of this stage was to create logical groups of codes according to a defined key or schema. After identifying potential themes, a review was conducted to ensure they accurately reflected the data content. The themes were refined, clearly explained, and then redefined and named. These actions led to the development of a final catalog of 24 OW elements, ensuring the consistency of the entire research process.

4. Findings

As a result of the research, a final list of 24 elements appearing in the examined models was obtained. These were then organized into three categories: knowledge management, organizational management, and human capital management. The first and largest group of elements identified in OW models relate to knowledge management (Table 2). These include knowledge absorption processes: acquisition and accumulation, adaptation and assimilation, transformation and utilization. Also included are learning and knowledge-sharing processes that concern the development of employees' skills and competencies and knowledge resources that serve as a foundation for the processes mentioned above. Including knowledge absorption, learning and sharing processes, and knowledge resources within the knowledge management (KM) category creates a logical structure of elements associated with this domain.

Table 2: Elements of Organizational Wisdom Models in the Area of Knowledge Management

OW Element and Organizational Action	Source
KM1. Acquisition and Accumulation The ability to identify and collect external knowledge such as customer feedback and market insights to update and guide organizational activities.	(Bierly et al., 2000; Pinheiro et al., 2012; Scott-Kennel & Von Batenburg, 2012; Stelamszyk et al., 2021)
KM2. Adaptation and Assimilation Integrating and applying new knowledge through smooth information flow integration with experience supports decisions and creates knowledge-based synergy.	(Akgün et al., 2019; Bierly et al., 2000; Pinheiro et al., 2012; Scott-Kennel & Von Batenburg, 2012; Stelamszyk et al., 2021)
KM3. Knowledge Transformation A process of analyzing and structuring new knowledge to convert it into a usable form within the Organization.	(Scott-Kennel & Von Batenburg, 2012; Stelamszyk et al., 2021)
KM4. Knowledge Utilization The use of knowledge to support prototyping, experimentation, and continuous improvement of methods and technologies.	(Bierly et al., 2000; Scott-Kennel & Von Batenburg, 2012; Ahmadi et al., 2021; Stelamszyk et al., 2021)
KM5. Knowledge A key resource exists in various forms and enhances the company's ability to respond to change and make decisions.	(Pinheiro et al., 2012; Scott-Kennel & Von Batenburg, 2012; Ahmadi et al., 2021; Vasconcelos, 2022)
KM6. Knowledge Infrastructure Dynamic knowledge management mechanism that supports structuring and using information, measured by the ability to store, transfer, codify, and replicate knowledge.	(Pinheiro et al., 2012; Scott-Kennel & Von Batenburg, 2012)
KM7. Knowledge Configuration	(Cortez & Johnston, 2019)

OW Element and Organizational Action	Source
The balance of different knowledge types is essential for ensuring continuous development and innovation.	
<p>KM8. Learning Processes</p> <p>Processes of developing employee competencies through learning and innovation, supporting adaptation to changing market conditions.</p>	(Bierly et al., 2000; Pinheiro et al., 2012; Scott-Kennel & Von Batenburg, 2012; Cortez & Johnston, 2019; Ahmadi et al., 2021; Stelamszyk et al., 2021)
<p>KM9. Knowledge Sharing</p> <p>Coordinated knowledge-sharing processes that support cross-level transfer and foster understanding and collaboration across departments.</p>	(Pinheiro et al., 2012; Scott-Kennel & Von Batenburg, 2012; Akgün et al., 2019; Cortez & Johnston, 2019; Stelamszyk et al., 2021)

Effective knowledge management within an organization is based on integrated processes of acquiring, processing, structuring, and utilizing knowledge, both internal and external.

This facilitates a seamless flow of information, integrating new knowledge with experience and informed decision-making. Coordinated activities, such as interdepartmental knowledge transfer or the incorporation of customer feedback, support innovation, developing employee competencies, and the Organization's adaptive capacity. A balance between different types of knowledge and a robust knowledge management infrastructure enhances flexibility, encourages experimentation, and enables continuous improvement of operational methods, which translates into long-term competitive advantage.

The second group of identified elements in OW models comprise those related to the organizational management process (Table 3). The organizational management (M) category includes relational capital, which encompasses interactions with stakeholders (such as customers, suppliers, and employees), organizational culture and values, i.e., how employees perceive values and behaviors within the Organization as well as the cultural and historical context, which also plays a significant role in shaping organizational strategies. The management category encompasses organizational processes, structure, decision-making, strategic management, and market and customer orientation. Relational capital, organizational culture, cultural context, organizational structure, and strategy are inextricably linked and collectively influence the effectiveness of organizational performance.

Table 3: Elements of Organizational Wisdom Models in the Area of Management

OW Element and Organizational Action	Source
<p>M1. Relational capital</p> <p>Collaboration with customers enables understanding the market, adapting products to client needs, and acquiring location-specific knowledge. Key elements are intermediaries between external clients and the company's internal knowledge resources.</p>	(Pinheiro et al., 2012; Scott-Kennel & Von Batenburg, 2012; Vasconcelos, 2022)
<p>M2. Organizational Culture and Values</p> <p>A system of shared meanings, norms, and beliefs that shape members' attitudes, behaviors, and values. Crucial to this is the alignment between the values held by employees and management.</p>	(Akgün et al., 2019; Bierly et al., 2000; Pinheiro et al., 2012; Ahmadi et al., 2021)
<p>M3. Cultural and Historical Context</p> <p>The ability to reflectively draw on traditions and wisdom from a cultural-historical perspective.</p>	(Akgün et al., 2019)
<p>M4. Decision-Making and Flexibility</p> <p>Contextual decision-making shaped by intuition, emotions, and sensory judgment rather than fixed rules.</p>	(Akgün et al., 2019; Pinheiro et al., 2012; Ahmadi et al., 2021; Vasconcelos, 2022)
<p>M5. Organizational Processes and Structure</p> <p>A structured system of activities built on operational regularity, including specialization, hierarchy, control span, centralization, and formalization.</p>	(Bierly et al., 2000; Pinheiro et al., 2012)
<p>M6. Strategic Management</p> <p>A long-term approach to organizational leadership based on vision, mission, and stakeholder trust, focused on improvement, market adaptation, and innovation.</p>	(Pinheiro et al., 2012; Vasconcelos, 2022; Cortez & Johnston, 2019; Bierly et al., 2000)
<p>M7. Market and Customer Orientation</p> <p>The ability to swiftly and effectively meet customer needs, solve problems, and adapt to market and competitive changes.</p>	(Pinheiro et al., 2012)

Management processes within organizational wisdom models represent a combination of a strong organizational culture, a flexible decision-making structure, and close collaboration with customers.

A system of shared values, norms, and beliefs shapes employee attitudes, supports learning, communication, and shared responsibility, and its alignment with managerial actions strengthens internal engagement. Decisions are made contextually, incorporating intuition and emotions, enhancing actions' appropriateness in complex situations. A well-organized operational structure and strategic management guided by vision and mission enable rapid response to change and the implementation of innovations. Customer relations also play a pivotal role. A notable example is the role of sales representatives as intermediaries of market and local knowledge, allowing for better adaptation of offerings to individual needs and effective responses to competition.

Human capital management is the last identified element category (Table 4). Within this category, we aggregated the competencies of organizational members, including social, professional, personal, ethical, cognitive, strategic, and leadership competencies, as well as employee attitudes. Additionally, this category includes elements related to people management processes, such as organizational motivators, employee relations, and the resolution of workforce-related issues.

Table 4: Elements of Organizational Wisdom Models in the Area of Human Capital Management

OW Element and Organizational Action	Source
HRM1. Social and Professional Competencies The ability to communicate effectively, sensitivity to the needs of others, and the capacity to acquire new knowledge through social interactions. Strong domain knowledge regarding the Organization's operations and the ability to act effectively.	(Scott-Kennel & Von Batenburg, 2012; Ahmadi et al., 2021; Akgün et al., 2019)
HRM2. Personal and Ethical Competencies The ability to apply universal ethical principles in complex and ambiguous professional situations. Awareness of the importance of ethics and the capacity for sound ethical judgment.	(Ahmadi et al., 2021; Akgün et al., 2019)
HRM3. Cognitive and Strategic Competencies The ability to effectively absorb, identify, evaluate, and transfer knowledge relevant to the Organization.	(Scott-Kennel & Von Batenburg, 2012; Ahmadi et al., 2021)
HRM4. Employee Attitudes Employees' ability to independently assess what is good and beneficial for themselves and the Organization. Includes behaviors, collaboration, engagement, and self-confidence.	(Pinheiro et al., 2012; Ahmadi et al., 2021; Akgün et al., 2019)
HRM5. Leadership Competencies The ability to communicate expectations and articulate goals simply and understandably. An effective leader inspires through message clarity, action consistency, and the ability to give shared efforts meaning.	(Bierly et al., 2000)
HRM6. Organizational Motivators Elements that encourage employees to use their industry knowledge and information. Support for employee development, talent retention, and consideration of employee needs.	(Pinheiro et al., 2012; Bierly et al., 2000; Stelamszyk et al., 2021; Ahmadi et al., 2021)
HRM7. Employee Relations The quality of interactions between management and staff. Characterized by honest communication, individualized attention to employees, and the display of personal care.	(Pinheiro et al., 2012; Bierly et al., 2000)
HRM8. Resolving Employee Issues The Organization's ability to identify employees' personal difficulties and provide support in overcoming them.	(Pinheiro et al., 2012)

5. Discussion and Conclusions

Models of organizational wisdom are grounded in elements whose origins can be traced to the domains of knowledge management, organizational management, and human resource management. The analysis conducted identifies these three areas as key sources of organizational wisdom. This finding reinforces the widely held belief that people, their human capital, are the true drivers of organizational success (Doong et al., 2010). The study results also emphasize the importance of principles and rules identified within the field of organizational management.

The elements identified in organizational wisdom (OW) models include process-related components, such as knowledge processes, learning, and organizational processes, and those connected to people management. They also encompass competency-based and resource-based components. Thus, organizational wisdom emerges as a multidimensional research area integrating cognitive, organizational, and social issues. The identified elements vary in type (resources, competencies, processes) and origin (knowledge, Organization, people). These elements and their appropriate configuration become the source of synergy in the Organization's accumulated knowledge. This phenomenon aligns with the resource-based view (Sajdak, 2010) and with definitions of strategic resources (Barney, 1991). Such an approach offers a novel perspective for studying organizational effectiveness and performance, where it is not the quantity of individual components but their optimal configuration that determines the actual value of wisdom. Knowledge, its application, organizational functioning, and human capital, including the attitudes individuals bring, constitute a set of intangible assets that build organizational wisdom. Therefore, further research on intangible organizational resources, particularly attitudes, is warranted as the foundation of organizational and decision-making processes.

In summary, this study contributes to theory by being among the first to structure and synthesize previously fragmented knowledge on the elements of organizational wisdom. The synthesis has allowed for identifying key organizational domains that, in prior conceptualizations, have been highlighted as sources of wisdom components. The main findings relate to identifying two dimensions: (1) the key organizational domains and (2) the nature/identity of the components of organizational wisdom. It was established that organizational wisdom is not a set of homogeneous elements; rather, it constitutes a complex organizational capability. Its components, processes, competencies, and resources enable organizations to succeed. They originate from human resource management, knowledge management, and organizational management.

The issue under analysis also carries significant practical implications, extending beyond theoretical considerations. Studying the structures of organizational wisdom in terms of their application value can support enterprises in achieving sustainable competitive advantage and long-term development. Based on the research, organizations receive clear guidance on which elements constitute OW and, thus, which should be prioritized for development. The research most frequently highlighted the importance of knowledge acquisition, adaptation, and learning processes where organizations should focus their initial efforts.

Additionally, effective knowledge management requires the creation of an infrastructure that facilitates rapid information flow, using local knowledge (e.g., from sales representatives) and integrating data with experience and intuition. Strengthening employee and leadership competencies in substantive knowledge and communication, ethics, and leadership domains is crucial. The work environment should foster engagement, individualized approaches, and identifying and resolving personal challenges. Strategic decisions should be contextually grounded and made flexibly, which enhances the Organization's ability to respond to market changes and build a lasting competitive advantage.

Continued research on organizational wisdom models is particularly important today, where enterprises operate under constant flux driven by shifting goals and ecological, social, and economic challenges. Such a dynamic business environment demands that organizations be capable of responding swiftly and appropriately to change. Future research directions may include:

- The relationship between the configuration of OW model elements and organizational outcomes.
- The role of employee well-being in shaping organizational wisdom.
- Organizational wisdom in the context of hybrid and distributed teams.

Ethics Declaration: This research did not involve human participants; therefore, ethical clearance was not required.

AI Declaration: AI tools were not used during the preparation of this paper.

This research was funded in whole by National Science Centre, Poland; Grant number: 2023/49/B/HS4/01481. For the purpose of Open Access, the authors have applied a CC-BY public copyright license to any Author Accepted Manuscript (AAM) version arising from this submission.

References

- Ahmadi, G., Rahimi, G., Nejadirani, F., & Bohlooli, N. (2021). Designing a native model of organizational wisdom assessment for government organizations (Case study: industrial townships of Kermanshah province). *Humanidades & Inovação*, 8(39), 369-383.

- Akgun, A. E., Keskin, H., & Kirçovalı, S. Y. (2019). Organizational wisdom practices and firm product innovation. *Review of Managerial Science*, 13(1), 57-91. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-017-0243-2>
- Attride-Stirling, J. (2001). Thematic networks: An analytic tool for qualitative research. *Qualitative research*, 1, 385–405.
- Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of management*, 17(1), 99-120.
- Becker, J., Brackbill, D., & Centola, D. (2017). Network dynamics of social influence in the wisdom of crowds. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(26). <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1615978114>
- Bierly, P. E. III, Kessler, E.H. & Christensen, E.W. 2000, "Organizational learning, knowledge and wisdom", *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, vol. 13, no. 6, pp. 595-618.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1995). *Leading with soul: An uncommon journey of spirit.*, Jossey Bass.
- Bontis, N. (1998). Intellectual Capital: An Exploratory Study that Develops Measures and Models. *Management Decision*, 36(2), 63-76.
- Clarke, V., Braun, V. (2016). Thematic analysis. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 12(3), 297–298. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2016.1262613>
- Collins, J. and Porras, J.I. (1994) *Built to Last: Successful Habits of Visionary Companies*. Harper Collins Publishing, New York.
- Czakon, W. (2015) *Podstawy metodologii badań w naukach o zarządzaniu*, Warszawa, Oficyna Wolters Kluwer Business.
- Czerniachowicz, B. (2016). Non-material resources and intellectual capital as elements of enterprise's value. *Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Szczecińskiego Finanse Rynki Finansowe Ubezpieczenia*, 82, 373-382. <https://doi.org/10.18276/frfu.2016.4.82/2-32>
- Durie, M. (2001), *Mauri Ora The Dynamics of Māori Health*, Oxford University Press, Auckland, pp. 185-217.
- Doong, S. C., Fung, H. G. i Wu, J. Y. (2011). Are social, financial, and human capital value enhancing? Evidence from Taiwanese firms. *International Review of Economics and Finance*, 20(3), ss. 395–405.
- Guo, X., Chen, D., & Wu, L. (2017). Analysis of Student Course Evaluation Data for an IT Subject: Implications for Improving STEM Education. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, 7(9), 945-950.
- Hofstede, G. and Hofstede, G. J. (2005). *Cultures and Organizations - Software of the Mind*. McGraw-Hill, NY 2005
- Izak, M. The foolishness of wisdom: Towards an inclusive approach to wisdom in Organization. *Scandinavian Journal of Management* (2012), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.scaman.2012.07.002>
- Kessler E., H. (2006) *Organizational Wisdom: Human, Managerial, And Strategic Implications*. *Group & Organization Management.*, 31(3), pp: 296-299. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601106286883>
- Kodama, M. (2021). Knowledge creation through collective phronesis. *Knowledge and Process Management*, 28(3), 223-245. <https://doi.org/10.1002/kpm.1667>
- Kotter, J.P. and Heskett, J.L. (1992) *Corporate Culture and Performance*. Free Press, New York
- Malan, L.-C., Kriger, M. P. (1998). Making Sense of Managerial Wisdom. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 7(3), 242-251. <https://doi.org/10.1177/105649269873006>
- Mann, R. P. and Helbing, D. (2017). Optimal incentives for collective intelligence. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(20), 5077-5082. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1618722114>
- Mora Cortez, R. and Johnston, W.J. (2019), "Cultivating organizational wisdom for value innovation", *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, Vol. 34 No. 6, pp. 1171-1182. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JBIM-11-2017-0292>
- Nahapiet, J., Ghoshal, S. (1998). Social Capital, Intellectual Capital, and the Organizational Advantage. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(2), 242-266.
- Nathan, S., Ribièrè, V. (2007). From knowledge to wisdom: the case of corporate governance in Islamic banking. *Vine*, 37(4), 471-483.
- Nielsen, T. M., Edmondson, A. C., & Sundstrom, E. (2007). Interpersonal Logic. *Handbook of Organisational and Managerial Wisdom*, 21.
- Osbeck, L. M., & Robinson, D. N. (2005). Philosophical Theories of Wisdom. In R. J. Sternberg & J. Jordan (Eds.), *A handbook of wisdom: Psychological perspectives* (pp. 61–83). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511610486.004>
- Pierścieniak, A. and Stelmasczyk, M. (2020). Organizational wisdom: the impact of organizational learning on the absorptive capacity of an enterprise. *European Research Studies Journal*, XXIII(Special Issue 2), 271-281. <https://doi.org/10.35808/ersj/1823>
- Pinheiro, M. A., & Martins, L. (2012). Measuring Organizational Wisdom Applying an Innovative Model of Analysis. *Management Decision*, 50(4), 547-561.
- Pinheiro, P., Raposo, M., & Hernández, R. J. (2012). Measuring organizational wisdom applying an innovative model of analysis. *Management Decision*, 50(8), 1465-1487. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00251741211262033>
- Radaelli, G. and Sitton-Kent, L. (2016). Middle managers and the translation of new ideas in organizations: a review of micro-practices and contingencies. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 18(3), 311-332. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12094>
- Riger, S., Sigurvinsdottir, R., (2016) *Thematic Analysis in Handbook of methodological approaches to community-based research*, Jason L.A., Glenwick D.S. p. 33, Oxford University press.
- Rocha, R. G., Kragulj, F., & Pinheiro, P. (2022). Practical wisdom, the (not so) secret ingredient for responsible knowledge management. *VINE Journal of Information and Knowledge Management Systems*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/vjikms-09-2021-0211>
- Ryan, S., 2012, "Wisdom, Knowledge, and Rationality," *Acta Analytica*, 27(2): 99–112.

- Ryan, Sharon, "Wisdom", The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Fall 2023 Edition), Edward N. Zalta & Uri Nodelman (eds.)
- Sajdak, M., (2010) Podejście zasobowe jako podstawa wyborów strategicznych, Zeszyty Naukowe / Uniwersytet Ekonomiczny w Poznaniu, 2010, nr 134, s. 46-61
- Scott-Kennel, J., & Von Batenburg, Z. (2012). The role of knowledge and learning in the internationalization of professional service firms. *The Service Industries Journal*, 32(10), 1667-1690.
- Senge, P (2004) *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organisation*. New York: Doubleday
- Stelmaszczyk, M., Pierścieniak, A., & Krzysztofek, A. (2021). Managerial energy in sustainable enterprises: organizational wisdom approach. *Energies*, 14(9), 2367.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1998). A Balance Theory of Wisdom. *Review of General Psychology*, 2(4), 347-365.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.2.4.347>
- Vasconcelos, A.F. (2022), "Wisdom capital: definitions, meaning and a two-level model", *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, Vol. 30 No. 2, pp. 365-388. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-09-2020-2409>
- Vitari, C., & David, C. (2017). Sustainable management models: innovating through Permaculture. *Journal of Management Development*, 36(1), 14-36.