

Editor

Luisa Angélica Paraguai Donati

Conflict of interest

The authors declare they have no conflict of interests.

Data Availability

The research data are available in the body of the document.

Received

December 30, 2024

Final version

July 11, 2025

Approved

October 16, 2025

Records Management and Knowledge Management: a strategic connection for organizational development

Gestão de Documentos e Gestão do Conhecimento: uma conexão estratégica para o desenvolvimento organizacional

Renato Plácido Mathias Machado¹ , Renato Tarciso Barbosa de Sousa¹ , Lillian Maria Araújo de Rezende Alves² 

¹ Universidade de Brasília, Faculdade de Ciência da Informação, Programa de Pós-Graduação em Ciência da Informação. Brasília, DF, Brasil. Correspondence to: R. P. M. MACHADO. E-mail: <renato.machado@aluno.unb.br>.

² Universidade de Brasília, Faculdade de Ciência da Informação. Brasília, DF, Brasil.

How to cite this article: Machado, R. P. M.; Sousa, R. T. B.; Alves, L. M. A. R. Records Management and Knowledge Management: a strategic connection for organizational development. *TransInformação*, v. 37, e14934, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1590/2318-0889202537e14934>.

Abstract

Records Management ensures that knowledge accumulated over time is maintained, retrieved, and transferred, capturing tacit knowledge and transforming it into formal documents, thus constituting a solid basis for organizational development. In a reciprocal way, Knowledge Management benefits Records Management by sharing the best practices and successful innovations, thereby improving the maintenance, accessibility, and use of documents within organizations. This article aims to investigate how the relationship between Records Management and knowledge Management contributes to organizational development, focusing on the alignment of these two fields in the organizational context. An exploratory approach was used as the methodology, beginning with a literature review that identifies the converging points of these two management models, which are the objects of this study. The results indicate an alignment that highlights the reciprocal and fruitful contributions between these two management models for organizations. This finding was confirmed by a bibliographic review on both fields, covering the sources available to the authors. This research concludes that both fields can benefit each other and drive organizational development.

Keywords: Archival document. Explicit knowledge. Organizational knowledge. Records. Tacit knowledge.

Resumo

A *Gestão de Documentos* garante que o conhecimento acumulado ao longo do tempo seja mantido, recuperado e transferido, capturando o conhecimento tácito e transformando-o em documentos formais, o que constitui uma base sólida para o desenvolvimento organizacional. De forma recíproca, a *Gestão do Conhecimento* beneficia a gestão de documentos ao compartilhando melhores práticas e inovações bem-sucedidas, aperfeiçoando a manutenção, a acessibilidade e o

uso de documentos na esfera das organizações. O artigo tem por objetivo investigar como o relacionamento entre a Gestão de Documentos e a Gestão do Conhecimento contribui para o desenvolvimento das organizações, explorando o alinhamento desses dois campos no contexto organizacional. Este artigo utilizou como metodologia uma abordagem exploratória, cujos procedimentos metodológicos partiram de uma revisão de literatura que identifica os pontos convergentes desses dois modelos de gestão, objetos deste trabalho. Os resultados apontam para um alinhamento que evidencia as contribuições recíprocas e profícuas entre esses dois modelos de gestão nas organizações. Isto foi confirmado por uma pesquisa bibliográfica sobre ambos os campos, abrangendo as fontes às quais os autores tiveram acesso. Esta pesquisa conclui que ambos os campos podem beneficiar-se mutuamente e impulsionar o desenvolvimento organizacional.

Palavras-chave: Documento de arquivo. Conhecimento explícito. Conhecimento organizacional. Registros. Conhecimento tácito.

Introduction

The relationship between information, communication and records arouses interest in information science. The record approach, perceived and valued by social actors as a vehicle for their expression and for the informational potential it generates, emerges as a central theme in the field's discussions.

This interest goes beyond the basic functionality of documents, exploring their complex interconnections with society, organizations, knowledge, and communication practices. Notably, in the organizational context, Records Management (RM) and archival practices offer guidelines and support for the trajectory of documents over time, proving indispensable in the preservation of memory, information and knowledge.

Notwithstanding, knowledge as a relevant asset arouses significant interest in scientific literature, society and organizations, highlighting the need for its creation, preservation, and development in a dynamic perspective that refers to Knowledge Management (KM) practices.

In the described scenario, the problem that the research investigates is the mutual benefits that RM and KM can mutually generate in the sphere of organizations. RM constitutes a solid basis for organizational development, capturing, maintaining, recovering and transferring tacit knowledge and transforming it into formal records.

On the other hand, KM favors RM by sharing the best practices and successful innovations, improving the maintenance, accessibility, and use of documents at the organizational level.

The article aims to investigate how the relationship between RM and KM contributes to organizational development, exploring the alignment of these two fields and their contributions to organizational development, based on the scientific literature produced to date.

We argue that there are significant relationships between the fields of RM and KM, and the recognition of such relationships will benefit the development and maturity of organizations.

Methodological Procedures

The methodological procedures adopted to meet the objective of this article refer to qualitative exploratory research, based on a review of non-exhaustive scientific literature, on the central themes proposed in this investigation.

Initially, in the literature review, the use of references "archival document" and "organizational knowledge" was sought to allow a more comprehensive scope of the concepts "Records Management" and "Knowledge Management" that would be the subject of the review.

Information sources were searched from Publish or Perish, an open access application that retrieves and analyzes academic citations, using a variety of scientific data sources (among them: Google Scholar Microsoft Academic Search, Scopus, and Web of Science). In the application we selected the fields “Title”, “Keywords”, and “Abstract”, and used combinations of Keywords in English and Portuguese as shown in Chart 1.

Chart 1 – Selected fields and keywords used.

Fields Selected	Keywords used
• Title	• Records management; knowledge management; recordkeeping
• Keywords	• Records management; knowledge management
• Abstract	• <i>Records; knowledge management</i> • <i>Records management; knowledge</i> • <i>Gestão de documentos; gestão do conhecimento; recordkeeping</i> • <i>Gestão de documentos; gestão do conhecimento</i> • Documents; knowledge management • <i>Gestão de documentos; conhecimento</i>

Source: Prepared by the authors (2024).

The temporal restriction and the inclusion criterion covered the entire period available in the database, including texts by Brazilian and foreign authors.

We chose the references first by reading the abstracts of the retrieved texts and later by reading and analyzing the full texts to verify the relevance of the content, forming the referential basis of this research.

Finally, we identified and analyzed the aspects that integrate the relationship between RM and KM, presenting their most significant constitutive elements.

Literature review: archival documents, organizational knowledge, records management and knowledge management

The literature review focuses on the conceptions, concepts and definitions of archival documents, organizational knowledge, RM and KM, highlighting their most significant and essential elements.

Archival document

In the last four decades, there has been a growing interest in the importance of the organization, dissemination and use of information within organizations at a time when records have gone beyond basic functionality, exploring their complex interconnections with society, knowledge and communication practices.

Duranti (1994) observes that documentary records have characteristics that allow the analysis and understanding of the record, whether for administrative or cultural purposes, namely: impartiality, authenticity, naturalness, interrelationship, and uniqueness.

Shepherd and Yeo (2003) point out that a record is not only defined by its age, physical format, storage medium, selection for preservation, or as a form of recorded information. It is characterized by providing evidence (not in a legal sense) of some exclusive activity. In this way, such evidence can be used in any situation where proof of a specific activity is required.

For Schellenberg (2006), the essential criteria that make it possible to distinguish “records” incorporate characteristics that determine the reason why they are considered as objects preserved over time – the values by which they are preserved (for administrative and evidentiary, cultural and historical purposes) and the links to an institution or person (origin or custody).

According to Cunningham, Millar, and Reed (2013), it is imperative to know the origin of a record, considering it as a contextualized source and an object of information provided with broader meaning and evidential value. Knowledge of the origin of a record allows its use as evidence of activities, as it is essential to know who created or received it and for what purpose.

Cunningham, Millar, and Reed (2013) emphasize a continuous cycle in which the individual, work group or organization is responsible or involved in processes of creation, capture, use and/or management of records. These processes aim to achieve organizational objectives in a context that houses business (which can be or are documented records), people (who conduct business), and records (created, handled, and managed by people).

Bellotto (2014) highlights the uniqueness of archival documents based on two parallel and essential intrinsic properties – those of being evidence and of being information/testimony –, shaping their relevance over time as historical, administrative, legal and historical sources.

The International Council on Archives (ICA) incorporates distinctive attributes and defines the archival document in relation to other documentary forms. According to International Council on Archives (2023), the archival document is an instrument created by individuals or organizations in the development of their activities, whose relevance is attested by its testimonial value over time, imbued with essential intrinsic qualities, such as authenticity, reliability, integrity, and usefulness.

The record stands out in its unique ability to capture facts, causes and consequences while preserving memory and expanding in time the evidence of these facts, retaining essential information and building history.

In particular, the archival document brings together variables such as form, content and representation in different media or formats that allow it to be identified and categorized into genre, species, type, and nature of the subject. These characteristics provide a comprehensive and classifying framework that facilitates their management and understanding.

From an organizational perspective, archival documents are recognized as instruments to support administration, culture, and scientific development, in addition to fundamental elements such as evidence and information.

Organizational knowledge

In the field of scientific literature, the complexity of the concept of “knowledge” is reflected in the wide range of definitions found and distinct emphases. In the sphere of this diversity, it is essential to identify and select a perspective that enriches the contemporary understanding of this term within the scope of this research.

For Nonaka (1994)⁴, the concept and meanings of knowledge are multifaceted and points out that since the classical Greek period, the history of philosophy can be considered an incessant search for the meaning of knowledge.

⁴ According to the author: “The discussion of epistemology here is based on such classic accounts as Plato’s *Theaetetus* and *Phaedo*, Descartes’ *Discourse on the Method*, Locke’s *An Essay on Human Understanding*, Hume’s *An Inquiry into Human Understanding* and Kant’s *Critique of Pure Reason*. For interpretation of these works, see Dancy (1985), Hallis (1985), Hospers (1967), Moser and Nat (1987), and Winograd and Flores (1986)”.

Nonaka (1994, p. 15) states: “[...] knowledge is created and organized by the flow of information itself, anchored in the commitment and beliefs of its holder”. The terms “information” and “knowledge” are often used interchangeably, however there is a clear distinction between information and knowledge.

Nonaka (1994, p. 15) further explains: “information is a flow of messages, while knowledge is created and organized by the flow of information itself, anchored in the commitment and beliefs of its holder”.

Nonaka and Takeuchi (1997, p. 63) emphasize the subjective and active nature of knowledge, highlighting its role in the dynamics, construction and validation of personal beliefs, considering it as: “a dynamic process of justifying personal belief in relation to truth”.

Davenport and Prusak (1998, p. 6) emphasize the fluidity, richness, importance of experience and values in the formation of knowledge, defining it as a “fluid mixture of condensed experience, values, contextual information and experienced insight, which provides a structure for the evaluation and incorporation of new experiences and information”.

Therefore, in this research, we selected as a definition for “knowledge” that presented by Dalkir (2011, p. 468) that incorporates distinctive attributes to the term: “Subjective and valuable information that has been validated and organized into a model (mental model); used to make sense of our world; generally originated from accumulated experience; incorporate perceptions, beliefs and values”.

Among these attributes, individuals’ reflections on certain information and the consequences they cause for decisions and actions stand out, including the condition in which information related to the current situation is compared to other situations experienced, reflecting the accumulated experience and the incorporation of individuals’ perceptions, beliefs and values.

Organizational knowledge evolves from an interactive process, with emphasis on the conversion between tacit and explicit knowledge that plays a decisive and fundamental role for the effective management of knowledge.

Nonaka (1994) notes that organizations do not create knowledge without individuals and from this perspective, the creation of organizational knowledge is a process that amplifies knowledge and consolidates it as part of organizational knowledge.

Nonaka and Takeuchi (1997, p. 7) point out that tacit knowledge “is highly personal and difficult to formalize, which makes it difficult to transmit and share with others”, while explicit knowledge “can be easily ‘processed’ by a computer, transmitted electronically or stored in a database” (Nonaka; Takeuchi, 1997, p. 8).

The authors point out that organizational knowledge evolves through an interactive process, in which the conversion between tacit and explicit knowledge plays a determining role. Indeed, they provide a theoretical basis for exploring knowledge in the organizational context.

Dalkir (2011) highlights the creation and diffusion of knowledge as crucial factors for competitiveness in the organizational perspective, recognizing knowledge as an asset, regardless of its tacit or explicit nature.

As knowledge is a formidable asset, it becomes imperative for organizations to measure and evaluate their potential through reliable approaches and a common language, promoting an assertive understanding of its value as a determining factor for the competitiveness of contemporary organizations.

Records management

Records Management presents itself as a dynamic and indispensable concept in the preservation of memory and information over time, drawing on concepts such as Theory of the Three Ages⁵, Document Life Cycle⁶, Records Continuum⁷ and Recordkeeping⁸. By using this conceptual framework, it strengthens the archival practice and the strategic role of effective records management throughout its trajectory.

In this perspective, RM plays a central role in the contemporary understanding of archival practices, in the performance of its various actors and in the continuous preservation of memory, information and knowledge in organizations.

Duranti (1989a, 1989b), from the historical path, outlined the evolutionary links of document production and conservation practices in ancient, medieval, and modern times, providing a critical reflection by raising questions about the determining conditions for the establishment and effectiveness of RM.

Kern, Holgado, and Cottin (2015) identified and detailed four major theories, models and influences of publications in a timeline from the 1920s to the present day, drawing from guides, archive management manuals and articles specialized in different authors and cultures.

The authors highlighted four major groups calling them “Precursors”, “Three Ages”, “Life Cycle” and “Records Continuum”. The four groups are listed in Chart 2.

Chart 2 – The concept of the document path from 1920.

1 of 2

Group/References	Period	Origin
Precursors 1928-1956		
Casanova	1928	Italy
Paczkowski	1930	Poland
Brooks	1940	USA
Brenneke and Leesch	1953	Germany
Schellenberg	1956	USA
Three Ages 1961-1994		
Pérotin	1961	France
Association des Archivistes Français	1970	France
Association des Archivistes Français	1970	France
Wyffels <i>et al.</i>	1972	Belgium
Service Central d’Organization et Méthodes (SCOM)	1982	France
Cortés Alonso	1982	Spain
Couture and Rousseau	1982	French-speaking Canada
Lodolini	1984	Italy
Heredia Herrera	1986	Spain

⁵ The Brazilian Dictionary of Archival Terminology defines the theory of Three Ages (original in Portuguese): “*Teoria segundo a qual os arquivos são considerados arquivos correntes, intermediários ou permanentes de acordo com a frequência de uso por suas entidades produtoras e a identificação de seus valores primário e secundário*” (Arquivo Nacional, 2005, p. 160).

⁶ The Brazilian Dictionary of Archival Terminology defines the Life Cycle of Records (original in Portuguese): “*Sucessivas fases por que passam os documentos de um arquivo da sua produção à guarda permanente ou eliminação*” (Arquivo Nacional, 2005, p. 47).

⁷ According to Costa Filho (2020, p. 155), (original in Portuguese): “*o records continuum consiste em uma visão em que os documentos podem possuir múltiplas finalidades em espaços distintos, para pessoas distintas, ao mesmo tempo e ao longo do tempo. Para tal fim, determinante se faz o uso do valor contínuo, que não impõe ao documento o valor primário ou secundário de cada vez, nem o aprecia como evidência ou como memória. Nesse caso, o documento pode ter os valores primário e secundário e figurar como evidência e memória no mesmo espaço e ao mesmo tempo*”.

⁸ The InterPARES 3 Project defines recordkeeping as (original in Portuguese): “*Função de capturar, armazenar e manter documentos arquivísticos e informação sobre eles, bem como o conjunto de regras que regulam tal função*”. Disponível em: http://www.interpares.org/ip3/ip3_terminology_db.cfm?letter=r&term=43.

Chart 2 – The concept of the document path from 1920.

2 of 2

Group/References	Period	Origin
Rousseau and Couture	1994	French-speaking Canada
Direction des Archives de France	1970	France
Life Cycle 1974-1996		
Maedke <i>et al.</i>	1974	USA
Couture and Rousseau	1982*	Canada
Penn	1983/1989	USA
Atherton	1986	Canada
Wallace <i>et al.</i>	1992	USA
Cruz Mundet	1994	Spain
McLeod	1996	Great Britain
Robek <i>et al.</i>	1996	USA
Records Continuum 1996-1998		
Upward	1996/1997/2000	Australia
McKemmish	1997	Australia
An	2003	China
Cruz Mundet	2006	Spain
Lin	2007	China
Bettington, Australian Society of Archivists <i>et al.</i>	2008	Australia
Modeling Crossdomain Task Force	2008	Canada

Note: *According to Kern *et al.* (2015, p. 41). Carol Couture and Jean-Yves Rousseau were the first to address the definition of the “life cycle” of records (Couture; Rousseau, 1982, p. 47).
Source: Own elaboration based on Kern *et al.* (2015, p. 43).

Jardim (2015) conducted comprehensive research that highlights this diversity, the intrinsic importance of these terminological instruments and the implications under theoretical and practical aspects in various archival contexts.

The author considers RM as “one of the most diverse archival territories, subject to different theoretical and practical perceptions” (Jardim, 2015, p. 20) and his research reflects these perceptions as essential resources for effective communication within the realm of archival knowledge.

Jardim (2015) based his study on multiple definitions of the term “records management”, extracted exclusively from glossaries, archival dictionaries, and archival traditions, notably in English, Spanish, French and Portuguese. Especially in the context of Brazilian archival science, the author points out: “In Brazil, with regard to English texts on records management, the translation or perception of the term records is often associated with current and intermediate documents or, in other words, documents that are not characterized as of permanent value” (Jardim, 2015, p. 23).

The author compiled, from the original language, a frequency of terms associated with the objects, actions and objectives that would be inherent to the RM, as presented in Chart 3.

Chart 3 – Applications of the term “records management”.

Originating language and Term	Objects	Actions	Objectives
English Records Management	Production, maintenance, use and disposal of documents	• Planning • Control • Direction	• Economy • Efficiency
French (<i>gestion des documents</i>)	Production, conservation, use and disposal of documents	• Control	• Efficacy
Spanish (<i>gestión de documentos</i>)	Production, use, maintenance, conservation, physical and intellectual control of complete, authentic, and reliable records	• Control • Planning • Analysis	• Efficiency • Standard setting
Portuguese (<i>gestão de documentos</i>)	Production, processing, classification, use, evaluation, and filing	• Control	• Efficacy • Efficiency • Rationalization

Source: Prepared by the authors based on Jardim (2015, p. 22).

Within the scope of international institutions, governments and archive associations of several countries, specific standards were defined, encompassing elements that characterize RM.

In this context, Jardim (2015) analyzed the emergence of document management, after the 1950s in the North American scenario, as a distinct area of archival science and highlighted its transformations with the adoption of new models and international standards.

The ISO 15489 standard is emphasized, as it has become over the years, a global reference for the development of RM in organizations, originally written in English, and has been translated into several languages, receiving prominence in the scientific literature by various authors.

For this research, the definition of RM was chosen from ABNT NBR ISO 15489-1 (Associação Brasileira de Normas Técnicas, 2018), the Portuguese version of International Standard ISO 15489-1:2016 – Information and documentation – Records management Part 1: Concepts and Principles published by the International Organization for Standardization (ISO):

[...] area of management responsible for the efficient and systematic control of the production, receipt, maintenance, use and destination of archival documents, including processes for capturing and maintaining evidence and information on business activities and transactions in the form of archival documents (Associação Brasileira de Normas Técnicas, 2018, p. 3).

Thus, supported by fundamental premises in the scope of archival science, the well-implemented RM guarantees an important source of information to consolidate the organization's knowledge, unfolding in the rationalization of documentary production and in the optimization of ease of use.

Knowledge management

Knowledge is a valuable corporate asset and requires coherent and understandable approaches that enable organizations to determine their current state of KM, progressing through the phases necessary for greater organizational development.

Notwithstanding the conceptual divergences in the terminology associated with KM, the differences between the accepted and widespread terms are not as substantial as they initially seem.

Alavi and Leidner (2001) note that small discrepancies in the delimitation of KM are reported in the scientific literature, in terms of the description and stages of the cycle. The position of the authors is corroborated by Dalkir (2011), who points out that KM is based on a vast number of different fields, reflecting its interdisciplinary nature. The scientific literature offers a representative number of texts that address the conceptions, concepts, definitions, and perspectives on KM.

At this juncture, the author points out the lack of conformity in the literature related to the terms that describe the stages of the KM cycle and highlights conceptual divergences in the terminology associated with these processes, which are generally outlined as creation, storage/retrieval, transfer and application of knowledge.

Dalkir (2011) identified, in the scientific literature, comprehensive approaches by Wiig (1993), Meyer and Zack (1996), McElroy (1999), Bukowitz and Williams (2000), and Rollett (2003) that have been implemented, validated, and contain detailed descriptions of the stages of the KM cycle. These approaches are described in Chart 4.

In the Brazilian scientific literature on KM, its constituent elements, and the evolution of the concept over time, Valentim (2020), when investigating the state of the art, conducted a review that identified various published concepts, according to Brazilian researchers. The author distinguished the constituent elements of KM, based on the authors' understanding of the analyzed texts:

- organizational learning;
- the sharing and socialization of knowledge;
- organizational culture and informational culture;
- organizational communication
- competence in information;
- the appropriation of data and information for the construction of knowledge; and
- the mediation of data, information and knowledge and information and communication technologies.

Chart 4 – Steps of the knowledge management cycle.

Author(s)	Steps of the knowledge management cycle
Wiiig (1993)	Creation, Supply, Compilation, Transformation, Dissemination, Application, and Value Realization
Meyer and Zack (1996)	Acquisition, Refinement, Storage/Retrieval, Distribution and Presentation
McElroy (1999)	Individual and group learning, Explicit knowledge validation, Information acquisition, Knowledge validation, and Knowledge integration
Bukowitz and Williams (2000)	Obtain, Use, Learn, Contribute, Evaluate, Build/Sustain, Divest
Rollett (2003)	Planning, Creating, Integrating, Organizing, Transferring, Maintaining and Evaluating

Source: Adapted from Dalkir (2011, p. 33).

In fact, the contribution of KM is realized in the organizational context in a collective, systematic and integrated manner, aiming at the creation, sharing and application of knowledge.

Relationships between records management and knowledge management within organizations

In this section, a review of the scientific literature is used to present studies that address the inherent aspects of the relationships between RM and KM in organizations, which are the objects of analysis in this article.

The articles identified through the application of the protocol for conducting the literature review (Section 1) are listed in Chart 5.

Chart 5 – Articles presenting aspects of the relationships between Records Management and Knowledge Management in national and international journals. (1997–2021).

Author(s)	Title	Year
Day	The role of records management in 'business information' services	1997
Beastall	Records management meets knowledge gathering	1998
Sanderson	Records management and the capture of tacit knowledge	2001
Tombs	Knowledge management is dead: long live records management	2004
Galt and Hase	Knowledge management and public records compliance: a forgotten world	2009
Harries	Managing records, making knowledge and good governance	2009
An and Wang	The integrated use of business continuity management systems, records management systems, and knowledge management systems	2010
Hase and Galt	Records management myopia: a case study	2011
Duranti and Xie	Knowledge management & records management-Establishing relationships for common development	2012
Lima and Duarte	<i>Diretrizes para uma política integrada de gestão documental, da informação e do conhecimento no SEBRAE Paraíba</i>	2017
Anderson	Knowledge Management (KM) Requires Records Management: The Role of Retention Schedules in Businesses with KM Programs	2019
Vieira	<i>O contributo da gestão de documentos na gestão do conhecimento nas organizações: uma abordagem exploratória</i>	2020
Isomura	The Gap Between Knowledge Management and Records Management	2021

Source: Prepared by the authors based on the selected articles (2024).

Day (1997) presented the reasons, challenges, benefits, and potential of integrating information services. The author points out that records managers must maintain and develop their essential skills to lead the process of integrating corporate information services.

According to the author, by avoiding information overload, RM and KM require the application of retention periods and information filtering processes that guarantee users access only to the necessary information. Thus, RM plays a key role in applying retention schedules, while KM, by accessing filtered and organized information, becomes a beneficiary.

In the context of information as a strategic resource, records must be recognized as essential assets for achieving organizational objectives, including using them to support corporate memory and organizational knowledge.

Beastall (1998) points out that the interface between RM and KM lies in the way individuals record their opinions and judgments based on what they discover in original documents, forming a continuous cycle in which information is converted into knowledge. For the author, the memory of the organization is an essential element through which the knowledge contained in the records is captured for management and sharing later.

The perspective of Beastall (1998) reveals that in certain contexts, the organizational culture may not favor the sharing of information. Thus, the knowledge of an individual or group becomes isolated and segregated from all others, compromising sharing and integration into corporate memory.

Beastall (1998) suggests flexible database structures that allow and facilitate changes or incorporations in the integration process between RM and KM. Nevertheless, the incorporation of nuances and details of the information obtained during the practical implementation of RM represents a challenge for records managers who wish to be an essential component of the KM cycle.

The author recognizes that RM in organizations requires agility and control at a higher level of complexity (as the materials that need to be controlled and managed extend beyond traditional paper documents), propelling RM to a new way of managing and recording information, aligned with the imperative of management by capturing and sharing knowledge.

Sanderson (2001) discussed the interrelationship between tacit knowledge and RM, highlighting the importance of capturing it (which often resides in the experience and intuition of individuals) within organizations. The author emphasizes the preservation of organizational memory as a crucial point of this interrelation. RM ensures that knowledge accumulated over time is maintained and can be recovered when needed, providing a solid foundation for future decision making and strategic development of organizations.

Sanderson (2001) argues that effective records management can contribute to transforming this implicit knowledge into documents that can be shared and reused by the organization in the future.

RM facilitates knowledge transfer at the organizational level by capturing tacit knowledge and transforming it into formal documents. Thus, knowledge can be more easily shared among team members, fostering a culture of continuous learning and collaboration.

For Sanderson (2001), the documentation of processes and procedures is crucial for capturing tacit knowledge. By formalizing, recording individuals' practices and experiences, organizations ensure that knowledge is not lost, and documents are organized and accessible at the right time.

Sanderson (2001) points out that by recording tacit knowledge, RM supports innovation and continuous improvement. Documenting ideas, problem solutions, and lessons learned allows the organization to evolve and adapt more quickly to market changes and new opportunities.

From the perspective of information management, Tombs (2004) discusses the complexity and challenges of KM. In this context, the author positions RM as a more effective and practical proposal. Despite their differences, KM and RM interact and complement each other in distinct aspects.

Tombs (2004) analyzed KM and RM perspectives in the context of usability, storage and retrieval of information, arguing that without a record-based approach, organizations will face difficulties due to their complex nature, the mutability of the context in which they operate and the variables that involve their employees. The author, when comparing the two fields of management, points out that RM emerges as the preferred solution for information storage and retrieval because it has a more agile approach, is easily understood within the organization, relatively low-cost and highly adaptable.

Tombs (2004) recognizes that KM approaches can be valuable, especially when they support RM activities. This suggests a potential integration where KM practices can be utilized to enhance the effectiveness of RM systems.

Harries (2009) points out that RM must adapt to transformative changes in the public sector, where the emphasis is on efficiency and expanding the quality of services. RM must demonstrate clear benefits and integrate into organizational processes, facilitating business transformation. The author proposes a framework to map the dynamics between records and knowledge in the process of formulating public policies through to the delivery of services, integrating RM with knowledge communities and KM processes, highlighting the mutual importance in governance and accountability.

Harries (2009) identified three types of communities with respective knowledge structures, shared interests and values that influence the production, organization, and use of records: communities of practice, communities of interest and communities of action.

Equally significant, RM processes are essential for producing new knowledge and for the continuous improvement of organizational practices, supporting externalization (making knowledge explicit and transferable), internalization (absorption of new knowledge), and socialization (creation of shared understanding).

The author highlights the crucial role of records managers for organizational efficiency, continuous innovation, and good governance, which, in time, should facilitate connections, encourage knowledge sharing and analyze patterns in relation to corporate strategy and risk profiles.

Galt and Hase (2009) point out that KM must be aligned with the organization's strategies, competencies, culture and needs to ensure effective implementation while in the context of RM this strategic approach reinforces the need for reliable and consistent search systems that support the organization's growth and viability.

Galt and Hase (2009) emphasize the importance of organizational learning and continuous improvement of KM and RM in the implementation of new systems and processes that contribute to the continuous development of organizational practices.

In the organizational context, the authors point out operational and cultural challenges in the implementation of KM and RM systems. Cultural resistance to change and the lack of standardized systems are significant obstacles that must be overcome to achieve compliance and operational efficiency.

An and Wang (2010), highlight how KM and RM are interrelated and complement each other, contributing to efficient governance, promoting organizational competitiveness and value creation in organizations.

Based on the approach of three types of systems used corporately, the authors observe that the integration between Business Continuity Management Systems (BCMS), Records Management Systems (RMS) and Knowledge Management Systems (KMS) promotes evidence-based governance, optimizing processes and resources, improving decision making and resulting in efficiency.

This level of organizational governance is achieved through the control of metadata and functional requirements for records' maintenance, authenticity, integrity, quality, and usability, ensuring responsible and consistent decision making.

In effect, records are managed as business resources and knowledge assets, ensuring their effective use as renewable and reusable capital.

Hase and Galt (2011), despite using a single case study in an educational institution, provide some points for understanding the relationship between RM and KM that deserve to be addressed as strategic issues and integrated into the various processes necessary to sustain operations, ensure organizational effectiveness and continuity of knowledge.

For the authors, specifically in a tertiary education environment, RM and KM are seen as inseparable. In this context, records of students' results and achievements, both in physical and electronic files, are fundamental to KM and the constitution of institutional memory.

Hase and Galt (2011) point out that good RM practices contribute to the continuity of knowledge and reduce operational costs by eliminating duplicates and improving organizational efficiency.

Duranti and Xie (2012) used the Socialization, Externalization, Combination and Internalization (SECI) model of Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995)⁹ to address the relationship between RM and KM. The authors note that during the KM cycle, the externalization process and the combination process produce tangible knowledge assets, which are potential records according to RM. The production of tangible knowledge assets will occur when information becomes documents that serve as a means of executing future business processes.

According to Duranti and Xie (2012, p. 248), "RM's function is to record the entire business process in the form of documents, and this certainly includes capturing the participation of the knowledge asset".

To illustrate Duranti and Xie's (2012) perspective, we refer to the following approach to organizational knowledge creation: "unlike individual knowledge creation, it occurs when all four knowledge creation processes are managed 'organizationally' to form a continuous cycle" (Nonaka, 1994, p. 20).

According to Nonaka (1994) the four processes of knowledge conversion are described as:

- Socialization (from tacit to tacit): in the organizational context, this involves the assimilation and incorporation of skills inherent to practice.

- Externalization (from tacit to explicit): the individual articulates elements of their tacit knowledge and converts it into explicit knowledge, enabling it to be shared with others in the organizational context.

⁹ Duranti and Xie used as reference the work of Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995).

–Combination (from explicit to explicit): an individual can also combine distinct parts of explicit knowledge to create new “knowledge”.

–Internalization (from explicit to tacit): when new explicit knowledge is shared within the organizational sphere, other employees internalize it and apply it, thereby expanding and reformulating their own tacit knowledge.

Duranti and Xie (2012) observe that the relationship between KM and RM is transformative, inclusive, and reciprocal. Transformative because knowledge conversion processes (outsourcing and combining) produce tangible knowledge assets that are potential records according to RM (the relationship with RM will be established when they participate and become an integral part of an organization’s business activity, regardless of where or how).

From this perspective, KM and RM intersect when an organization applies externalized knowledge and preserves operational evidence. The relationship between KM and RM is inclusive because RM envisions knowledge conversion processes (outsourcing and combining) as business components of the KM function, in the same way as other business components of other organizational functions (financial management or human resource management, among others).

The relationship between KM and RM is reciprocal in at least two aspects: first, by the assistance provided by knowledge assets to the development of RM rules and, second, by the application of KM techniques to make tacit knowledge in RM explicit in the organization.

Likewise, RM provides contextual information so that knowledge assets are interpreted and applied in a meaningful way in the organization, being essential for the practical implementation of KM because it guarantees the authenticity, quality and usability of the records generated by the KM function.

Duranti and Xie (2012) note that both disciplines have reciprocal capacities, face similar challenges and opportunities. RM can provide support to the development of KM rules, while KM techniques can be applied to favor the conversion of tacit knowledge of RM into explicit and accessible, benefiting in the creation of an environment where RM benefits from KM practices and vice versa.

The authors distinguish that the challenges and opportunities of both disciplines are similar in common areas, such as business process alignment, change management and organizational culture.

These common areas reinforce the need for collaboration between KM and RM and highlight the importance of an integrated approach, where KM and RM complement each other, providing a more robust and efficient organizational environment.

Lima and Duarte (2017), when presenting guidelines for an integrated RM, Information Management (IM) and KM policy, highlights the importance of integrating the three management modalities (RM, IM, and KM) for documental, informational and knowledge sustainability in search of authenticity, quality and administrative effectiveness of organizational processes.

From this perspective, KM practices can assist in the development of organizational competencies by integrating people and processes, from an integrated approach between RM, IM, and KM.

Lima and Duarte (2017), notably on RM and KM, points out that these courses have different but complementary objectives, focuses and management instruments. The RM cycle involves production, organization, and preservation of documents in daily operations and strategic decisions of organizations ensuring authenticity, integrity, and accessibility.

Notwithstanding, RM favors compliance and administrative efficiency by defining the rules, standards for archiving and storing records used as a factual and legal basis for the organization's operations.

Knowledge management, in turn, focuses on people and knowledge management, both tacit and explicit, using documented information to transform data into valuable insights, improving the ability to adapt and respond to organizational changes.

Indeed, the instruments used in the three management modalities (RM, IM, and KM) also reflect their interrelationship. RM employs classification plans and temporality tables, information management can use taxonomies and thesaurus, and KM relies on knowledge maps and skill banks.

These instruments, although different, are complementary and favor the integration of informational and documentary practices, promoting an environment conducive to the creation, organization, sharing and use of organizational knowledge.

For Anderson (2019), KM also involves the preservation and sharing of institutional memory, while RM ensures that crucial information is maintained and accessible, providing the framework for knowledge retention and organization. The author notes that KM systems rely heavily on records retention policies to maintain data integrity and accessibility over time. In this context, the interaction between KM and RM directly impacts organizational efficiency and effectiveness.

Therefore, organizations that implement good RM practices in their KM programs gain greater capacity to retain critical knowledge and improve their competitive performance in the market.

Anderson (2019) points out that the development of technical solutions to support KM requires the consideration of RM practices (including those that support the management and distribution of explicit forms of knowledge) to ensure the maintenance of institutional memory and avoid the possibility of gaps in records retention.

Vieira (2020) highlighted the mutual relationship and complementarity between RM and KM, demonstrating how the organization, preservation and proper use of archival documents are essential for the creation, storage, and dissemination of knowledge within organizations.

The author assumed that RM contributes to KM in two dimensions: (i) the physical and intellectual organization of records; (ii) the selection of records for disposal or permanent safekeeping throughout their life cycle, providing savings, efficiency, and administrative effectiveness to organizations.

Vieira (2020) then analyzed how RM can contribute to improving KM in organizations, exploring their approximations and distances, concluding that the results point more to an approximation than to a distance, evidencing the contribution of RM in the KM process.

RM provides KM with the control, organization, and ease of access to information in the records produced and received by the organization, including the rationalization of production and the application of control practices, classification, ordering and retrieval of records essential for the creation and use of organizational knowledge.

Vieira (2020) points out that the result of the application of RM may benefit from a knowledge asset in relation to archival documents (which are accessible, contextualized in their function/activity and organizational structure, maintaining its identified values and established custody deadlines).

In this perspective, interrelated cycles of RM and KM are formed, the records since production complement the cycle of KM, which involves the organization, use and generation of new registered knowledge, which is then transformed again into new cycles of RM and KM.

Isomura (2021), based on a framework to analyze KM and RM, points out that archival documents and knowledge are created, collected, and used through three processes: operation, communication and decision making.

When these three processes are dynamically interconnected, KM and RM become effective and must be integrated to improve operational effectiveness, support decision making and ensure the strategic use of knowledge in organizations.

The author used three cases to confirm his approach and presented the following conclusions:

- action, knowledge and judgment are dynamically interrelated. KM practices are designed to combine an operation process, a communication process, and a decision-making process;
- the gap between KM and RM is assumed to be caused by the separation of these three processes and an effective RM system should be designed to interconnect these three processes; and
- a RM system is standardized and comprehensive and may become complex and not necessarily support operations directly, in this sense, it must be flexible and local to effectively use organizational knowledge.

The author argues that KM is strategically oriented to use information assets, promoting communication and information sharing, while RM is directed towards efficiency, focusing on well-defined policies and auditable procedures, responding to compliance and documentation needs in organizations.

Results and Discussion

This study aimed to characterize the scientific literature and provide a source for reflection and broader discussion on the interrelationship between RM and KM in the organizational context. Compared to studies in the specific domains of RM or KM, the results suggest that, over a long-time span, when a long-time span is observed, studies with approaches that directly investigate this interrelationship in organizations are not predominant. This striking finding is corroborated by the small number of studies identified and analyzed that address the topic under consideration in this article.

There was little discussion and no broad theoretical or methodological dialogue was established between the authors present in the literature review, as evidenced by the scarce dialogue presented between the authors in the contexts and interlocations of the thematic contents between (“Knowledge Management”, “Organizational Knowledge” and “Tacit Knowledge”) and (“Records Management” and “Archival Document”), as described below: (i) Tombs (2004), is referenced by Anderson (2019) and Isomura (2021), for his Anderson (2019) uses Beastall (1998), Tombs (2004), already mentioned previously and Hase and Galt (2011); and (iii) Hase and Galt (2011) mention the work of Sanderson (2001) and a work by the authors themselves in Galt and Hase (2009).

Regarding the references used by the authors present in the literature review, there is a prevalence of published studies that use common references related to the thematic content of “Knowledge Management”, “Organizational Knowledge”, and “Tacit Knowledge”.

Thus, we highlight (here, considering the references cited, at least, in two or more studies present in the literature review of this article): (i) “Knowledge Management”, Davenport and Prusak,

(1998) is cited by Galt and Hase (2009) and Isomura (2021), Wiig (2000a, 2000b) is cited by Galt and Hase (2009)¹⁰ and Hase and Galt (2011)¹¹; (ii) “Organizational knowledge”, Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) are cited by Duranti and Xie (2012), Lima and Duarte (2017) and Isomura (2021); and (iii) “Tacit Knowledge”, Polanyi (1966a, 1966b) is cited by Sanderson (2001)¹² and Isomura (2021)¹³.

However, in the thematic areas “Records Management” and “Archival Documents”, there is a diversity of references cited by the studies included in the literature review, and no publications appear as common sources in at least two or more studies. The diversity in scope and methodological design of the studies analyzed may indicate the dispersion of references to these two thematic areas among researchers pursuing research objectives in distinct organizational contexts.

According to the perspective presented in this article, RM and KM practices can be used reciprocally, mutually benefiting each other, with the aim of developing organizations, since they provide theoretical and methodological support applicable in this context. We observed that despite the scarce theoretical and methodological dialogue among the authors present in the literature review, except for Tombs (2004), the other authors identify aspects favorable to the reciprocal contributions between RM and KM for Organizational Development. In Chart 6, we consolidate a view of this perspective according to the national and international authors cited in the literature review.

Chart 6 – Reciprocal contributions between records management and knowledge management for Organizational Development.

Author(s)	Year	Reciprocal contributions between RM and KM for Organizational Development
Day	1997	RM and KM work together in organizations to guarantee users access to filtered and organized information
Beastall	1998	Organizations benefit from reciprocal practices between RM and KM when the knowledge contained in documents is captured for management and sharing in the organizational context
Sanderson	2001	RM and KM, working together, promote a culture of continuous learning and collaboration, ensuring that knowledge is not lost and that documents are organized and accessible in a timely manner.
Tombs	2004	RM is more effective than KM in the context of usability, storage, and retrieval of information, in a document-based approach, due to the complex nature and changeability of the context of organizations
Galt and Hase	2009	RM and KM bring benefits to organizations in implementing new systems and processes that contribute to the continuous development of organizational practices
Harries	2009	RM and KM work to produce new knowledge for the continuous improvement of organizational practices, making the explicit and transferable knowledge, favoring the absorption of new knowledge and the creation of shared understanding in the organization
An and Wang	2010	RM and KM are essential to the activities, processes, and systems of any organization. They promote business efficiency, accountability, risk management, and business continuity. They also allow organizations to capitalize on the value of their information resources as business, commercial, and knowledge assets, and contribute to the preservation of collective memory
Hase and Galt	2011	Good RM and KM practices used together contribute to knowledge continuity and reduce operating costs by eliminating duplication and improving organizational efficiency
Duranti and Xie	2012	RM supports the development of KM rules, while KM techniques are applied to facilitate the conversion of tacit RM knowledge into explicit and accessible knowledge. RM and KM complement each other, providing a more robust and efficient environment for business processes, changing management, and organizational culture.
Lima and Duarte	2017	The instruments used by RM and KM, although distinct, are complementary and favor the integration of informational and documentary practices, promoting an environment conducive to the creation, organization, sharing and use of organizational knowledge
Anderson	2019	Organizations that implement good RM practices in their KM programs have a greater capacity to retain critical knowledge and improve their competitive performance in the market
Vieira	2020	RM provides KM with control, organization, and ease of access to information in documents produced and received by the organization. RM and KM provide organizations with knowledge assets related to archival documents (accessible, contextualized within their function/activity and organizational structure, maintaining their identified values and established retention periods)
Isomura	2021	Organizational development occurs when KM is strategically oriented towards utilizing information assets, promoting communication and information sharing, while RM is geared towards efficiency, focusing on well-defined policies and auditable procedures, responding primarily to compliance and documentation needs in organizations

Source: Prepared by the authors based on the selected articles (2024).

¹⁰ Galt and Hase (2009) used as reference the work of Wiig (2000a).

¹¹ Hase and Galt (2011) used as reference the work of Wiig (2000b).

¹² Sanderson (2001) used as reference the work of Polanyi (1966a).

¹³ Isomura (2021) used as reference the work of Polanyi (1966b).

Conclusion

Based on scientific literature, this research made it possible to identify, analyze and recognize the most significant constitutive aspects that integrate the relationship between RM and KM in the organizational sphere.

RM and KM are disciplinarily independent in concepts, processes, key activities, methodologies and results, but they demonstrate similarities and points of convergence that do not necessarily require a joint and consistent approach of both fields in the organizational context.

In fact, the recognition of the relationships (in research and practical application) between both fields consolidates a framework of collaboration that should be logically articulated, concentrating efforts, optimizing resources, and contributing to the achievement of organizational objectives.

Notwithstanding, inevitably these two courses intersect in the context of organizations can evolve by interacting with each other, taking advantage of opportunities, and facing similar challenges to satisfactorily fulfill their purposes.

References

- Alavi, M.; Leidner, D. E. Knowledge management and knowledge management systems: conceptual foundations and research issues. *MIS Quarterly*, v. 1, n. 10, p. 107-136, 2001. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.2307/3250961>.
- An, X.; Wang, W. The integrated use of business continuity management systems, records management systems and knowledge management systems. In: 2010 International Conference on Management and Service Science, 2010, Wuhan, China. *Proceedings* [...]. Wuhan, China: IEEE, 2010. p. 1-4. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICMSS.2010.5576713>.
- Anderson, D. J. *Knowledge management (KM) requires records management: the role of retention schedules in businesses with KM programs*. 2019. 43 f. Master's paper (M.S. in Library Science) – University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, 2019.
- Arquivo Nacional (Brasil). *Dicionário Brasileiro de Terminologia Arquivística*. Rio de Janeiro: Arquivo Nacional, 2005. 232 p.
- Associação Brasileira de Normas Técnicas. *NBR ISO 15489-1: informação e documentação – gestão de documentos de arquivo: Parte 1: conceitos e princípios*. Rio de Janeiro: ABNT, 2018.
- Beastall, G. Records management meets knowledge gathering. *Records Management Journal*, v. 8, n. 2, p. 89-94, 1998.
- Bellotto, H. L. *Arquivos: estudos e reflexões*. Belo Horizonte: Editora UFMG, 2014.
- Bukowitz, W. R.; Williams, R. L. *The knowledge management fieldbook*. London: Prentice-Hall, 2000.
- Costa Filho, C. M. A. *Records continuum: limitações do ciclo vital dos documentos na era pós-custodial e as contribuições da arquivologia australiana*. Rio de Janeiro: Arquivo Nacional, 2020.
- Couture, C.; Rousseau, J.-Y. *Les archives au XXe siècle*. Montréal: Université de Montréal, 1982.
- Cunningham, A.; Millar, L. Peter J. Scott and The Australian 'series' system: its origins, features, rationale, impact and continuing relevance. *Comma*, v. 2013, n. 1, p. 121-144, 2013. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.3828/comma.2013.1.13>.
- Dalkir, K. *Knowledge management in theory and practice*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2011.
- Dancy, J. *Introduction to contemporary epistemology*. New York: Basil Blackwell, 1985.
- Davenport, T. H.; Prusak, L. *Working knowledge: how organizations manage what they know*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 1998.
- Day, I. The role of records management in 'business information' services. *Records Management Journal*, v. 7, n. 2, p. 91-99, 1997.

- Duranti, L. Registros documentais contemporâneos como provas de ação. *Revista Estudos Históricas*, v. 7, n. 13, p. 49-64, 1994.
- Duranti, L. The Odyssey of Records Managers Part I: from the dawn of CI. *Information Management*, v. 23, n. 3, p. 3, 1989a.
- Duranti, L. The Odyssey of Records Managers: Part II: from the Middle A. *Information Management*, v. 23, n. 4, p. 3, 1989b.
- Duranti, L.; Xie, S. L. Knowledge management & records management-Establishing relationships for common development. In: International Conference on Knowledge Management and Information Sharing, 2012, Barcelona. *Proceedings* [...]. Barcelona: SCITEPRESS, 2012. p. 247-250. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.5220/0004110302470250>.
- Galt, J.; Hase, S. Knowledge management and public records compliance: a forgotten world. *Southern Institute of Technology Journal of Applied Research*, p. 1-11, 2009. Disponível em: <https://researchportal.scu.edu.au/esploro/outputs/journalArticle/Knowledge-management-and-public-records-compliance/991012820451202368>. Acesso em: 27 jul. 2024.
- Hallis, M. *Invitation to philosophy*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1985.
- Harries, S. Managing records, making knowledge and good governance. *Records Management Journal*, v. 19, n. 1, p. 16-25, 2009.
- Hase, S.; Galt, J. Records management myopia: a case study. *Records Management Journal*, v. 21, n. 1, p. 36-45, 2011. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1108/09565691111125099>.
- Hospers, J. *An introduction to philosophical analysis*. 2. ed. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1967.
- International Council on Archives. *¿Qué es un documento de archivo?* [S. l.: s. n.], 2023. Disponível em: <https://www.ica.org/es/que-es-un-documento-de-archivo>. Acesso em: 9 ago. 2024.
- Isomura, K. The Gap Between knowledge management and records management. In: Fujiyoshi, K. (ed.) *Archives, accountability, and democracy in the digital age*. Singapore: Springer Singapore, 2021. p. 13-27. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-33-6715-9_2.
- Jardim, J. M. Caminhos e perspectivas da gestão de documentos em cenários de transformações. *Acervo*, v. 28, n. 2, p. 19-50, 2015.
- Kern, G.; Holgado, S.; Cottin, M. Cinquante nuances de cycle de vie: quelles évolutions possibles? *Les Cahiers du Numérique*, v.11, n.2, p. 37-76, 2015.
- Lima, E. S.; Duarte, E. N. N. Diretrizes para uma política integrada de gestão documental, da informação e do conhecimento no SEBRAE Paraíba. In: Encontro Nacional de Pesquisa e Pós-Graduação em Ciência da Informação, 18., 2017, Marília. *Anais* [...]. Marília: Enancib, 2017.
- McElroy, M. The knowledge life cycle. In: ICM Conference on Knowledge Management, 1999, Miami, FL. Miami, FL.: [s. n.], 1999.
- Meyer, M.H.; Zack, M.H. The design and implementation of information products. *Sloan Management Review*, v. 37, n. 3, p. 43-59, 1996.
- Moser, P.K.; Nat, A. V. *Human knowledge*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Nonaka, I. A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation. *Organization Science*, v. 5, n. 1, p. 14-37, 1994.
- Nonaka, I.; Takeuchi, H. *Criação de conhecimento na empresa*. Rio de Janeiro: Elsevier, 1997.
- Nonaka, I.; Takeuchi, H. *The knowledge creating company: how Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Polanyi, M. *The tacit dimension*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966a.
- Polanyi, M. *The tacit dimension*. Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1966b.
- Rollett, H. *Knowledge management: processes and technologies*. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2003.

- Sanderson, M. Records management and the capture of tacit knowledge. *Records Management Journal*, v. 11, n. 1, p. 7-17, 2001.
- Schellenberg, T.R. *Arquivos modernos: princípios e técnicas*. 6. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Fundação Getúlio Vargas, 2006.
- Shepherd, E.; Yeo, G. *Managing records: a handbook of principles and practice*. London: Facet Publishing, 2003.
- Tombs, K. Knowledge management is dead: long live records management. *Records Management Journal*, v. 14, n. 2, p. 90-93, 2004.
- Valentim, M. L. P. Conceitos sobre gestão do conhecimento: uma revisão sistemática da literatura brasileira. *Informação & Sociedade*, v. 30, n. 3, p. 1-34, 2020.
- Vieira, T. O. O contributo da gestão de documentos na gestão do conhecimento nas organizações: uma abordagem exploratória. *Em Questão*, v. 26, n. 1, p. 327-350, 2020. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.19132/1808-5245261.327-350>.
- Wiig, K. M. *Application of knowledge management in public administration*. Arlington, Texas: Knowledge Research Institute, 2000a. Paper prepared for Public Administrators of the City of Taipei, Taiwan. Disponível em: https://web.archive.org/web/20190712004351id_/http://www.krii.com:80/downloads/km_in_public_admin_rev.pdf#page=1.00&gsr=0. Acesso em: 2 ago. 2024.
- Wiig, K. M. Application of knowledge management in public administration. *In: International Symposium Building Policy Conference, 2000, Taipei, Taiwan. Proceedings [...]*. Taipei, Taiwan: [s. n.], 2000b. Disponível em: https://lib.ncdd.gov.kh/storage/app/public/library_backend/CAT_7411_1/2000-Knowledge-PublicAdm.pdf. Acesso em: 2 ago. 2024.
- Wiig, K. M. *Knowledge management foundations*. Arlington, TX: Schema Press, 1993.
- Winograd, T.; Flores, F. *Understanding computer and cognition*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1986.

Colaborators

Conceptualization: R. P. M. MACHADO. Data curation: R. P. M. MACHADO. Investigation: R. P. M. MACHADO, R. T. B. SOUSA, and L. M. A. R. ALVARES. Methodology: R. P. M. MACHADO, R. T. B. SOUSA, and L. M. A. R. ALVARES. Supervision: R. T. B. SOUSA and L. M. A. R. ALVARES. Validation: R. P. M. MACHADO, R. T. B. SOUSA, and L. M. A. R. ALVARES. Writing – original draft: R. P. M. MACHADO. Writing–review and editing: R. P. M. MACHADO, R. T. B. SOUSA, and L. M. A. R. ALVARES.