Measuring knowledge management: evidence essentials in purpose-driven organizations

Silvia Capezzuoli and Ruth Jolly

Abstract

This paper suggests a framework for conceptualising what knowledge management (KM) we want to measure by putting forward the idea that purpose-driven organizations need a particular take on measuring KM impact. There is emerging interest in the purpose-driven organization, defined as an organization that has its purpose at its heart; where purpose is the organization's deepest creative potential, focusing on the "Why". In the international development sector, it is key to always start from the position of being a purpose-driven organization, given the underlying shared values which should inform and guide all practice. Driven by a central purpose and supporting values, an organization defines its best intent and direction; and indicators naturally emerge from these. So KM measurement becomes less about 'proof,' less about ROI or value for money, and more about trends and patterns that point to evidence. The article explores areas and evidence of KM impact with several organizations which we have worked closely with. We interview a selection of organizations active in international development, each of which have grappled with shaping their KM approach directly to organizational purpose, and with the challenges and triumphs of setting KM intentions, direction and indicators.

Key words: knowledge management, international development, measurement, organizations, systems thinking, complex adaptive systems

Introduction

This paper sets out how we are thinking about the issues of measuring knowledge management (KM) in international development, surfacing our assumptions and drawing on our experience as we grapple with this field. It is an exploration, rather than a set of conclusions or recommendations. The paper tries to make sense of trends and received wisdom, and explores what could be on the horizon – where things may take us when we don't start with the premise of the current measurement model. Starting with a brief look at why we measure, and common measurement challenges,

Capezzuoli, S. and Jolly, R. 2019
Measuring knowledge management: evidence essentials in purpose-driven organizations.
Knowledge Management for Development Journal. Online first. 16pp.
www.km4djournal.org

we discuss the limitations of measuring KM against current models. We suggest that KM is not an end in itself, rather its function is to serve the wider organizational purpose. Given its nature, KM actually infuses and can contribute to all aspects of organizational culture. So how can such a diffused function actually be meaningfully measured separately, and to what extent should organizations even be trying?
We outline our take on organizations, proposing that systems thinking and complexity theory provide useful conceptual frames for understanding organizations and how we might approach KM measurement. We reflect that when an organization is driven by a central purpose and supporting values, and able to engage in feedback and define intention and direction, fitting indicators naturally emerge. In turn, KM measurement becomes less about 'proof,' less about return on investment (ROI) or value for money, and more about trends and patterns of improvement which point to evidence. We hold that international development organizations working on long-term social change need a particular take on measuring KM impact and we suggest some approaches and some practical ideas for how to do this.

Our experiences of working with international development practitioners, facilitating our residential KM courses and in our in-house consultancies, along with the valuable responses to recent informal interviews and rapid assessment questionnaires with three international non-governmental organizations (INGOs), help to inform this paper, and reveal some current practice and results. Three stand-alone organizational snapshots provide an additional glimpse into how KM measurement is addressed within these INGOs.

Why measure and why measure KM activities?

We know that in a sector with shared underlying values of poverty reduction, equality and social justice, organizations (i.e. the people working in and for them) really *do* want to know that they are making a difference to people's lives. And we doubt anyone would argue with the principle that any organization, in the development sector or otherwise, genuinely does need to measure some of what it does. Why?

Measurement can show how an organization is performing in relation to its aims and objectives; what is and is not working. For example, Six Sigma, a globally recognised process improvement method, endeavours to achieve near-perfect quality and relies on careful data collection and measurement (Hurley 2017). Measurement can help to reveal why results emerge and why changes are or are not happening, and it can shed light on identifiable changes and trends which organizational work has contributed to – the elusive organizational impact. Specifically in the international development sector, the push for results through measurement is reflected in a whole body of work from

the early 2000s (Kusek and Rist 2004). Measurement can also tell us about the health of internal systems.

Ever since Peter Drucker claimed that "What gets measured, gets managed" (Drucker 1954), a debate and a whole industry has continued to grow and argue for the necessity of measurement for organizational development and impact. Similar reasons for measuring apply to KM activities. We want to know if our efforts are worth it, that we are learning from experience, and seeing positive results. A wide range of organizational assessments are available as a starting point for this. One of the most well-known with a KM focus is the Five Competencies Framework (Collison and Parcell 2004). So there are self-evident reasons why we would want to measure things we get up to in organizations and things we get up to in KM. With that uncontroversial assessment over, we are at once drawn to the intrinsic challenges of measurement.

Some general measurement challenges

Following are four challenging areas of measurement in general, which can equally apply to KM as it is practised in the international development sector.

How much?
Anyone involved in committed, co-ordinated action will directly or indirectly face a fundamental measurement question: How much? What is the *extent* of measurement required? We might imagine a sliding scale of measurement effort, ranging from none, to middling to extensive. How do we pitch our extent of effort, so that we measure enough to reveal vital findings that enable us to learn, adapt and get better results, but not so much as to be time, energy and resource consuming? And not so negligible that we gain no insights as to the efficacy of our activities?

Attribution
Then there is the question of attribution. It is notoriously difficult to ascribe attribution and build a picture of cause and effect links. Even in technical operations this is difficult, and so much more challenging in the field of international development. The sector exists to address an indescribably complex world context.   Human relations and processes are fluid, issues are multi-faceted, and problems are described as 'wicked', which is to say their solutions require that a great number of people change their mind-sets and behaviour. The rate and scale of change is arguably unprecedented. It is now recognised we are living in the geological 'Anthropocene era', in which human activity is the dominant influence on climate and environment. Picture a kaleidoscope

in perpetual and infinite re-calibration and re-patterning. And now picture how to go about making and measuring accurate causal links.

Ethics

There are also uncomfortable questions about *who* might be doing the measuring (of what, of whom and to what end) which take us into the territory of power relations and agendas. Jones et al. (2012) identify three types of knowledge: research-based, practice-informed and citizen/lay knowledge. Who decides which knowledge to measure?

Resources

In addition is the question of resources. At what point does the cost of measurement outstrip the benefits of any findings? How high do they go before they compromise other choices about investment? And what is the limit at which investments become ethically unjustifiable?

In addition, there are challenges directly related to measuring KM in international development which we deal with in the next section.

Challenges facing measurement of KM in international development

Measuring the immeasurable

KM itself is an intangible and diffuse thing. It is an abstract. We hear that KM initiatives impact 'diverse, widespread changing groups and programmes'. And in our workshop series with diverse groups of international development practitioners, we collectively ascertain that KM can hardly be seen as a discreet, contained function with neat goals and outputs. As our delegates contest 'it sits nowhere and everywhere – it touches everything'. In best efforts to make the abstract visible, some organizations set up KM units or functions. Others conceive knowledge sharing as a foundation of their work from the start - which is reviewed, adapted and grown in alignment with other organizational processes. Clearly the origins of how KM was born in an organization influences how its effects are measured.

The term KM is perhaps even a contradiction in itself. Hagmann and Gillman (2017), for example, suggest we should not use the term at all, rather call it a way of working. This doesn't make the question of measuring it any easier. How can knowledge actually be managed? Were we to call it 'knowledge sharing' or 'knowledge mobilisation' the approach to how we measure it might shift, possibly steering away from measuring the management, to focusing on the outcomes of knowledge sharing and mobilising.

The limitations

But back to our quest to find fitting ways to measure KM in the international development sector. Some classic measurement approaches, variously adopted in the sector, lean towards hard, quantitative data, attribution lines, 'logframitis' with strict monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems, return on investment (ROI) and linear checking and results chain. These approaches are limited when applied to the complexity of a great deal of long-term international development. And they are even more deficient when applied to KM, which is abstract and fluid. In fact, the extent and types of measurement vary considerably within this sector, with numerous (and often conflicting) perspectives, conceptual frameworks and paradigms. At the organization-wide and programmatic level, there has been an enormous push for M&E in the last two to three decades and it has evolved into a discipline in its own right. Nowadays it is taken for granted that there needs to be an M&E unit/ team/person to fulfil the measurement function in relation to the 'work' of the organization. In extreme cases, the ever-extending culture of 'results' manifests as systems, frameworks, indicators and data that few can, want, or have the time to make sense of. The familiar emphasis within this model on value for money has limitations as 'the prevention of errors and the savings that are often achieved through better use and reuse of existing knowledge are practically invisible in accounting terms. Knowledge management prevents waste of money, time and human resources and one cannot measure what is prevented.' (Dumitriu 2016: 46)

Reasons often cited for this 'measurement of results' trend are the need for greater accountability and transparency, and for learning and improvement. These are sound intentions, but is this conventional style of measurement actually helping to achieve these aspirations? Do we still remain in the regimen of counting and attempting to *prove*, but find it hard to seek new ways of measuring that will take us closer to discovering if things are truly *improving*? For example, does the number of downloads of public health documents tell us anything about positive behavioural change?
Has the development sector lost the art of social change to the science of delivery, reducing an understanding of how change happens to an aggregate of technical interventions – and producing a mechanistic measurement industry in its wake?
And finally, where KM is marginalised, both structurally and functionally, there may not be the capacity (or even the will) to measure the change it contributes to, and therefore to establish its value.

How we view organizations

Before we move to outlining some approaches and practical ideas that might offer a better fit for measuring KM work in the development sector, we pause to surface some assumptions about what we hold organizations to be and how they operate. This is

Capezzuoli, S. and Jolly, R. 2019
Measuring knowledge management: evidence essentials in purpose-driven organizations.
Knowledge Management for Development Journal. Online first. 16pp.
www.km4djournal.org

important because our approach to KM measurement is predicated on how we read organizations themselves. And we are increasingly struck with the strength of the notion that the way the problem is understood, determines what you do.
In grappling with how to measure KM, we return to first principles and ask: how do we and our clients understand the challenge? Can we recognise what lens we are using? And what is our prevailing mind-set?

We are becoming more convinced that systems thinking and complexity theory are hugely helpful concepts as we work in and with organizations on KM issues. In The Fifth Discipline, Peter Senge (1997: 6) explains: 'You can only understand the system of a rainstorm by contemplating the whole, not any individual part of the pattern…business and other human endeavours are also systems…Systems Thinking is a conceptual framework, a body of knowledge and tools, that has been developed over the past 50 years to make the full patterns clearer, and to help us see how to change them effectively.' Unable here to honour the range of thinking and vast literature on complexity, we offer a proposition which describes its value: 'I suggest that the modern natural sciences of complexity, essentially sciences of uncertainty, provide us with important insights into the evolution of complex phenomena which could well provide the basis for an alternative way of thinking about organizations and their management' (Stacey, 2010:1).

Informed by systems thinking and complexity theory, we favour the term 'complex adaptive systems'. This describes organizations functioning as fluid, living systems, characterised by: giving and receiving feedback; adapting to feedback; re-organizing; making new patterns; dynamic relationships and connectivity; self-organizing; and innovation. Describing organizations as these open, complex networks, requiring healthy feedback loops, and living with conflict and uncertainty as part of the terrain, produces different results from describing organizations as if they were closed structures to be managed, particularly when addressing how to measure KM.

In a real sense, international development organizations qualify as complex adaptive systems. They can also be described, as many other types of organizations in different sectors can be, as 'purpose driven organizations' where at best they operate with purpose at their heart and where members can readily express and engage in that purpose, constellating around the 'why'. They are fully conscious of their '*Ikigai*' – the Japanese expression for their very reason for being. They genuinely connect to the vision and mission. And they share a set of collective values with other organizations in the sector, working on issues of social well-being, empowerment and livelihoods, and towards the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), which underpin their practice. So what does this reading of organizational identity mean for KM measurement?

Some approaches and practical ideas for measuring KM

How do we approach measuring KM, avoiding the traps and limitations of some conventional approaches, while bringing real value? We hold that certain conditions and values, when in place, support ways of measuring KM.

A mind-set that views organizations as complex adaptive systems
This view recognises that when seen in this light, organizations can naturally flourish by giving, receiving and adapting to feedback. We hold that where this mind-set is present, it brings about opportunities to measure KM in positive, helpful and creative ways. Thinkers and practitioners promoting 'Teal organizations'[i] speak of the importance of understanding patterns of feedback loops and the significance of self-management, evolutionary purpose and wholeness (Laloux 2014; Robertson 2015).

The sense of being truly 'purpose-driven'
Where an organization attracts and retains people dedicated to its purpose, then positive results often follow in terms of individual accountability, giving and receiving feedback, and learning and adaptation. This kind of culture invites KM to be liberated from the measurement challenges described above, and move into a looser, lighter kind of mode.

Conscious intent to hear from the whole system
A systemic approach asserts that organizations stand or fall on their ability to exchange feedback. Given this, organizations do well to make conscious efforts to hear from the whole system. In KM terms, this demands attending not only to the measurement of codified knowledge such as articles, papers and policy – all the explicit, visible permutations of knowledge transfer. It also demands an understanding of the effects of the tacit knowledge processes and conversions operating throughout the system, and on the borders of the system where it connects with others. 'An understanding of knowledge systems as fundamentally social has profound implications for the current predominance of technical approaches to evidence-informed development' (Georgalakis 2017:17). And this understanding is deeply embedded in an appreciation of individual relationships, group dynamics, culture, politics and social norms.

Real-time, continuous feedback
Those organizations that practise proactive knowledge-sharing behaviours as their inherent culture, state that they seek confirmation of what is working well, often through small, direct, informal feedback - and focus on doing more of the same. This helps us to have the pulse on stakeholder-wider system changes, see trends and feel confident that certain initiatives have value for our context. Fostering a culture of feedback loops at all levels, and enhancing people's ability to articulate the value of

the learning and knowledge they are accessing/receiving in real time, is a way to do this (Henley Business School 2013).

Aspiring to processes of 'downward accountability'
The most vital part of this whole system feedback is finding ways to hear from the target populations – from those people most affected by the endeavours of the organization. Downward accountability seeks to do just this (Jacobs 2007). Research shows that in the discourse of international development and SDGs, local knowledge is (still) lacking (Cummings et al. 2018). Academic, research-based knowledge is still given precedence; more needs to be done to capture the voice of lived experience and treat it as similar evidence[ii]. Interestingly, a shift towards downward accountability engendered new forms of KM in Action Aid. In a bold experiment, with a wide aim of addressing accountability (Scott-Villiers 2002), field offices were released from standard reporting formats and requirements, and local organizations and beneficiaries were invited to give feedback in the ways and media they wanted. This produced dynamic and immediate interest, mixed media feedback, and increased learning and ownership.

Emphasis on direction and intent
Arising out of a systemic approach, we see a looser, lighter approach to strategizing (Mintzberg 1994 and 1998). There are fewer detailed plans, fewer written reports, fewer checks and controls and limited logical frameworks. There are more expressions of intent, more spaces for strategic thinking and articulations of directions of travel. These processes are typically involving and participatory, and allow for things to emerge and plans to adjust accordingly. They call for readiness to read trends and patterns. KM, being part and parcel of organizational culture, takes on a related style when operating in this frame.

KM is embedded in core work and organizational culture
Knowledge management should be strategically embedded in the organization's core work, because its function is to serve and support the wider organizational purpose. Unfortunately, often KM initiatives are treated as 'add-ons', just another task that has to be done. Or else KM tends to be marginalized and disconnected from organizational goals and strategies. We need a shift towards greater awareness of the potential driving force of KM and its central place in core work and culture (Hagmann and Gillman 2017).

Internal and external
There are a variety of reasons why knowledge managers try to evaluate the impact of KM. These can include the need to demonstrate value for money, the desire to support a range of learning purposes, and the need to comply with performance management

Capezzuoli, S. and Jolly, R. 2019
Measuring knowledge management: evidence essentials in purpose-driven organizations.
Knowledge Management for Development Journal. Online first. 16pp.
www.km4djournal.org

and reporting cycles (Henley Business School 2013). This is very much an internal questioning, focusing on how we are doing as an organization. However, we need to shift from a tendency towards KM introspection (asking whether we are sharing knowledge effectively with our colleagues, and whether we are working well internally), which runs the risk of developing a whole set of efforts to justify KM *per se*. We support holding to an outward-facing enquiry that asks primarily what changes KM is contributing to, being mindful that the whole point of measuring is to identify those things that achieve results with and for ultimate stakeholders. Internal KM results are not an end in themselves; rather they need to serve the organizational purpose. So any attempt to measure KM must and can only be done as part of organizational strategy and direction, and not as an end in itself, i.e. KM measurements have to align with overall organizational strategic approach and plans.

Last but not least

A few touchstone questions attend us as we seek to measure KM in this sector. Beware of measuring for the sake of measuring. Always ask ourselves: Why are we asking these questions? What is this information used for? Why are we collecting it? What do we really need to measure and what are 'nice to haves'? Whose time are we using? In the following textboxes, we show how different organizations are meeting some of the challenges we describe above.

Textbox 1: Organizational snapshot of International HIV/AIDS Alliance, now FrontlineAIDS[iii]

Founded over 20 years ago, the Alliance works on HIV, health and human rights through local, national and global action with communities in over 40 countries on four continents. The Alliance is a network of national organizations worldwide – known as linking organizations (LOs) supported by an international secretariat based in the UK. The LOs support each other, as well as local NGOs and community organizations.

Learning and sharing are fundamental to what the Alliance is about. Most of the secretariat's activities, and some of the LOs' activities, can be seen as KM (peer review teams on accreditation standards; crowd sourcing best practice and case studies to develop resources and tools; coordinated platforms at regional and international conferences; regional thematic meetings coordinated by LOs; LO directors' conference; fostering communities of practice,). They are all integral to how the Alliance operates. Some clearly identifiable initiatives are measured separately; however most day-to-day practices that could fall under the KM remit, are not.

In terms of assessing KM-type elements, small informal feedback loops with LOs and secretariat staff are used to identify trends and feel confident that these initiatives provide value. The Alliance also favours process measures on a number of programmes, given the importance and added value of 'learning while doing'.

One specific programme that had learning and knowledge sharing as a core aim (the KP Connect programme) did include a more specific measure. This included a participatory social network mapping with each organization at the beginning and the end of the programme. This both informed the programme and helped to measure how social networks had changed through the programme - in terms of who people learnt from and shared knowledge with.

In annual surveys of LOs, on average the highest ratings were given for enabling them to collaborate with and learn from others, as well as improve programme quality and generate evidence.

Textbox 2: Organizational snapshot of Practical Action[iv]

Practical Action was founded in 1966, and was known as the Intermediate Technology Development Group until 1996. This INGO gains knowledge and experience through practical projects with local partners, and combines this with research and best practice from around the world. Practical Action has placed knowledge work, and particularly knowledge sharing, at the heart of its work since its foundation.

The current knowledge brokering model is based on knowledge and learning being the very essence of what Practical Action does. Practical Action Consulting carries out commissioned research work. Practical Answers, a grassroots knowledge service, from the start used panels of experts to decide on what areas of expertise to focus upon and to assist in the development of knowledge resources to respond to enquirers. Together with Practical Action Publishing they disseminate to an external audience brokered knowledge products that have gone through peer review processes. This knowledge informs and influences national and international practices and policies.

Practical Action uses a set of key performance indicators to assess its progress with knowledge, but these are more for internal reporting purposes. The general feeling is to sense where the energy is, build groups of champions, trial and demonstrate KM initiatives, and support more of these where they seem to be spreading. Internally, headline KM work is discussed quarterly, and reviewed annually with a deeper dive.

Working with direction of travel, the question is what can accompany the required shift, and what needs to be learned to achieve this? These help determine which initiatives are measured, and how.

Textbox 2: Organizational snapshot of MSF OCB and South Africa[v]

Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) is an international, independent, medical humanitarian organization that delivers emergency aid to people affected by armed conflict, epidemics, natural disasters and exclusion from healthcare. Within its change management remit, the MSF Operational Centre Brussels (OCB) started a KM project in 2014 to improve organizational KM. Like Practical Action, MSF OCB established, through consultation, direction of travel statements which provided a clear steer for measuring progress:

From a tacit KM culture to more explicit
From a broadcasting internal communications to one that narrowcasts
From a legacy ICT to a modern digital workplace
From a culture of evaluations which are 'eyes only' to public evaluations
From a learning & development (L&D) function which is organization-centric to more user-centric initiatives
From focused organizational development to broader support

These statements were used as a framework to initiate a whole spectrum of large and small-scale KM initiatives. Many did not work, and many others have taken root and are becoming institutionalised. The idea is to loudly work with groups of champions, promote innovation through 'failing forward,' sense which KM initiatives are working and support more of these where they seem to be spreading. The approach included associating KM closely with existing functions of HR, L&D and ICT, knowing that KM is integral to other functions' core work.

The identified 'measure of success' for many of these are user satisfaction surveys and outcome processes. Rapid informal feedback also provides a sense of whether the many initiatives are contributing to MSF's work.

MSF South Africa has recently embarked on promoting KM for its programmes. Adequate measurement factors allow the team to create a space for dialogue. These measurements aim to be more people- and process- centred. The indicators developed are fairly loose, reflecting KM as a support to other functions' core work.

Practical ideas for measuring KM

We highlight here some practical ideas for measuring KM.

1. Rather than 'SMART,' detailed or precise, indicators can be expressed, for example, in terms of what activities might result in success. What is critical is that any generic category be refined by the organization together with key stakeholders, and meaningful indicators be developed and agreed jointly, adhering to participatory principles (Chambers 1994; Chambers 1997). Indicators need to be tailored to the particular context in which they will be used, and also connected to the Theory of Change. The organizational/ programmatic Theory of Change reflects the overarching purpose, so KM indicators need to dovetail and be nested in it.

2. Various attempts have been made to identify indicators for assessing KM initiatives. Henley Forum research shows that such an approach is useful where there is a focus on initiatives to improve explicit KM 'in relatively stable environments in which there are not interacting influences from ongoing organizational change programmes' (Henley Business School 2013). More often than not however, KM is introduced precisely as part of a package of other change initiatives, so the question of an intangible cause and effect link remains. At best, we can identify categories of indicators that can help to steer us in the questions we ask, and in the kind of 'evidence' we seek to better understand how KM initiatives have made a difference. An IDS workshop identified 100 indicators to help with M&E of KM (Mansfield and Grunewald 2013).

3. Our quest for KM indicators can be helped by looking to measure aptitude for roles, such as the role of knowledge intermediaries (brokers), rather than knowledge actors. The functions approach to knowledge intermediaries suggested by Jones et al (2012) is a useful framework for understanding knowledge functions. This approach takes Michaels' (2009) six functions of knowledge intermediaries - informing, consulting, matchmaking, engaging, collaborating and building adaptive capacity - and suggests indicators of progress for each. Many of these indicators are articulated in terms of 'breadth of, 'extent of' and 'balance in', allowing for an openness of interpretation.

4. A mantra for fostering KM culture is to go where the energy is and build groups of champions. So one way of addressing measurement questions is, when the time is right, to retrospectively look at what is successful. Being always on the lookout for success stories, and fostering a culture of telling stories can surface much called for 'evidence'. It is good practice to look out for trends and develop an open-ended

collection of views that can be used to tell a story. Methods such as Most Significant Change (Davies and Dart 2004) can be used for harvesting stories. It is important to clarify the distinction between stories that strengthen organizational work (which we need more of) and stories for the sake of stories (which we can do with less of).

5. Real-time feedback is increasingly being generated, accessed and substantiated through the use of radical information technology. Just as the latest technology is being used to monitor and report across sectors - humanitarian, governance, health, etc. - it can equally be used for KM measurement. For an example of sophisticated generation and use of citizen data see www.civicus.org/thedatashift.org.

6. 'Evidence informed, not based.' Given points 4 and 5 above, we suggest being more at ease taking decisions informed by evidence gathered on an ongoing basis, often informally, from various sources, rather than striving towards the rigours of more academic, scrupulous evidence-based methods. Evidence-based discipline is vital in some contexts, but less fitting for measuring KM.

7. Given the approaches we suggest above, planning looks more like intent and direction of travel, within 'loose' not 'tight' strategies and therefore with looser ways of measuring these. This means: generic learning outcomes; going with the feeling; agreeing what is 'good enough'.vi

8. Given that measuring KM relates to how we, as socially inter-connected beings operating in wider systems, generate and interpret 'evidence' through our different mind-sets, it becomes more meaningful to focus on measuring outcomes within an impact pathway. We can ask what actions are stemming from KM initiatives. What changes, if any, have occurred? And how can we make sense of these?

Conclusions

Given the challenges of current measurement models, a number of alternative approaches can help us in our quest to adequately capture the all-encompassing and fluid nature of KM. These approaches lend themselves to measuring KM contribution to overall organizational impact in a fitting way. The overall theme of 'more improve, less prove' needs to be taken up more widely. The value of KM will continue to be challenged as long as it is considered an 'add-on' rather than integral to organizational purpose. Where KM *is* aligned with organizational purpose and practice, and where attitudes to organizations and measurement in general embrace complexity and emergence, then there is scope for KM measurement to afford meaningful and timely

findings. In this context, we ask less about the impact of KM as a stand-alone function and more about contribution and organizational impact.

References

Chambers, R. (1994) 'Participatory rural appraisal (PRA): challenges, potentials and paradigm,' World Development, 22 (7): 1437-1454

Chambers, R. (1997) Whose reality counts? Putting the first last. London, Intermediate Technology Publications

Collison, C. and Parcell, J. (2004) Learning to Fly. Capstone Publishing

Cummings, S.J.R., Regeer, B.J., de Haan, L.J.A., Zweekhorst, M.B.M. and Bunders, J.F.G. (2018) 'Critical discourse analysis of perspectives on knowledge and knowledge societies within the Sustainable Development Goals,' Development Policy Review, 36 (6): 727-742

Davies, R.J. and Dart, J. (2004) The Most Significant Change (MSC) technique - a guide to its use.

Drucker, P.F. (1954) The Practice of Management. Harper Business

Dumitriu, P. (2016) 'Knowledge management in the United Nations system.' JIU/REP/2016/10

Georgalakis, J., Oronje, R., Ramalingam, B. and Jessani, N. (2017) 'Introduction.' In: The social realities of knowledge for development: sharing lessons of improving development processes with evidence, IDS

Hagmann, J. and Gillman, H. (2017) 'The future of knowledge management in large development programmes and organizations: lessons from a large-scale institutional experiment,' Knowledge Management for Development Journal 13 (1): 4-24

Henley Business School (2013) 'Thinking differently about evaluating knowledge management,' Knowledge in Action, Issue 28

Hurley, B. (2017) Lean Six Sigma for good: how improvement experts can help people in need, and help improve the environment. Odin Ink

Jacobs, A. and Wilford, R. (2007) 'Putting new approaches to NGO accountability into action. Paper prepared for the Development's Futures Conference, NUI Galway, 24 – 25th November 2007

Jones H., Jones, N., Shaxson, L. and Walker, D. (2012) Knowledge, policy and power in international development: a practical guide. The Policy Press

Kusek, J. and Rist, R. (2004) Ten Steps to a Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation System. World Bank, Washington DC

Laloux, F. (2014) Reinventing Organizations: A Guide to Creating Organizations Inspired by the Next Stage in Human Consciousness. Nelson Parker

Mansfield, W. and Grunewald, P. (2013) 'The use of indicators for monitoring and evaluation of knowledge management brokering in international development.'

Capezzuoli, S. and Jolly, R. 2019
Measuring knowledge management: evidence essentials in purpose-driven organizations.
Knowledge Management for Development Journal. Online first. 16pp.
www.km4djournal.org

Report of a workshop held at IDS 8/3/2013. Loughborough University and IDS Knowledge Services

Micheals, S. (2009) 'Matching knowledge brokering strategies to environmental policy problems,' Environmental science and Policy, 12 (7): 994-1011.

Milner, T. (2017) 'From intermediate technology to technology justice: the knowledge sharing journey of Practical Action.' In: The social realities of knowledge for development: sharing lessons of improving development processes with evidence, IDS

Mintzberg, H. (1994) The Rise and Fall of Strategic Planning. Prentice Hall

Mintzberg, H., Ahlstrand, B. and Lampel, J. (1998) Strategy Safari – a guide through the wilds of strategic management. Free Press

Robertson, B. (2015) Holacracy: The Revolutionary Management System that Abolishes Hierarchy. Penguin

Scott-Villiers, P. (2002). 'The struggle for organizational change: how the ActionAid Accountability, Learning and Planning System emerged,' Development in Practice, 12 (3-4): 424-435

Senge, P. (1997) The Fifth Discipline - Measuring Business Excellence. MCB UP Ltd.

Stacey, R. (2010) Complexity Theory and Strategic Management. https://sigs.cim.co.uk/media/2135/the_knowledgeapril2010.pdf

Acknowledgements

About the authors

Silvia Capezzuoli is a senior consultant with IMA International (www.imainternational.com). She is a social development specialist with 25 years' experience in international development. She facilitates open and in-house KM and M&E workshops, supports KM within organizations and runs Training of Trainers programmes. She has managed NGO programmes in West and East Africa; run adult education programmes in South East Asia and UK, and worked worldwide in capacity building with public sector, UN agencies and INGOs. Silvia holds a Master's Degree in Gender and Development from the Institute of Development Studies, Sussex. Email: silvia.capezzuoli@imainternational.com

Ruth Jolly is a senior consultant with IMA International (www.imainternational.com). She is an organizational development (OD) specialist with 25 years' experience working internationally within the development sector. She focuses on design and facilitation of OD processes, leadership and KM programmes, and facilitates KM open

Capezzuoli, S. and Jolly, R. 2019
Measuring knowledge management: evidence essentials in purpose-driven organizations.
Knowledge Management for Development Journal. Online first. 16pp.
www.km4djournal.org

and in-house workshops. She has headed organizational learning functions, co-ordinated an advocacy coalition and served as a photojournalist in the sector. Ruth holds a Master's Degree in Human Rights and is a certified coach. Ruth has published papers on managing humanitarian organizations, manuals on campaigning and researching and lectured on human rights and NGOs.

Email: ruth.jolly@imainternational.com

---

[i] Teal organizations are described in Frederic Laloux's book, Reinventing Organizations. The premise is that organizations change as human consciousness evolves and now humanity is at a new organizational threshold and a new form of organization is emerging. There have been, according to this view, at least five different organizational paradigms in human history. This concept is not new. It is part of a body of work known as Spiral Dynamics. What is new, is the documentation and understanding of a whole new group of organizations that defy the normal hierarchy paradigm and live three common principles: *Self Organising*, striving for *Wholeness* and understanding their *Evolutionary Purpose.* In Spiral Dynamics, these are known as Teal Organizations. Frederic Laloux is a Belgian consultant and coach who worked for 10 years at McKinsey & Company. His book, Reinventing Organizations, brings to light 12 companies of different industries, cultures and sizes (over 100 and up to 40,000 employees), which are currently achieving results based on Teal ways of working.

[ii] Presentations and discussions during KMb Forum, Bristol, UK 7-8 March 2018

[iii] Interview with Anna Downie, International HIV AIDS Alliance. NB. The organization is now rebranded Frontline AIDS.

[iv] Interview with Sarah Begg, Practical Action and notes from Milner, T. 2017.

[v] Interview with Zoya Naidoo, MSF South Africa and work-based conversations with Robin Vincent-Smith, MSF OCB

[vi] Discussions authors were part of during KMb Forum, Bristol, UK 7-8 March 2018