

Chapter 4.28

Communities of Practice as Facilitators of Knowledge Exchange

Scott Paquette

University of Toronto, Canada

INTRODUCTION

For knowledge to create value in an organization, whether tacit or explicit, it must have the ability to be shared among employees. This intentional (or in some instances unintentional) flow of knowledge can become the driver for organizational learning. When examining knowledge sharing, it is important to consider the context in which the knowledge is developed, as the community in which the individual is learning can affect any knowledge that is created. Organizational learning is impacted by individuals, groups, and the organization as a whole, and how these three levels are linked by social processes (Crossan, Lane & White, 1999). However, it is very difficult to create the right social environment to produce optimum knowledge sharing and learning. Sharing knowledge is an ‘unnatural act’, and therefore firms must strive to create the right environment

and means to assist employees in overcoming knowledge flow barriers (Ruppel & Harrington, 2001).

Previous research has identified communities of practice as a hub for sharing knowledge within an organization (Brown & Duguid, 1991; Ellis, 1998; Hildreth & Kimble, 1999). The ability of a community of practice to create a friendly environment for individuals with similar interests and problems to discuss a common subject matter encourages the transfer and creation of new knowledge. Practitioners with similar work experiences tend to be drawn to communities, and from this a common purpose to share knowledge and experience arises (Wenger, 1998). Blackler (1995) argues that the creation and deployment of knowledge is inseparable from activity, and different contexts manifest in the form of knowledge boundaries. A community of practice can help individuals remove this boundary through the

creation of a common context that links different experiential knowledge in an environment suited for knowledge exchange.

BACKGROUND

Communities of practice bring value to individuals and organizations by allowing for the acquisition of knowledge that supports practice within a role or responsibility. Brown and Duguid (1998) distinguish between two types of knowledge: (1) “know-what” or topical knowledge, and (2) “know-how” or knowledge derived from experience and action. They define “know-how” as the ability for an individual to take his or her “know-what” knowledge and put it into practice.

Other perspectives focus on the knowledgeability of action (Orlikowski & Yates, 1994). Here the verb knowing is stressed, rather than the noun knowledge. The emphasis on the interactive requirement for individual learning rather than the passive receipt of knowledge is a perspective that fits well with communities of practice. The use of the verb participation, a requirement for membership within a community of practice, also suggests that knowledge is created and shared from participation in experience and active membership within a community. An individual’s ability to know is inseparable from practice and context.

Communities of practice follow the logic that knowledge cannot be separated by practice, as what is learned is highly dependent on the context where the learning takes place (Hayes & Walsham, 2001). The concept of legitimate peripheral participation (LPP) is derived from this notion, as it postulates that members who are allowed the opportunity to fully participate in community activities begin to behave as community members, or as practitioners. It is through this membership that knowledge can be shared with the rest of the community. Learning within a community is situated, as it occurs through people interacting in context. The learner’s situated perspective,

including physical and social context, become an important aspect in their learning and interaction with the community (Lave & Wenger, 1991).

In some cases, a familiar context or environment becomes a crucial factor in a practitioner’s ability to deal with unfamiliar, unstructured problems (Tyre & von Hippel, 1997). These members must have access to the periphery of the practice, which allows for either observation or participation in the practice that eventually contributes to their decision to join the community. The term periphery is not used in the geographical sense, but as the degree of involvement an individual may have with the community. Their participation must eventually become legitimized (though not in the formal sense), in order to empower the participants to participate in learning and personal development.

Knowledge is situated within these communities through the situated learning curriculum that is unique to each community of practice. Newcomers can access this curriculum to gain the common knowledge resident in the community as a first step towards full participation. However, learning is an improvised practice, and eventually the participant must go beyond this notion of structure and curriculum to acquire knowledge. Therefore, participation in any community where knowledge exists can be defined as the act of learning (Lave & Wenger, 1991).

Communities of practice are able to assist an individual with this knowledge conversion as long as the participants are situated within the same community. The transfer of knowledge across communities becomes more challenging due to the “sticky” nature of knowledge. As knowledge is situated within a particular context, the removal from this context may distort its value or meaning. Various means of overcoming this obstacle have been proposed. Boland and Tenaski (1995) propose the use of communication forums that span multiple communities, while both Star (1989) and Carlile (2002) support the use of boundary objects.

5 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage: www.igi-global.com/chapter/communities-practice-facilitators-knowledge-exchange/25211

Related Content

Planning for Knowledge Management: Conducting a Knowledge Assessment

Cynthia Shamel (2014). *Knowledge Management Practice in Organizations: The View from Inside* (pp. 59-97).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/planning-for-knowledge-management/98528

Evaluation of Strategic Opportunities and Resulting Business Models for SMEs: Employing IoT in Their Data-Driven Ecosystems

Izabella V. Lokshina, Cees J. M. Lantingand Barbara Durkin (2020). *Knowledge Management, Innovation, and Entrepreneurship in a Changing World* (pp. 148-186).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/evaluation-of-strategic-opportunities-and-resulting-business-models-for-smes/250973

RDF and OWL

Gian Piero Zarri (2008). *Knowledge Management: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications* (pp. 1231-1244).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/rdf-owl/25175

Getting Knowledge Management Right: Lessons from Failure

Ivy Chanand Patrick Y.K. Chau (2005). *International Journal of Knowledge Management* (pp. 40-54).

www.irma-international.org/article/getting-knowledge-management-right/2667

A Virtual Intelligent Creativity Matrix for Employees Clustered Interactivity Network with Knowledge Development Program

Iraj Mahdavi, Hamed Fazlollahtabar, Nezam Mahdavi-Amiri, Mohsen Arabmaghsudiand Mohammad Hassan Yahyanejad (2014). *International Journal of Knowledge-Based Organizations* (pp. 65-79).

www.irma-international.org/article/a-virtual-intelligent-creativity-matrix-for-employees-clustered-interactivity-network-with-knowledge-development-program/109591