

## Chapter 1.31

# Biological and Information Systems Approaches

**Barry E. Atkinson**

*Monash University, Australia*

**Frada Burstein**

*Monash University, Australia*

### INTRODUCTION

Knowledge of past activities, discoveries, and events is applied by businesses to support everyday operations in much the same manner that human beings use their personal memories. But the true nature of organizational memory (OM) remains obscure, and information-systems practitioners have no clear definitional model of what they are working toward and have been unable to build a convincing organizational memory system (Olfman, 1998).

Having apparently reached a dead end, OM studies have been subsumed into knowledge management (KM) research as a subsidiary field. OM research is currently focused on the faculties of an organization that are capable of storing knowledge perceived or experienced beyond the duration of the actual event. Researchers and practitioners in the field use a definitional frameworks and models of organizational memory derived from flawed models of aggregate human behavior used in

earlier sociological studies (Frost, 1942; Wilson, 1998). Models derived from earlier sociological studies rarely consider the exact nature and sources of commonplace thinking and memory use, and focus on highly visible and significant behavior and activities. Rapid theoretical and technological advances made in psychology research, brought about by the advent of sophisticated technological aids, have disparaged and largely disproved many of the naive systemic models of human cognition developed by earlier social scientists (Dominowski & Bourne, 1994; Sternberg, 1994) and were incorporated into information-systems sciences in the early years.

Before we consign the hope of deeper knowledge of business memory to the “too hard basket,” it might be fruitful to examine an alternative path to understanding the nature of organizational memory and its application: The impersonal and generalized models of business activity (and cognitive operations) inherited from social sciences have not proved fertile, but the individual

and personal models of memory and cognition found in biological and related sciences offer some promise in light of recent advances.

## **BACKGROUND**

The human mind has always been, and always will be, an area of great interest to the layperson and scientist alike (Luria, 1973). The sheer volume, and constancy, of research attention it receives has inevitably resulted in a plethora of knowledge that enlightens us about various aspects of the human mind, but, on the other hand, it has tended to add a complexity to our view of human cognitive functioning. The modeling theory and conceptual analysis techniques, however, offer a means whereby the complexity and controversies of a topic can be isolated or marginalized in the interest of building a clear overall picture of a concept or phenomenon (Dubin, 1969). This can be particularly valuable in a field of study like human cognition where scholarly research has branched into many unreconciled and introverted schools of thought.

While many gaps still exist in our knowledge of exactly how humans think and remember (Baddeley, 1998), and the mind is shrouded in scientific (and nonscientific) controversy and beliefs, many incontrovertible aspects and fundamental elements of biological memory offer a path to a less controversial understanding of what organizational memory might be.

Biological studies offer some clues as to the purpose memory has been put to and the structure of memory elements (Carlson, 1994). Anthropology offers an indication of how simple behaviors dependent on memory have evolved over time into sophisticated activities of modern man (Hallpike, 1979). Studies of the psychology of memory provide an increasingly vivid breakdown of what happens when people remember (Carter, 1998). Specialist research into cognitive subelements

such as consciousness (Dennett, 1991), emotion (Damasio, 2000), language (Jackendoff, 1992), and perception (Sowa, 1984) offer insight into the essential nature of human ideas and at the same time provide a means for isolating many of the complexities involved in understanding the relationship between thinking and memory. Some of the more interesting ideas that can be gleaned from these research fields in respect to memory phenomena, and which could stabilize and enrich our current model of organization-centered memory, are presented here.

## **A BIOLOGICAL MODEL OF MEMORY**

### **Organizational Self**

Deutsch's (1966) central idea in his influential model of organizational cognition is an "organizational self," which, like a personal human self, has a central role in focusing and directing all organizational behavior. This idea was studiously avoided in subsequent OM research (Stein, 1995) probably because such a concept is problematic in the context of the shifting (and often private) constitutional and motivational elements that focus and direct modern collective business behavior: Deutsch's example was a formally constituted government authority whose purpose and goals were published and generally unchanging.

KM and OM researchers have recognized the efficacy of personalizing organizational knowledge (e.g., Spender, 1995; Tuomi, 1999), but not the power of one integral element—a person—as an organizing device. Damasio's (2000) work describes how an individual biological body informs all that organism's cognitive function and provides a single point of reference for all its cognitive artifacts.

The critical nature of an executive intervention in the component processes of memory might be

7 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/biological-information-systems-approaches/25102](http://www.igi-global.com/chapter/biological-information-systems-approaches/25102)

## Related Content

---

### Exploring the Links between Structural Capital, Knowledge Sharing, Innovation Capability and Business Competitiveness: An Empirical Study

Josune Sáenz, Nekane Aramburu and Olga Rivera (2010). *Cultural Implications of Knowledge Sharing, Management and Transfer: Identifying Competitive Advantage* (pp. 321-354).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/exploring-links-between-structural-capital/36673](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/exploring-links-between-structural-capital/36673)

### Mobile Technology for Knowledge Management

Volker Derballa and Key Pousttchi (2006). *Encyclopedia of Knowledge Management* (pp. 651-656).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/mobile-technology-knowledge-management/17010](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/mobile-technology-knowledge-management/17010)

### Knowledge Identification and Acquisition in SMEs: Strategically Emergent or Just Ad Hoc?

Karen Becker, Frances Jørgensen and Adelle Bish (2015). *International Journal of Knowledge Management* (pp. 1-16).

[www.irma-international.org/article/knowledge-identification-and-acquisition-in-smes/148315](http://www.irma-international.org/article/knowledge-identification-and-acquisition-in-smes/148315)

### Improving KMS Acceptance: The Role Of Organizational And Individuals' Influence

Claudio Vitari, Jennifer Moro, Aurelio Ravarini and I. Bourdon (2007). *International Journal of Knowledge Management* (pp. 68-90).

[www.irma-international.org/article/improving-kms-acceptance/2702](http://www.irma-international.org/article/improving-kms-acceptance/2702)

### Are ICT Non-Users Absolute Non-Users?: Segregation of "Potential ICT Users" From the Non-Users' Profile

Nimmy Maria Joseph and P. E. Thomas (2021). *Ubiquitous Technologies for Human Development and Knowledge Management* (pp. 225-242).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/are-ict-non-users-absolute-non-users/274957](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/are-ict-non-users-absolute-non-users/274957)