

Chapter 2.18

Organizational Structure

Paul H. J. Hendriks

Radboud University Nijmegen, The Netherlands

INTRODUCTION

For many decades, organization scientists have paid considerable attention to the link between knowledge and organization structure. An early contributor to these discussions was Max Weber (1922), who elaborated his concepts of professional bureaucracy. History shows a multitude of other descriptions and propositions which depict knowledge-friendly organization structures such as the ‘organic form’ for knowledge-intensive innovation promoted by Burns and Stalker (1961), professional bureaucracies and adhocracies described by Mintzberg (1983), and the brain metaphor for organization structure (Morgan, 1986). Discussions on such knowledgefriendly organization structures led to many neologisms including the flexible, intelligent, smart, hypertext, N-form, inverted, network, cellular, or modular organization.

This article discusses the fundamental importance of organization structure for a knowledge

perspective on organizations. This discussion involves two classes of questions. Organization structure can be studied as the backdrop against which the knowledge aspects of organizations take shape. Key questions then are how different structural configurations involve stimuli and barriers to the generation and embedding of organizational knowledge through such processes as knowledge exploration and knowledge sharing. Organization structure can also be studied from the perspective of organization design, which is the premeditated construction or change of organization structure (see Bowditch & Buono, 1985). Questions that appear then include: what are possible design interventions and how does one assess their knowledge-friendliness? The article addresses both classes of questions. Its objective therefore is: (1) to look at what defines a knowledge-friendly organization structure, and (2) to explore which interventions organizations have at their disposal when trying to achieve such a structure.

BACKGROUND

The importance of organization structure is well established in the discussions that address matters of organizational knowledge and associated concepts such as creativity, learning, or R&D activities in organization design (e.g., Myers, 1996). Yet, in the stricter circle of studies that explicitly present themselves as knowledge management (KM) studies, organization structure plays second fiddle to issues of ICT and HRM. Organization structure concerns patterns of work relationships (a more elaborate definition of organization structure is given below). Such work relationships can be predefined (formal organization structure) or organically evolving (informal organization structure). There is a general recognition that relationships among individuals in collectives are centrally important in the organizational production of knowledge and its organizational embedding (e.g., Blackler, 1995). Several trends lend support to the idea that the perspective of knowledge workers and their work relationships should guide discussions of organization design. These trends include the increased complexity in the competitive environment, the greater pressure on innovation and proactive manipulation of markets, and the emergence of provisional structural arrangements such as in network organizations and organizational networks.

A common undertow in these discussions is that knowledge workers need the freedom or autonomy to decide for themselves when to establish work relationships. Such accounts stress that the formal organization structure can be a burden to knowledge aspects of work. They argue that organizational knowledge shows up much better in the informal organization structure (such as communities of practice, e.g., Brown & Duguid, 2001). As Teece (2000, pp. 39-40) puts it: “The migration of competitive advantage away from tangible assets towards intangible ones [forces organizations to] focus on generating, acquiring, transferring and combining such assets to meet

customer needs. In order to be successful in these activities, firms and their managements must be entrepreneurial.” This implies, according to Teece, that knowledge-intensive, entrepreneurial firms must have:

- flexible boundaries,
- high-powered incentives,
- non-bureaucratic structures,
- shallow hierarchies, and
- an innovative and entrepreneurial culture.

In short, the following suggestions are made for the design of knowledge-intensive forms: reduce hierarchy, only provide the basic outline of production structure, and transfer decisions to connect knowledge worker tasks from the formal to the informal organization structure. Note, however, that loosening control for knowledge work is a disputed issue (e.g., Butler, Price, Coates, & Pike, 1998).

Many of the proposed prescriptions for building knowledge-friendly organization structures (e.g., Quinn, 1992; Sanchez & Mahoney, 1996; Miles, Snow, Mathews, Miles, & Coleman, 1997) share with Teece’s prescription a ‘one-size-fits-all’ character. The assertion that no single organization structure can be a panacea for all management ills, which underlies several organization theories (e.g., the contingency and configurational approaches; see Donaldson, 2001), seems to be fairly broadly accepted. Nevertheless, it appears to be weakly developed where organization structures for knowledge work are concerned. When authors do introduce contingencies (e.g., Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1997; Hobday, 2000), these are usually of a general nature (e.g., complexity or turbulence of the environment, analyzability of the task, size of the firm, type of technology), and not specifically knowledge related. The characteristics of an organization’s knowledge base can also serve as contingency variables, as Birkinshaw, Nobel, and Ridderstrale (2002) show in a study of international R&D. Particularly the importance

9 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/organizational-structure/25128

Related Content

The Importance of Balancing Knowledge Protection and Knowledge Interchange

Yutaka Takahashi (2011). *Ethical Issues and Social Dilemmas in Knowledge Management: Organizational Innovation* (pp. 180-198).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/importance-balancing-knowledge-protection-knowledge/48233

A Framework for Introducing Knowledge Management in the Banking Sector: State of the Art and Empirical Results

Friedrich Roithmayrand Kerstin Fink (2008). *Knowledge Management Strategies: A Handbook of Applied Technologies* (pp. 316-330).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/framework-introducing-knowledge-management-banking/25028

Multi-Modal Visual Teaching Combined With Artificial Intelligence Empowerment Mechanism to Innovate the Image Teaching of Ancient Literary Knowledge

Osman Jumaand Maysigul Husiyin (2026). *International Journal of Knowledge Management* (pp. 1-18).

www.irma-international.org/article/multi-modal-visual-teaching-combined-with-artificial-intelligence-empowerment-mechanism-to-innovate-the-image-teaching-of-ancient-literary-knowledge/411841

Towards a New Model for Causal Reasoning in Expert Systems

M. Keith Wright (2017). *International Journal of Knowledge-Based Organizations* (pp. 32-63).

www.irma-international.org/article/towards-a-new-model-for-causal-reasoning-in-expert-systems/169127

Incremental Experts: How Much Knowledge Does a Team Need?

Ronald D. Freeze, Sharath Sasidharanand Peggy L. Lane (2012). *International Journal of Knowledge Management* (pp. 62-82).

www.irma-international.org/article/incremental-experts-much-knowledge-does/69173