

# Chapter 5.1

## Knowledge Organizations

**Daniel L. Davenport**

*University of Kentucky Chandler Medical Center, USA*

**Clyde W. Holsapple**

*University of Kentucky, USA*

### INTRODUCTION

An important endeavor within the field of knowledge management (KM) is to better understand the nature of knowledge organizations. These are variously called knowledge-based organizations, knowledge-centric organizations, knowledge-intensive organizations, knowledge-oriented organizations, and so forth. One approach to doing so is to study the characteristics of specific organizations of this type such as Chaparral Steel (Leonard-Barton, 1995), Buckman Labs, World Bank, or HP Consulting (O'Dell, 2003). A complementary approach is to study various frameworks that have been advanced for systematically characterizing the elements, processes, and relationships that are found in knowledge organizations. Here, we examine three such frameworks that are representative of the variety in perspectives that have been advocated for understanding the nature of knowledge organizations. These

frameworks share a view that sees knowledge as a key organizational asset that enables action. However, they differ in emphases (e.g., asset vs. action) and constructs.

This article is organized as a systematic review of the three frameworks. The content relies heavily on the original presentations found in the referenced publications. Space limitations do not permit a comparative analysis or synthesis of the frameworks. Nevertheless, taken together, the reviews do offer valuable vantage points for studying knowledge organizations and useful departure points for more detailed consideration of these as well as other frameworks concerned with knowledge organizations.

The Intangible Assets Framework of Knowledge Organizations, as developed by Karl Sveiby (1997), is considered first. It relies on the concept of intangible assets and characterizes companies for whom these assets are important. Second, the Knowledge Management Cycle Framework

introduced by Wiig, de Hoog, and van der Spek (1997) emphasizes the cyclical nature and means of managing an organization's knowledge assets. Third, the Knowledge Flow Framework advanced by Newman (2003) emphasizes flows of knowledge assets in the sense of agents performing transformations on knowledge-bearing artifacts.

Each framework description starts with a brief overview of the framework from the perspective of its creator(s). It continues by describing and defining the elements, processes, and relationships of the framework in encyclopedic format. Additional references to related works by other authors also are provided for readers who wish to further explore the framework's perspective. Where pictorial renditions of a framework are available, they are reproduced to visually tie together the concepts.

## **BACKGROUND**

Frameworks are cognitive structures used to organize our thinking about a particular domain of interest. They give us concepts pertaining to the domain and guidance about relationships among those concepts, thereby forming a basic understanding of what is observed in a domain, for formulating new ideas about a domain, and for operating or managing in a domain. As such, KM frameworks are useful to academicians in framing research and building theory, to practitioners in learning about and executing KM, and to educators for organizing and presenting KM. Here, the KM domain of interest involves knowledge organizations.

The notion of organizations that explicitly recognize and cultivate knowledge as a key resource began to gain prominence in the 1980s (Holsapple & Whinston, 1987; Paradice & Courtney, 1989). It was seen as being on a par with the traditional

organizational resources of people, materials, and finances. Knowledge was seen as pervading all functional areas of organizational management from strategy to operations, from human resources to technological systems, from economics and accounting to finance and marketing. The processing of an organization's knowledge resources was seen as an important (or even indispensable) aspect of nearly all organizational work. A confluence of forces led to the widespread rise of knowledge organizations in the 1990s, and the accompanying interest in more fully understanding these organizations and their possibilities (Bennet & Bennet, 2003).

Growing out of this interest, various frameworks of the knowledge organization have been advanced by researchers and practitioners. Although we do not exhaustively survey them here, we do review three that represent a diversity of views about an organization's knowledge assets and its use of those assets. Thus, the article serves as an introduction to the realm of knowledge organization frameworks and a foundation for review, comparison, and contrast of perspectives on organizational knowledge assets and their utilization.

## **AN INTANGIBLE ASSETS FRAMEWORK OF KNOWLEDGE ORGANIZATIONS**

Within the intangible assets (IA) framework, people are the only true agents in business. All assets and structures, whether tangible or intangible, are seen as being the result of human actions. The intangible assets of an organization are those embedded in the competences of its human resources and in its internal and external structures of interactions among these people. Knowledge organizations are those for which the greatest value lies in intangible assets (Sveiby, 1997).

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/knowledge-organizations/25239](http://www.igi-global.com/chapter/knowledge-organizations/25239)

## Related Content

---

### An Ontology-Based Extraction Framework for a Semantic Web Application

Hadrian Peter and Charles Greenidge (2011). *International Journal of Knowledge-Based Organizations* (pp. 56-71).

[www.irma-international.org/article/ontology-based-extraction-framework-semantic/55601](http://www.irma-international.org/article/ontology-based-extraction-framework-semantic/55601)

### Modern Leadership in Singaporean and Thai Organizational Contexts

Nattavud Pimpa and Elsie Hooi (2014). *International Journal of Knowledge-Based Organizations* (pp. 21-35).

[www.irma-international.org/article/modern-leadership-in-singaporean-and-thai-organizational-contexts/120149](http://www.irma-international.org/article/modern-leadership-in-singaporean-and-thai-organizational-contexts/120149)

### The Role of Informal Groups in Organisational Knowledge Work: Understanding an Emerging Community of Practice

Gerlinde Koeglreiter, Ross Smith and Luba Torlina (2006). *International Journal of Knowledge Management* (pp. 6-23).

[www.irma-international.org/article/role-informal-groups-organisational-knowledge/2674](http://www.irma-international.org/article/role-informal-groups-organisational-knowledge/2674)

### A Model of Interrelationships Among Individual Level Knowledge Management Success Measures

Shahnaqaz Muhammed, William J. Doll and Xiaodong Deng (2009). *International Journal of Knowledge Management* (pp. 1-16).

[www.irma-international.org/article/model-interrelationships-among-individual-level/2742](http://www.irma-international.org/article/model-interrelationships-among-individual-level/2742)

### Towards a Learning Organization: Navigating Barriers, Levers, and Employees' Capacity for Change

Anindita A. Bose and Colin D. Furness (2021). *Handbook of Research on Organizational Culture Strategies for Effective Knowledge Management and Performance* (pp. 217-236).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/towards-a-learning-organization/286316](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/towards-a-learning-organization/286316)