

## Chapter 6.24

# Work and Knowledge

**Tom Butler**

*University College Cork, Ireland*

**Ciaran Murphy**

*University College Cork, Ireland*

### INTRODUCTION

It is widely believed that knowledge work is a relatively new phenomenon and that it constitutes the main form of activity in post-industrial organizations. While the term remains undefined, knowledge work is taken to refer to the knowledge that individuals apply in performing role-related business activities in “knowledge-intensive” organizations. In this scheme of things, the conventional wisdom holds that the subjective knowledge of individual social actors is applied to “objectified” organizational knowledge (i.e., data held in various paper and electronic repositories) as the raw material of the production process. Thus, knowledge is considered to be both an input to, and an output of, business processes: It also is argued to underpin the process by which knowledge inputs are transformed to outputs.

Cooley (1975) was one of the first to employ the term “knowledge worker,” however, his conception encompasses both white and blue-collar workers, professionals, and craftspeople alike. This is to be contrasted with Drucker’s (1999) perspective on knowledge work, which focuses primarily on the upper echelons of management. This article echoes Cooley’s perspective in many respects, however, it seeks to strengthen, extend, and apply it in a contemporary context. The following section provides the rationale and context for this article’s thesis by illustrating the socially distributed and collective nature of knowledge. It also helps illustrate certain deficiencies in the conventional understanding of this important topic; these are then addressed in the third section’s exploration of the social construction of knowledge. The third section also deconstructs commonly held beliefs on knowledge by examining its relationship to data

and information. The fourth section then presents this article's main contribution by presenting a conceptual model and taxonomy of knowledge in organizational contexts. It is hoped that this will help researchers and practitioners better understand the relationship between knowledge and work going forward.

In sum, the article's motivation is to eliminate the misunderstandings that surround the concept of knowledge work and to propose an understanding of the phenomenon that is more in tune with the "reality" of organizational life. The article's marriage of philosophy (Aristotle, 1945; Gadamer, 1975; Heidegger, 1976) and institutional theory (e.g., Berger & Luckmann, 1967, from sociology, and Nordhaug, 1994, from economics) acts to "inform" researchers who seek to understand the know-how, -why, and -what of social action in organizational settings. For practitioners, it highlights areas where experiential and skill-based knowledge are of value in organizations and illustrates for them the relative importance of task- and firm-specific knowledge.

## **BACKGROUND: EVERYBODY KNOWS...BUT ONLY COLLECTIVELY**

Aristotle argues that no one individual can know or possess all of the available knowledge, rather, knowledge is dispersed among individuals in society (Aristotle, 1945; Hayek, 1945; Berger & Luckmann, 1967). However, Grant (1996) maintains that knowledge creation is an individual activity, and that the extant emphasis on "organizational knowledge" is misplaced—he argues that organizational knowledge does not exist as a distinct phenomenon (see Stata, 1989; Taylor, 1993; Pfeffer, 1994). Therefore, what Hayek says about society also may be applied to organizations, viz knowledge of and about an organization and its activities will be dispersed among organizational

actors and the "communities-of-practice" which they constitute (cf. Tsoukas, 1996). The problem facing social groupings such as organizations, societies, and cultures is therefore "a problem of the utilization of knowledge not given to anyone in its totality" (Hayek, 1945, p. 450). A portion of this dispersed knowledge may, and particularly in more formal institutions will, be codified as information in documents, manuals, books of operating procedures, and so forth, which may be paper-based, electronic, or both (Bruner, 1990; Davenport & Prusak, 1998). Berger and Luckmann (1967) consider this as pretheoretical recipe knowledge and, as such, it forms an operational backdrop for organizations by supplying institutionally appropriate rules of conduct, by placing boundaries on acceptable actions and by defining and enumerating activities to be performed by social actors (see Taylor, 1993; Tsoukas, 1996). Therefore, it acts as both a controlling and predictive mechanism for such conduct.

Thus, institutions are akin to "collective minds" (Weick & Roberts, 1993) whose cultures become a learned product of group experiences, particularly those of the organization's founders (Schein, 1985). Over time, the cognitive dispositions and dispersed knowledge of individual social actors, who actively participate in the dialogic process of institutional reality construction within the aforementioned unarticulated background of wider social and institutional contexts, come to populate this metaphorical "collective mind," which emerges as the unarticulated background of organizational experience. Hence, it is an individual's Heideggerian "fore-knowledge" of the type of actions required of him or her by other actors in the relevant "community-of-practice" and in the wider organization that shapes his or her ongoing actions and utterances (Heidegger, 1976); in turn, these actions once taken and linguistic expressions uttered influence the actions and cognitive dispositions of others (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Thus, it is the existence of previously

8 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/work-knowledge/25299](http://www.igi-global.com/chapter/work-knowledge/25299)

## Related Content

---

### The Concept of Autonomy in Distributed Computation and Multi-Agent Systems

Mariusz Nowostawski (2009). *Intelligence Integration in Distributed Knowledge Management* (pp. 154-170). [www.irma-international.org/chapter/concept-autonomy-distributed-computation-multi/24131](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/concept-autonomy-distributed-computation-multi/24131)

### Using Social Networking Analysis to Facilitate Knowledge Sharing in the British Council

Bonnie Wai-yi Cheuk (2006). *International Journal of Knowledge Management* (pp. 67-76). [www.irma-international.org/article/using-social-networking-analysis-facilitate/2692](http://www.irma-international.org/article/using-social-networking-analysis-facilitate/2692)

### Harnessing Blockchain Technology for the Promotion of Knowledge Management

Geeta Nair (2025). *Blockchain Technology Applications in Knowledge Management* (pp. 323-334). [www.irma-international.org/chapter/harnessing-blockchain-technology-for-the-promotion-of-knowledge-management/366252](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/harnessing-blockchain-technology-for-the-promotion-of-knowledge-management/366252)

### Knowledge Discovery Process and Introduction of Domain Knowledge

Katsutoshi Yada (2004). *Innovations of Knowledge Management* (pp. 86-98). [www.irma-international.org/chapter/knowledge-discovery-process-introduction-domain/23800](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/knowledge-discovery-process-introduction-domain/23800)

### An Integrated Risk Management Framework: Measuring the Success of Organizational Knowledge Protection

Stefan Thalmann, Markus Manhart, Paolo Ceravolo and Antonia Azzini (2014). *International Journal of Knowledge Management* (pp. 28-42). [www.irma-international.org/article/an-integrated-risk-management-framework/117903](http://www.irma-international.org/article/an-integrated-risk-management-framework/117903)