

# Chapter 95

## Learning in Organizations

**Irena Ali**

*Department of Defence, Australia*

**Leoni Warne**

*Department of Defence, Australia*

**Celina Pascoe**

*University of Canberra, Australia*

*Category: Organizational Aspects of Knowledge Management*

### INTRODUCTION

In work life, socially based learning occurs all the time. We learn from interactions between peers, genders, functional groups, and across hierarchies, and it happens in ways not normally recognized as learning (Jordan, 1993). Therefore, use of the term “social” learning reflects that organizations, organizational units, and work groups are social clusters, as are study groups and task groups, and thus learning occurs in a social context.

In this situation, social learning is defined as learning occurring within or by a group, an organization, or any cultural cluster and it includes:

- The procedures by which knowledge and practice are transmitted across posting

cycles, across different work situations and across time;

- The procedures that facilitate generative learning — learning that enhances the enterprise’s ability to adjust to dynamic and unexpected situations and to react creatively to them.

Social learning represents important processes that contribute to individuals’ abilities to understand information, create knowledge from that information, and share what they know. Social learning is therefore intrinsic to knowledge management.

This article is based on research conducted by the Enterprise Social Learning Architectures (ESLA) team. The ESLA team was created in 1998 to carry out a research study into “social learning” and the organizational culture that supports such learning. The study, spanning a period of four years, took place in a number of

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-59904-931-1.ch095

different settings within the Australian Defence Organisation (ADO).

The findings of this research are of importance because the ADO, like other organizations, faces the problem that much of the organization's memory and knowledge is "walking out the door" in terms of the skills, experience, and the corporate knowledge of its ex-employees. In the current climate, the competitive edge lies in gaining the *knowledge edge*, and to do so requires an understanding of how new knowledge is generated within groups, what motivates people to share what they know, how it is shared between and managed amongst members of an organization, and to what extent organizational culture influences social learning. In this article, we explore some of the organizational factors that enhance social learning and as such, are intrinsically related to knowledge management, as there is a symbiotic relationship between the two concepts.

## **BACKGROUND**

A key assumption underlying the study was that research aimed at explicating social learning requires a socio-technical approach. Many organizations invest heavily in implementing information technology in the hope of providing a seamless solution to managing information resources and organizational knowledge. Unfortunately, these initiatives are often implemented without much regard to how people in organizations go about creating, acquiring, sharing, and making use of information (Bednar, 2000; Davenport, 1994; Vandeville, 2000). The greatest knowledge base in the company does not reside in a computer database somewhere but in the heads of the individuals associated with that organization. These individual knowledge bases are continually changing and adapting to the real world in front of them. Therefore, these individual knowledge bases need to be connected together so that they can do whatever they do best in the shortest pos-

sible time. New communication technology will certainly support information sharing where physical proximity is not a possibility. However, the technology alone will not create the trust and interpersonal context necessary to achieve a true network. It is, therefore, necessary to prepare the cultural ground. Values cannot be shared electronically or via bits of paper. Organizations are not based on electronic networks, rather, relationships must be initially constructed through face-to-face interactions (Davenport, 1994). Thus, knowledge sharing will depend on the quality of conversations, formal or informal, that people have (Davenport & Prusak, 1998).

Research on the cultural aspects of those organizations that foster new knowledge and generative learning suggests that employee trust and open communication play an integral role. Higher levels of trust between managers and employees are correlated with more open communication (Ruppel & Harrington, 2000). Schein (1993) and Phillips (1997) suggest that information sharing promotes common identity, mutual trust, and organizational learning and is directly related to organizational cultures that foster generative learning. Schein (1993) also claims that opening up and sharing encourages integration between organizational subcultures and, in turn, organizational adaptation to change. Organizations have a responsibility to create a culture in which learning occurs and that culture will determine the quality of learning that takes place. Such a culture provides the opportunity for personal contact so that tacit knowledge, which cannot effectively be captured in procedures or represented in documents and databases, can be transferred (Davenport & Prusak, 1998; Webber, 1993). For this to occur, the focus has to be on increasing the ability of the individual, as it would be the collective result of many individual actions that would produce a result for the whole of the organization. In a culture that values knowledge, managers recognize not just that knowledge gen-

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/learning-organizations/49046](http://www.igi-global.com/chapter/learning-organizations/49046)

## Related Content

---

### Measuring Knowledge Management Outcomes at the Individual Level: Towards a Tool for Research on Organizational Culture

Shahnawaz Muhammed, William J. Dolland Xiaodong Deng (2011). *Global Aspects and Cultural Perspectives on Knowledge Management: Emerging Dimensions* (pp. 1-18).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/measuring-knowledge-management-outcomes-individual/54078](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/measuring-knowledge-management-outcomes-individual/54078)

### Measuring Organizational Learning as a Multidimensional Construct

Juan C. Real, Antonio Lealand Jose L. Roldan (2006). *Encyclopedia of Knowledge Management* (pp. 614-620).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/measuring-organizational-learning-multidimensional-construct/17005](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/measuring-organizational-learning-multidimensional-construct/17005)

### ICT and Building a Knowledge-Based Society in Egypt

Nagla Rizkand Sherif Kamel (2013). *International Journal of Knowledge Management* (pp. 1-20).

[www.irma-international.org/article/ict-building-knowledge-based-society/77324](http://www.irma-international.org/article/ict-building-knowledge-based-society/77324)

### A Multimodal Knowledge Management Approach to Korean Classical Literature in Digital Communication

Ping Zhao (2026). *International Journal of Knowledge Management* (pp. 1-17).

[www.irma-international.org/article/a-multimodal-knowledge-management-approach-to-korean-classical-literature-in-digital-communication/401114](http://www.irma-international.org/article/a-multimodal-knowledge-management-approach-to-korean-classical-literature-in-digital-communication/401114)

### Knowledge Transfer: The Innovation Side of Knowledge Management in Education

Alina Mihaela Dima (2013). *Knowledge Management Innovations for Interdisciplinary Education: Organizational Applications* (pp. 88-107).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/knowledge-transfer-innovation-side-knowledge/68322](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/knowledge-transfer-innovation-side-knowledge/68322)