

Kansas State University Libraries

New Prairie Press

Adult Education Research Conference

2005 Conference Proceedings (Athens, GA)

Connections Between Organizational Culture and Knowledge Management

Elisabeth E. Bennett

University of Georgia, USA

Follow this and additional works at: <https://newprairiepress.org/aerc>



Part of the [Adult and Continuing Education Administration Commons](#)



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 4.0 License](#)

Recommended Citation

Bennett, Elisabeth E. (2005). "Connections Between Organizational Culture and Knowledge Management," *Adult Education Research Conference*. <https://newprairiepress.org/aerc/2005/roundtables/18>

This is brought to you for free and open access by the Conferences at New Prairie Press. It has been accepted for inclusion in Adult Education Research Conference by an authorized administrator of New Prairie Press. For more information, please contact cads@k-state.edu.

Connections Between Organizational Culture and Knowledge Management

Elisabeth E. Bennett

University of Georgia, USA

In the present knowledge economy, Adult Education (AE) plays an important role in creating, distributing, and applying knowledge through research and practice. AE programs are considered to be political and ethical activities (Cervero & Wilson, 1995; Wlodkowski & Ginsberg, 1995) that often occur in organizational contexts, including academic, for-profit, and non-profit groups. Organizations tend to have a predominant outlook on knowledge that is part of organizational culture (OC) (Wikstrom & Normann, 1994). A new line of inquiry, Knowledge Management (KM), focuses on how knowledge is acquired, created, and distributed (Alvesson & Karreman, 2001; Lengnick-Hall & Lengnick-Hall, 2003) within organizations. Alavi and Tiwana (2003) suggest that KM has unexplored socio-cultural aspects. The purpose of this paper is to uncover connections between OC and KM theories that impact AE.

Knowledge Management (KM)

KM breaks knowledge into three parts: data, information, and knowledge (Bhatt, 2001; Drucker, 1989). Specialized knowledge is needed to transform data into information and endow it with relevance through interpretation (Drucker, 1989). KM involves tacit and explicit forms of knowledge (Choo, 1995; Nonaka, 1998). Tacit knowledge is difficult to uncover and is second nature. Explicit knowledge is more visible and often more technical in nature. Choo (1995) suggests tacit knowledge is connected to action and intuition. He also indicates background knowledge used to interpret information is part of organizational culture communicated through oral and verbal texts. Additionally, knowledge can be viewed as the kind or degree of understanding that is obtained through learning (Chakravarthy, McEvily, Doz, & Rau, 2003). Myers (1996) suggests knowledge can only be managed only to the extent that it has been captured in organizational process, systems, products, rules, and culture.

Organizational Culture (OC)

Organizations are complex social systems (Fenwick, 2000) in which the culture has a strong impact on workplace learning (Darrah, 1995) and performance (Kotter & Heskett, 1992). Traditional theories indicate that shared values and beliefs among members are central to organizational culture (Deal & Kennedy, 1992; Kotter & Heskett, 1992; Schein, 1992). Definitions of organizational culture can be as simple as 'the way things are done here' (Drennan, 1992) to the complex that includes almost all structures, behaviors, artifacts and knowledge bits that create ideological practice (Sentell, 1998). Schein (1992) theorized three levels of culture that reflect a continuum of the observable to the embedded. These levels are a) artifacts, b) espoused values, and c) shared tacit assumptions. Kotter & Heskett (1992) also believe that OC is multi-leveled with more or less embedded forms. Stackman, Pinder, and Connor (2000) see values as the building blocks for behavior and choice, and fundamental to OC. These values affect the interpretation and processing of information.

Connections between OC and KM

KM and OC are connected in two critical ways that create a dynamic of influence in day-to-day organizational activities. First, managing knowledge may help to maintain or change organizational culture since certain forms of OC can be captured in texts and artifacts. More explicit forms of cultural knowledge are more easily managed. Second, values, assumptions, and other forms of OC provide a frame of knowledge through which information is interpreted and applied if determined to be relevant. Because there are both tacit and explicit forms of knowledge in OC and KM, these connections can be overt or hidden.

Implications and Conclusion

The vast amount of information available today creates a challenge for organizations and for individuals to create, absorb, and apply that which will help them be successful while ignoring or forgetting the extraneous. The culture of an organization can act as a barrier to incorporating knowledge that is not valued. Systems of hierarchy and privilege, for example, may disregard information coming from local and underprivileged sources. AE institutions, too, may value certain forms of knowledge over others manifest in the research agenda. Adult learning programs within organizations may be the direct result of KM activities. Training is often seen as a way to disseminate new information. How instruction is designed could alter the organizational culture if it changes shared assumptions and norms or corporate ideology. Understanding the dynamics between OC and KM theories may help researchers and professionals in adult education critically appraise the political and ethical environment in which they produce and disseminate knowledge. This is especially challenging given the tacit forms of knowledge that are difficult to observe and analyze yet have immense power to influence new knowledge and learning.

References

- Alvesson, M., & Kärreman, J. D. (2001). Odd couple: Making sense of the curious concept of knowledge management. *Journal of Management Studies*, 38(7), 995-1018.
- Alavi, M., & Tiwana, A. (2003). Knowledge management: The information technology dimensions. *The Blackwell Handbook of Organizational Learning and Knowledge Management* (pp. 104-121). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Bhatt, G. D. (2001). Knowledge management in organizations. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 5(1), 68-75.
- Cervero, R. M., & Wilson, A. L. (1995). *Planning responsibly for adult education: A guide to negotiating power and interests*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Chakravarthy, B., McEvily, S., Doz, Y. & Rau, D. (2003). Knowledge management and competitive advantage. In M. Easterby-Smith and M. Lyles (Eds.), *The Blackwell Handbook of Organizational Learning and Knowledge Management* (pp. 305-323). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Choo, C. W. (1995). *Information management for the intelligent organization: The art of scanning the environment*. Medford, NJ: Information Today, Inc.
- Darrah, C. N. (1995). Workplace training, workplace learning; A case study. *Human Organization*, 54(1). 31-41.
- Deal, T. E., & Kennedy, A. A. (1982). *Corporate cultures: The rites and rituals of corporate life*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Drennan, D. (1992). *Transforming company culture: Getting your company from where you are now to where you want to be*. London: McGraw-Hill.
- Drucker, P. (1998). The coming of the new organization. *Harvard business review on knowledge management* (pp. 1-20). Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Fenwick, T. J. (2000). Putting meaning into workplace learning. In A. L. Wilson & E. R. Hayes (Eds.), *Handbook of adult and continuing education* (pp. 278-293). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kotter, J. P., & Heskett, J. L. (1992). *Corporate culture and performance*. New York: Free Press.
- Lengnick-Hall, M. L. and Lengnick-Hall, C. A. (2003). *Human resource management in the knowledge economy: New challenges, new roles, and new capabilities*. San Francisco, CA: Barrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.
- Myers, P. (1996). *Knowledge management and organizational design*. Newton, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Nonaka, I. (1998). The knowledge-creating company. In *Harvard Business Review on Knowledge Management* (pp. 21-45). Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Sentell, G. (1998). *Creating change-capable cultures*. Alcoa, TN: Pressmark International.
- Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Stackman, R. W., Pinder, C. C., & Connor, P. E. (2000). Values lost: Redirecting research on values in the workplace. In N. M. Ashkanasy, P. M. Wilderom, and M. F. Peterson (Eds.), *Handbook of Organizational Culture and Climate*, (pp. 71-84). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wikström, S., & Normann, R. (1994). *Knowledge and Value*. London: Routledge.
- Wlodkowski, R. J., & Ginsberg, M. B. (1995). *Diversity & motivation: Culturally responsive teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.