

## Chapter 7.20

# Anti-Foundational Knowledge Management

**Tom Butler**

*University College Cork, Ireland*

### INTRODUCTION

Under the influence of Enlightenment epistemological thought, the social sciences have exhibited a distinct tendency to prefer deterministic explanations of social phenomena. In the sociology of knowledge, for example, “foundational” researchers seek to arrive at objective knowledge of social phenomena through the application of “social scientific methodolog[ies] based on the eternal truths of human nature, purged of historical and cultural prejudices” and which also ignore the subjective intrusions of social actors (Hekman, 1986, p. 5). This article argues that “foundationalist” perspectives heavily influence theory and praxis in knowledge management. “Foundationalist” thinking is particularly evident in the posited role of IT in creating, capturing, and diffusing knowledge in social and organisational contexts. In order to address what many would consider to

be a deficiency in such thinking, a constructivist “antifoundationalist” perspective is presented that considers socially constructed knowledge as being simultaneously “situated” and “distributed” and which recognizes its role in shaping social action within “communities-of-practice.” In ontological terms, the constructivist “antifoundational” paradigm posits that realities are constructed from multiple, intangible mental constructions that are socially and experientially based, local and specific in nature, and which are dependent on their form and content on the individual persons or groups holding the constructions (see Guba & Lincoln, 1994; Bruner, 1990). One of the central assumptions of this paradigm is that there exist multiple realities with differences among them that cannot be resolved through rational processes or increased data. Insights drawn from this short article are addressed to academics and practitioners in order to illustrate the considerable difficulties

inherent in representing individual knowledge and of the viability of isolating, capturing, and managing knowledge in organisational contexts with or without the use of IT.

## **BACKGROUND: WHAT KNOWLEDGE IS AND WHAT IT IS NOT?**

The point of departure for the present treatise on the concept of “knowledge” is a definition that is in good standing within the IS field and which is congruent with extant perspectives across the social sciences (e.g., Grant, 1996). In their book *Working Knowledge*, Davenport and Prusak (1998) posit that:

*Knowledge is a fluid mix of framed experience, values, contextual information, and expert insight that provides a framework for evaluating and incorporating new experiences and information. It originates and is applied in the minds of knowers. In organisations, it often becomes embedded not only in documents and repositories but also in organisational routines, processes, practices, and norms. (p. 3)*

While this definition is, on the surface, all-embracing and without contradiction it does, however, possess certain weaknesses that can only be illustrated by a consideration of taken-for-granted issues of ontology. This involves a description of the relationships that exist between the individual and his social world; that is between the knowing social actor and the social groupings and contexts in which he or she participates and exists, and in which knowledge is socially constructed. In terms of the present analysis, this task begins with a brief consideration of the constructivist, “antifoundational” philosophies of Martin Heidegger and Hans Georg Gadamer in order to sketch out the ontological basis of knowledge.

This undertaking is particularly timely given the recent emphasis on knowledge management, which is described “[as] an integrated, systematic approach to identifying, managing, and sharing all of an enterprise’s information assets, including databases, documents, policies, and procedures, as well as previously unarticulated expertise and experience held by individual workers.”<sup>2</sup> Whereas the ability of organisations to identify, manage, and share, databases, documents, and codified procedures using IT is not in question, identifying, managing, and sharing tacit knowledge using IT is questionable, as the following treatise on knowledge illustrates.

## **An Anti-Foundational Perspective on Knowledge**

In response to the question “What is knowledge and what is it not?” we argue that knowledge cannot ever become “embedded...in documents and repositories [and] also in organisational routines, processes, practices, and norms.” Why? Precisely because it is impossible to isolate and represent objectively “a fluid mix of framed experience, values, contextual information, and expert insight.” Certainly, as Bruner (1990) points out, a social actor’s knowledge resides not only in his head, but also in the notes, underlined book passages, manuals, and guides he consults, and in the computer-based data he has access to. This is, in many respects, a shorthand description by Bruner. Social actors use such sources because of their inability to recall every source of data they have interpreted and laid down in memory (see Goleman, 1996)—hence they are considered sources of personal information only for the actor who has painstakingly sought out, collated, and put into context the data contained in each personal artefact. Accordingly, contextual, temporally based data makes the transition to knowledge only when an actor interprets (or subsequently reinterprets) them in order to inform his or her

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/anti-foundational-knowledge-management/25329](http://www.igi-global.com/chapter/anti-foundational-knowledge-management/25329)

## Related Content

---

### Integrating Heterogeneous Enterprise Data Using Ontology in Supply Chain Management

Kamalendu Pal (2019). *Big Data and Knowledge Sharing in Virtual Organizations* (pp. 71-102).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/integrating-heterogeneous-enterprise-data-using-ontology-in-supply-chain-management/220785](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/integrating-heterogeneous-enterprise-data-using-ontology-in-supply-chain-management/220785)

### Towards a Comprehensive Process Model for Transitioning MIS to KMS

Ricardo Anderson and Gunjan Mansingh (2016). *International Journal of Knowledge Management* (pp. 1-17).

[www.irma-international.org/article/towards-a-comprehensive-process-model-for-transitioning-mis-to-kms/160187](http://www.irma-international.org/article/towards-a-comprehensive-process-model-for-transitioning-mis-to-kms/160187)

### Fostering Innovation Through Knowledge-Centered Principles: A Case Analysis of Singapore Airlines

Andrew L.S. Goh (2005). *International Journal of Knowledge Management* (pp. 73-90).

[www.irma-international.org/article/fostering-innovation-through-knowledge-centered/2672](http://www.irma-international.org/article/fostering-innovation-through-knowledge-centered/2672)

### The Myth of the Importance of Consistency in Analytical Hierarchical Processes

Johnny J. Dahdah A., Gilberto J. Hernández G., María J. García G. and José G. Hernández R. (2021).

*International Journal of Knowledge-Based Organizations* (pp. 1-13).

[www.irma-international.org/article/the-myth-of-the-importance-of-consistency-in-analytical-hierarchical-processes/267128](http://www.irma-international.org/article/the-myth-of-the-importance-of-consistency-in-analytical-hierarchical-processes/267128)

### The Social Reality of Business Activity: A Contingent Methodology for Knowledge Elicitation and Mapping

Paul Jackson and Ray Webster (2007). *International Journal of Knowledge Management* (pp. 49-65).

[www.irma-international.org/article/social-reality-business-activity/2696](http://www.irma-international.org/article/social-reality-business-activity/2696)