

# Chapter 1

## Anti-Foundational Knowledge Management

**Tom Butler**

*University College Cork, Ireland*

*Category: Theoretical Foundations of Knowledge Management*

### INTRODUCTION

Under the influence of Enlightenment epistemological thought, the social sciences have exhibited a distinct tendency to prefer deterministic<sup>1</sup> 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 “antifoundationalist” 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.

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-59904-931-1.ch001

## **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 understanding of some phenomenon or other. This is a fairly straightforward task for the individual who has, over time, constructed a personal database of the type described. However, others who access the personal “notes, underlined passages, manuals, etc.” that constitute such databases may interpret their content differently and not come to the same understanding, as they may not have the same pre-existing ground of understanding

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/anti-foundational-knowledge-management/48952](http://www.igi-global.com/chapter/anti-foundational-knowledge-management/48952)

## Related Content

---

### An Empirical Assessment of the Performance Impacts of IS Support for Knowledge Transfer

Michael J. Zhang (2007). *International Journal of Knowledge Management* (pp. 66-85).

[www.irma-international.org/article/empirical-assessment-performance-impacts-support/2697](http://www.irma-international.org/article/empirical-assessment-performance-impacts-support/2697)

### Standards, Benchmarks, and Qualitative Indicators to Enhance the Institutions' Activities and Performance: Surveys and Data Analysis

Zuhair A. Al-Hemyari and Abdullah M. Alsarmi (2015). *International Journal of Knowledge-Based Organizations* (pp. 37-61).

[www.irma-international.org/article/standards-benchmarks-and-qualitative-indicators-to-enhance-the-institutions-activities-and-performance/133150](http://www.irma-international.org/article/standards-benchmarks-and-qualitative-indicators-to-enhance-the-institutions-activities-and-performance/133150)

### Promoting Organizational Knowledge Sharing

Jack S. Cook and Laura Cook (2004). *Innovations of Knowledge Management* (pp. 300-321).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/promoting-organizational-knowledge-sharing/23809](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/promoting-organizational-knowledge-sharing/23809)

### The Impact of National Cultural Values on Intrinsic Motivation to Transfer Tacit Knowledge

Nicole Amanda Celestine and Chris Perryer (2016). *International Journal of Knowledge Management* (pp. 1-19).

[www.irma-international.org/article/the-impact-of-national-cultural-values-on-intrinsic-motivation-to-transfer-tacit-knowledge/177890](http://www.irma-international.org/article/the-impact-of-national-cultural-values-on-intrinsic-motivation-to-transfer-tacit-knowledge/177890)

### The Syndemic and One Health Nature of Pandemics: Arguments for Renewed Attention to Intelligence Management

João Paulo Magalhães, Tiago Correia, Inês Fronteira, Mohsin Sidat, Fernando Passos Cupertino de Barros, Cláudio Tadeu Daniel-Ribeiro, Antonio Pedro C. Delgado and Paulo Ferrinho (2022). *Handbook of Research on Essential Information Approaches to Aiding Global Health in the One Health Context* (pp. 1-13).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/the-syndemic-and-one-health-nature-of-pandemics/293090](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/the-syndemic-and-one-health-nature-of-pandemics/293090)