

Chapter 39

Inquiring Organizations

Dianne Hall

Auburn University, USA

David Croasdell

University of Nevada - Reno, USA

Category: Theoretical Foundations of Knowledge Management

INTRODUCTION

In order to manage knowledge and operate successfully in today's information-intensive business environments, various organizational forms have emerged (e.g., Mintzberg, 1979; Nonaka, 1994; Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995). The form that an organization takes has consequences for communication and dissemination of information, and thereby the ability to engage in organizational learning. Some of these forms compress knowledge at the root level of the organization, while others facilitate the search for useful knowledge within the organization. Other forms are capable of supporting organizational members who must synthesize knowledge from diverse sources. If a firm begins to reconfirm that knowledge management and core competencies are at the heart of organizational performance, the demand on organizations to develop core competencies and

to create and manage knowledge intensifies. Even after realizing the critical role of knowledge in the present competitive environments, firms are struggling with managing and creating knowledge.

Growing interest in a firm's intellectual capital and collective knowledge have led to ways in which organizations improve knowledge (organizational learning), store knowledge (organizational memory), and share knowledge (knowledge transfer). Although often discussed separately, these three concepts are tightly interwoven, and all must be considered when an organization strives to move toward a knowledge-based competency. These aspects fall under the broad and complex umbrella of knowledge management. In a review of knowledge management literature, Schultze and Leidner (2002, p. 218) suggest a definition of knowledge management as being the "generation, representation, storage, transfer, transformation, application, embedding, and protecting of organizational knowledge." While their definition is not the only one, nor may all researchers or practitioners agree with its appropriateness, it does demonstrate the incredible complexity that

knowledge management presents. The authors note that research in knowledge management is a complex interdependency of collaboration (both in knowledge/information sharing and work), organizational memory, and organizational learning.

An organization striving toward knowledge management competency may be best served by incorporating an organizational form that facilitates learning and thus the expansion of organizational memory. However, choosing one form may not be supportive of the multiple types of learning required by such an organization. These organizations should adopt the form of an inquiring organization (Courtney, Croasdell, & Paradice, 1998) and use it to structure flexible subforms that facilitate the learning process.

This article describes inquiring organizations and considers the appropriateness of applying philosophical perspective to organizational form. The next section provides a background to inquiring organizations. The latter part of the article focuses on how inquiring organizations can take on multiple forms. The article concludes with a discussion of areas for future investigation.

BACKGROUND: INQUIRING SYSTEMS, INQUIRING ORGANIZATIONS AND LEARNING

Inquiring systems are characterized by properties described by Churchman (1971), who develops five inquirers based on the writings of five Western philosophers — Leibniz, Locke, Kant, Hegel, and Singer. While an in-depth discussion of the inquirers is not within the scope of this article, each of the inquirers is briefly introduced in the following sections on inquiring organization subforms.

Inquiring systems create and manage knowledge, and provide a component called a guarantor that promotes accuracy and reduces redundancy in organizational memory (Hall, Paradice, & Courtney, 2003). They can provide the basis for

a knowledge-oriented organization by facilitating the creation of new organizational knowledge and the adaptation of existing knowledge in wickedly changing situations (Hall et al., 2003). *Inquiring organizations* are based on inquiring systems (Courtney et al., 1998).

Inquiring organizations and learning organizations are terms that are often used interchangeably; however, there is one critical difference between the two. To be an inquiring organization, the organization's philosophical foundation must be laid on the principles of inquiring systems as discussed by Churchman (1971). Both the learning organization and the inquiring organization aspire to learn. Learning organizations primarily engage in double-loop learning (e.g., reacting to a problem by both fixing the problem (single-loop learning) and making changes to underlying norms that may have contributed to the problem) (Argyris & Schön, 1996) and often approach knowledge management in a reactive manner rather than the proactive process of the inquiring organization. However, an inquiring organization *inquires* — that is, it continuously searches and investigates its environment and engages in behavior that examines the learning process itself with an end goal of increasing learning efficiency (triple-loop learning). In this manner, the organization challenges the assumptions on which its behavior is based, effectively examining not the most effective means to an end, but examining the foundation of means themselves (Isaacs, 1993). This provides the capacity to routinely check organizational memory for inaccuracies, redundancies, or information that is no longer relevant (Hall et al., 2003).

Given the complexity of any organization moving toward knowledge competency, one can see that its support needs go beyond managerial style, technology, or process design. A knowledge-based organization must be considered in its entirety; however, providing an adequate foundation that can support such an organization is not easy. Churchman's (1971) inquirers, and the inquiring

7 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/inquiring-organizations/48990

Related Content

Understanding the Composition of Knowledge Management Capability

Ronald Freeze and Uday Kulkarni (2010). *Ubiquitous Developments in Knowledge Management: Integrations and Trends* (pp. 68-87).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/understanding-composition-knowledge-management-capability/41856

Knowledge Sharing Barriers in Vietnamese Higher Education Institutions (HEIS)

Canh Van Ta and Suzanne Zyngier (2018). *International Journal of Knowledge Management* (pp. 51-70).

www.irma-international.org/article/knowledge-sharing-barriers-in-vietnamese-higher-education-institutions-heis/201526

Knowledge Sharing Between Individuals

Carolyn McKinnell Jacobson (2011). *Encyclopedia of Knowledge Management, Second Edition* (pp. 924-934).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/knowledge-sharing-between-individuals/49039

Supporting Knowledge-Based Decision Making in the Medical Context: The GLARE Approach

Luca Anselma, Alessio Bottrighi, Gianpaolo Molino, Stefania Montani, Paolo Terenziani and Mauro Torchio (2011). *International Journal of Knowledge-Based Organizations* (pp. 42-60).

www.irma-international.org/article/supporting-knowledge-based-decision-making/50537

Mapping the Knowledge Management Domain of Ideas: Evidence from a Practice Group

Andrea Hornett and Eric W. Stein (2007). *International Journal of Knowledge Management* (pp. 1-25).

www.irma-international.org/article/mapping-knowledge-management-domain-ideas/2705