

# Chapter 146

## Understanding Organizational Memory

**Sajjad M. Jasimuddin**

*University of Dhaka, Bangladesh and University of Southampton, UK*

**N.A.D. Connell**

*University of Southampton, UK*

**Jonathan H. Klein**

*University of Southampton, UK*

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-59904-9

*Category: Organizational Aspects of Knowledge Management*

### INTRODUCTION

It is generally recognized that Walsh and Ungson (1991) “provided the first integrative framework for thinking about organizational memory” (Olivera, 2000, p. 813). Within the field of knowledge management (KM), there has been interest in a variety of issues surrounding organizational memory (OM), which is understood to involve processes of storage and retrieval of organizational knowledge of the past for use in both the present and the future. The recognition of the importance of OM has implications for practice. For example, Argote, Beckman, and Eppele (1990) suggest that the effective use of OM can protect an organization from some of the negative effects

of staff loss, while Stein (1995, p. 19) asserts that an appreciation of OM can facilitate the solution of problems associated with the retention and utilization of knowledge within organizations.

Although the need to preserve knowledge in organizations is now recognized, organizational theorists still disagree on a number of issues relating to OM. Existing literature exhibits contradictory arguments regarding OM which can make the relevance and application of OM concepts to KM difficult to understand. This article describes some of the disagreements surrounding OM in order to provide a deeper understanding of how OM might help to manage knowledge.

### BACKGROUND

The topic of OM has received a great deal of attention from researchers across a wide range of disciplines, most notably organization theory,

psychology, sociology, communication theory, and information systems. In a detailed exploration of OM, Stein (1995, p. 17) suggests that “there are three major reasons to explore this concept in more detail: (1) memory is a rich metaphor that provides insight into organizational life; (2) OM is embedded in other management theories; (3) OM is relevant to management practice.”

Most of the literature on OM tends to focus on definitions of the term, the content and types of OM, its location, and the processes associated with the acquisition, storage, retrieval, and maintenance of memory (Walsh & Ungson, 1991; Stein & Zwass, 1995; Casey, 1997). Walsh and Ungson (1991, p. 61) provide an overall definition of OM as “stored information from an organization’s history that can be brought to bear on present decisions.” This corresponds closely with the definition given by Stein (1995), who regards OM as the way in which organizational knowledge from the past is brought to bear on present activities.

Some studies have addressed the role of information technology in developing OM systems (OMS) which support OM processes (Sherif, 2002). Several researchers have highlighted the barriers to the implementation of OMS, the ways in which they might be overcome (Sherif, 2002), and the influence of OM on organizational effectiveness (Olivera, 2000).

OM occupies a significant place within management literature. However, Walsh and Ungson (1991, p. 57) argue that “the extant representations of the concept of OM are fragmented and underdeveloped.” Examination of the existing literature reveals frequent divergence of understanding of the notion of OM (Corbett, 1997). Indeed, earlier researchers (most notably Ungson, Braunstein, & Hall, 1981; Argyris & Schon, 1978) denied the existence of OM. Generally, organizational theorists disagree about a variety of issues surrounding OM. Ackerman and Halverson (1998, cited by Schwartz, Divitini, & Brasethvik, 2000, p. 3) are concerned that a clear and universally accepted definition of what an OM should do appears to be lacking:

*After nearly 10 years of research, the term organizational memory has become overworked and confused. It is time for a re-examination. The term is burdened with the practical wish to reuse organizational experience, leading researchers to ignore critical functions of an organization’s memory and consider only some forms of augmenting memory.*

## CONTROVERSIES IN OM

The field of OM exhibits many controversies in which researchers seem unable to agree about fairly fundamental features. The literature regarding these issues tends to be somewhat sparse and inconclusive. Some of the most notable of these issues, on which we focus in subsequent sections, are:

- Can organizations be said to have memories, or is OM essentially anthropomorphism?
- What is the relationship between the research fields of OM and KM?
- Does OM reside in the minds of individual organizational members, or elsewhere?
- Is OM appropriately modeled in terms of static storage bins, or should it be treated as a dynamic socially constructed process?
- How are OM systems operationalized?
- Is OM functional or dysfunctional in terms of organizational performance and effectiveness?

## IS OM ANTHROPOMORPHISM?

Some researchers question whether OM can truly exist at all. They argue that, unlike an individual human being, an organization cannot be said to have a memory. Walsh and Ungson (1991) suggest that the idea of OM raises possible problems of anthropomorphism: Attributing characteristics that may be uniquely human to organizations may be

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/understanding-organizational-memory/49097](http://www.igi-global.com/chapter/understanding-organizational-memory/49097)

## Related Content

---

### Rakshak: A Child Identification Software for Recognizing Missing Children Using Machine Learning-Based Speech Clarification

Ashutosh Dixit, Preeti Sethi and Puneet Garg (2022). *International Journal of Knowledge-Based Organizations* (pp. 1-15).

[www.irma-international.org/article/rakshak/299968](http://www.irma-international.org/article/rakshak/299968)

### Technology Trends in Knowledge Management Tools

Gilles Balmissse, Denis Meingan and Katia Passerini (2007). *International Journal of Knowledge Management* (pp. 118-131).

[www.irma-international.org/article/technology-trends-knowledge-management-tools/2704](http://www.irma-international.org/article/technology-trends-knowledge-management-tools/2704)

### Design and Implementation of Product Structure Ontology

Nadhiya N. Mohammad, Ismail M. Amin, Razib M. Othman, Hishammuddin Asmuni, Rohayanti Hassan and Shahreen Kasim (2013). *Ontology-Based Applications for Enterprise Systems and Knowledge Management* (pp. 246-260).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/design-implementation-product-structure-ontology/68899](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/design-implementation-product-structure-ontology/68899)

### Smart Activation of Citizens: Opportunities and Challenges for Scientific Research

Maria Gilda Pimentel Esteves, Jano Moreira de Souza, Alexandre Prestes Uchoa, Carla Viana Pereira and Marcio Antelio (2017). *Analyzing the Role of Citizen Science in Modern Research* (pp. 262-284).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/smart-activation-of-citizens/170194](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/smart-activation-of-citizens/170194)

### Discovering Communities of Practice Through Social Network Analysis

Cindi Smatt and Molly McLure Wasko (2008). *Knowledge Management: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications* (pp. 2057-2059).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/discovering-communities-practice-through-social/25241](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/discovering-communities-practice-through-social/25241)