Piotr Ney
Wrocław University of Economics

THE UTILITY OF TACIT KNOWLEDGE IN CORPORATE RENEWAL

Summary: Corporate renewal programs usually address tangible elements such as the organizational structure, processes and infrastructure, as well as the explicit knowledge of workers through training or coaching. Such programs do not usually address the tacit knowledge of workers. Tacit knowledge, the personal and specialized professional knowledge that individual workers develop to succeed in performing complex roles, is often a significant corporate resource. It can have a positive utility in helping workers adapt quickly to the renewed organization. However, it can also act as a strong constraint to change. This article discusses tacit knowledge within the context of organizational renewal programs, and suggests some practical techniques for positively influencing its utility.

Keywords: tacit knowledge, organisational transformation, metaphors, storytelling.

1. Introduction

The corporate response to significant economic or competitive pressure is often a program of internal renewal, designed to refresh core competencies, reduce operating cost and increase effectiveness and competitiveness of the core business. Tangible elements such as the organizational structure, processes and infrastructure, such as IT systems, can be explicitly updated. The explicit knowledge of workers, such as their fluency in operating procedures, can also be tackled through training or coaching, and related artifacts such as manuals or workplace instructions can be updated relatively easily. However, management literature does not satisfactorily discuss how the tacit knowledge of workers should be addressed as part of corporate renewal.

Tacit knowledge, the personal and specialized professional knowledge that an individual worker needs to succeed in performing a complex role, is a significant corporate resource, particularly in innovation-intensive and professional services firms. As corporate renewal usually implements changes to roles and work procedures, the inherent richness and adaptability of tacit knowledge may help workers to adjust quickly to the renewed organization and flex their work approach accordingly. However, while being a corporate asset, tacit knowledge can sometimes act as a strong constraint to change both at an individual and group level. For example,

cognitive congruence, where individuals within a group will over time converge to a common tacit knowledge domain, which then naturally resists change, is often a contributory factor to corporate underperformance. While explicit knowledge can be updated visibly and unambiguously, the process of changing tacit knowledge, and especially the mental models that workers base their behavior and attitudes on, is more complex and much less predictable, visible and controllable.

This article highlights the need for management literature to address this issue and strive towards developing a coherent strategy for controllably managing tacit knowledge shifts during corporate renewal, and in the meantime, it suggests some practical techniques, such as storytelling, for positively influencing its utility.

2. The epistemological problem of taxonomizing knowledge

Knowledge is "the most strategically-significant resource of the firm" [Grant 1996], has substantial financial value [Brooking 1997], and has a key role in developing a sustainable competitive advantage [Nonaka 1994; Stańczyk-Hugiet 2007, p. 28]. Unfortunately, management literature generally struggles with the very concept of knowledge at the epistemological level. It is largely biased towards a neo-functionalist, taxonomic view of knowledge, characterized by the framing of phenomena in terms of dualisms and an assumption that there is a natural tendency to social order and equilibrium [Schultze and Stabell 2004]. While some constructivist scholars consider knowledge in terms of dualities [e.g. Tsoukas 1996], located in action [Cohen 1998] and the continuously shaping world of becoming [Kogut and Zander 1996; Styhre 2004], even in constructivist discourse there is a regular tendency to deconstruct and taxonomize knowledge.

That epistemological caveat aside, at the individual level, while hard to define with much precision [Badenoch et al 1994], much academic organizational literature explicitly or implicitly views knowledge in terms of a continuum between *explicit* knowledge (Polanyi's [1967] *knowing what*), which can be codified and expressed, is easily communicable and sharable, "is reusable in a consistent and repeatable manner" [Snowden 1999], is non-specific and can be shared [Ambrosini and Bowman 2001]; and *tacit knowledge* [Nonaka 1994], which is deeply personal, non-sharable, embedded in culture and shaped by beliefs and metaphors (Polanyi's [1967] *knowing how*). Winter [1987] proposes that the characteristic of *tacitness* itself as an intrinsic variable of knowledge, inversely correlated to its capacity should be codified and abstracted. As Michael Polanyi suggested back in 1962, tacit knowledge is often characterized by knowing things, without being able to explain how, "the kind of knowledge people possess but that they are unable articulate" [Schultze 2000].

This much referenced explicit-tacit classification has been employed extensively in management literature to elaborate additional knowledge dichotomies such as local--universal, codified-uncodified, canonical-noncanonical and procedural-declarative [Orlikowski 2002]. Several scholars decompose tacit knowledge further into discrete

cognitive (i.e. established mental models) and technical (i.e. acquired task know-how) elements [Johnson-Laird 1983; Nonaka and Takeuchi 1995; Baumard 1999]. However, as I have remarked earlier, such classifications tend to reflect a strong taxonomic bias [Tsoukas 1996] and a lack of confidence in literature to meaningfully challenge some of the underlying propositions [Styhre 2004]. Some contributors appear to classify knowledge in deliberately simplistic terms in order to be able, in more concise ways, to promote various strategies and techniques of managing it [e.g. Winter 1987; Nonaka and Takeuchi 1995; Hansen 1999].

Many scholars also still refuse clearly to acknowledge the essentially inseparable nature of knowledge where *tacit and explicit knowledge are mutually constituted* [Tsoukas 1996] and need to be holistically addressed [Boland and Tenkasi 1995; Davenport and Prusak 1998]. In practical terms, as illustrated by an action research vignette later in this article, this suggests that during corporate renewal corporations should explicitly address the tacit and not just the explicit dimension of workers' knowledge. This tacit knowledge forms the mental framework which allows workers to organize and interpret the explicit knowledge conveyed to them, such as work procedures, and the two dimensions synthesize into professional intellect [Quinn et al. 1996].

Workplace observations, as illustrated by the vignette, support this mutually constituted view of professional knowledge, it being neither fully explicit nor fully tacit, but a dynamic interplay of the two. Awareness of normative expectations, such as how to behave in a specific customer interaction, is characteristically based on a blend of explicit knowledge (e.g. corporate guidelines and scripts) and tacit knowledge (e.g. judgment derived from previous personal interactions with customers). Pfeffer and Veiga's [1999] research, for example, demonstrates that in observing or questioning workers, it is impossible in practice to differentiate between their tacit and explicit knowledge components. Even with the full commitment of participants, it would be conceptually impossible for workers to accurately explain their mental processes or the elemental sources of their knowledge. As Brown and Duguid [2000a] observe, "there is a gap between what people think they do, and what they really do. Actual work practices are full of tacit improvisations that the employees who carry them out would have trouble articulating". Direct observation is also inherently difficult, not least because mental processes themselves are not visible, only the resultant action or outcomes.

3. Renewing the knowledge of workers

In order for a corporate renewal program to embed successfully, and for workers to effectively align with it, workers' knowledge needs to be addressed holistically and its mutually constituted nature should be also taken into account. Management literature provides little clear normative advice of how this should be tackled, and no coherent strategy for shifting and re-aligning workers' professional knowledge to the new corporate operating model. Classic schemas that attempt to show

knowledge holistically as an interplay between tacit and explicit [e.g. Nonaka and Takeuchi 1995] typically invoke processes such as socialization (from tacit to tacit), externalization (from tacit to explicit), internalization (from explicit to tacit) and combination (from explicit to explicit). However, these schemas do not adequately address the practical and conceptual issues with any attempt to shift workers' tacit knowledge. These include knowledge stickiness which constrains its transmission [Szulanski 1996], the inability of the human mind to fully and accurately remember retained information [Stein and Ridderstråle 2001], inherent impossibility to fully articulate tacit knowledge [Schultze 2000; Brown and Duguid 2000a], limited absorptive capacity of actors [Cohen and Levinthal, 1990], the situated and context-specific nature of knowledge [Glazer 1998; Wenger 1998], and that at the core of any sense-making are the necessarily polluting processes of reduction and extrapolation [Reed 1988].

Fundamentally, though, classical schemas of knowledge dynamics do not address the sociocognitive view that "individuals are not just passive perceivers of their environment" [Stein and Ridderstråle 2001], but actively construct their own meaning from information being received [Weick 1979; Glazer 1998], and this in turn depends on the sender, the receiver, and the social context. Because of different cognitive and heuristic biases [Sanchez 2001], *sense-making by two individuals even when sharing exactly the same experience will produce differences in their resultant knowledge* [Walsh 1988; Crossan et al. 1999].

Corporate training programs can clearly convey explicit knowledge. This could include new work instructions, procedures, scripts, product specifications, business rules, indeed anything that can be articulated and codified. Workers could even be tested afterwards to demonstrate their accurate retention of this knowledge. As the preceding discussion illustrates however, the process of individual sense-making moderates both the accurate conveyance of tacit knowledge and the ability to unambiguously test it.

It is not helpful that in management literature, both academic and popular, the treatment of learning and knowledge sharing is often inhibited by its implication that the issue is predominantly that of communicating information. However, information and knowledge are *not* synonymous [Davenport and Prusak 1998; Hendriks 1999; Sanchez 2001]. The former is a neutral collection of data [Glazer 1998], whereas the latter is "the condition of knowing or understanding something" [Webb 1998], and the capacity to exercise judgment and draw distinctions [Tsoukas and Vladimirou 2001]. Information becomes knowledge only when it is absorbed and interpreted by one's mind frame, which in turn it enriches. Information is thus merely the potential for knowledge. As the vignette presented in this article illustrates, it is only through training and management techniques that address the tacit knowledge of workers, and not just convey explicit information, is it possible to help them develop the required capacity for judgment and other professional soft skills.

The confused interchangeability of the terms knowledge and information leads many theoretical contributors into the pitfall of also treating knowledge management

as essentially an information technology issue [McDermott 1999; Akgun et al 2003], where "much of the literature of 'knowledge management' is almost identical in theme and content to that of 'information management'" [Blosch 2001], and "approximately 70 per cent of publications on knowledge management so far have been written by information technology specialists who focus on the technical aspects such as database design and knowledge warehousing" [Easterby-Smith et al. 2000]. Instead, knowledge should fundamentally be considered a dimension of the "social ecology of an organization" [Gupta and Govindarajan 2000], the dynamic interaction of the company culture, structure, processes, infrastructure, and people.

The majority of observers from the social constructionist school emphasize the key role of such social context and situational determinants [DeFillippi and Ornstein 2003] in the processes of knowledge creation and sharing [e.g. Wenger 1998; Brown and Duguid 2000b], underlining that "these transformations in knowledge (between tacit/explicit and personal/organizational) happen through the social interactions in which individuals communicate, share activities, and exchange ideas" [Merali 2001], and that "we acquire knowledge by participating in a community" [McDermott 1999]. This supports the notion that training or coaching sessions with workers which aim mainly to transfer tacit knowledge need to have a strong interpersonal interaction element within a supportive social context. Techniques such as group discussions, role playing, storytelling and even many of the traditional corporate "team building" exercises are consequently all natural and effective channels for influencing tacit knowledge.

Paul Hendriks [1999] observes that "in a strict sense, knowledge cannot be shared. Knowledge is not like a commodity that can be passed around freely, it is tied to a knowing subject. To learn something from someone else, i.e. to share his or her knowledge, an act of reconstruction is needed". To share any knowledge, the knowledge giver must first externalize it. This can be done through one or several methods such as direct mentoring, explicit codification, observable action, metaphors or storytelling. The knowledge receiver then needs to internalize this knowledge [Davenport and Prusak 1998]. This involves the integration of the newly acquired knowledge with that already absorbed, and potentially resolving any conflicts and ambiguities between these two sets. These processes, as well as the actual act of transferring the knowledge between giver and receiver, inevitably modify ("pollute") the unit of knowledge being shared. Thus, I would agree with Hendriks [1999] that in reality we do not share knowledge, in the sense that a unit of knowledge cannot be passed to another person in an unmodified form, but rather allow the receiver to take an imperfect and personalized impression of the giver's knowledge.

4. Tacit knowledge in corporate renewal

In many modern organizations, key workers perform knowledge intensive roles and have a relatively broad locus of discretion. Such workers are often team leaders,

product designers, engineers, or experts in marketing or research and development. They perform roles that are typically unpredictable in process and/ or with an unpredictable outcome [Earl 1994; Szulanski 1996; Amar 2002, p. 66; Morawski 2009, p. 40] and are often under full control and autonomy of the actor [Drucker 1999]. It is critical in times of corporate renewal for the organization not only to carry them across successfully to the new operating model, but to engage with them effectively so that they become supporters and ideally champions of this renewal.

Corporations that rely on a largely dictatorial approach to such workers during corporate renewal programs are likely to fail. Literature generally agrees that the nature of such knowledge intensive work intrinsically conflicts with a hierarchical and coercive approach to management. "Knowledge organizations require skills derived from freethinking and unbounded actions of those working for them" [Amar 2002, p. 3], or as Joseph Weiss [1996] similarly observes, "the information-based organization has knowledge workers who are specialists (or players) and who resist command-and-control procedures based on the military model". Davenport et al. [1996] agree: "knowledge workers are likely to resist standard routines; in fact, the level of discretion and autonomy often separates knowledge workers from administrative workers". "Each doer has a unique way of accomplishing knowledge work" and requires control over the environment within which this work is situated [Amar 2002, p. 66].

According to Alvesson and Sveningsson [2003], "managers must allow much space for knowledge workers, partly because managers know less of what goes on than those large groups of employees holding esoteric expertise, partly because professional norms and occupational cultures make such employees less inclined to subordinate themselves to managerial hierarchies", which resonates with the widespread notion that workers in knowledge intensive roles need to be largely autonomous and self-managing [Drucker 1999; Morawski 2009, p. 95], and Blosch's [2001] summary that "the knowledge-based organization focuses on allowing individuals to learn, experiment and communicate with each other in an atmosphere that is open to change".

This can prove to be a great asset in corporate renewal, as such workers can quickly self-adapt to the new operating model without much interference from management. Providing the objectives and priorities of corporate renewal are communicated clearly and meaningfully to the workers, they can flex their roles accordingly. Where the need for management interference is accepted, because of the uniqueness of each knowledge worker and their work content, the management approach would need similarly to be unique and appropriate to that individual [Amar 2002, p. 7].

What have not been well articulated in management literature are strategies for effectively engaging with such workers and motivating them to be supporters and champions of change through directly influencing their tacit knowledge where this is required. Where the literature cites knowledge management as a component of corporate renewal, as already discussed this is usually from an information

management perspective. There is also a lack of specific operational examples of any management of tacit knowledge, and the extant literature on this issue remains essentially conceptual [Ambrosini and Bowman 2001].

While being a corporate asset, tacit knowledge can be a strong *constraint* to change [Ambrosini and Bowman 2001; Brown and Duguid 2001] and limit competitive flexibility and responsiveness. "Knowledge results from, and reinforces, specific mindsets" [Chakravarthy et al. 2003]. While explicit knowledge, such as company guidelines or product specifications, can be updated visibly and unambiguously during corporate renewal, the process of changing tacit knowledge, and especially the mental models that workers base their behavior and attitudes on, is more complex and much less predictable, visible and controllable. Sanchez [2001] similarly discusses the concept of *cognitive congruence*, where individuals within a group will over time converge to a common tacit knowledge domain of "beliefs, self-concepts and scripts", which then naturally resists change and can lead to cognitive stasis in work groups.

It is sometimes incorrectly assumed that highly knowledge-intensive corporations (such as research or professional services organizations) are inherently more adaptable and hence more manageable candidates for corporate renewal than traditional process-based ones (such as manufacturers). This notion is indirectly supported by an implicit assumption in the most management literature that knowledge is something self-evidently positive, in that the more knowledge workers possess, the 'better'. This view is difficult to justify on two counts. Firstly, and philosophically, it can be asserted that knowledge "is not necessarily functional, useful, and a generally good thing" [Alvesson and Kärreman 2001]. As any other resource, its utility is directly proportional to its contribution within a domain of action [Tsoukas and Vladimirou 2001; Vera and Crossan 2003; Stańczyk-Hugiet 2007, p. 45]. In other words, workers' knowledge is only 'positive' if it helps them successfully to perform their roles in line with the needs of the organization [Stańczyk-Hugiet 2007, p. 96] or, in this context, to successfully adapt during corporate renewal. Secondly, there are specific examples where workers "correctly learn that which is incorrect" [Huber 1991], and their subsequent superficially 'positive' knowledge was actually damaging to their effectiveness and performance. This includes the continuation of poor improvisations based on sub-optimal heuristic knowledge.

A corporate renewal program needs therefore to ensure that not only is there a structured approach for aligning workers' tacit knowledge with the demands of the new operating model, but also that any specific elements of this knowledge that are either barriers to change or would negatively impact the effectiveness of the new model are eliminated.

5. Supporting renewal through metaphors and storytelling

Knowledge and language form an indissoluble fusion in that "knowledge is constructed in and through language" [Johnson and Duberley 2000] and knowledge

is predominantly transmitted linguistically through speaking or writing. The granularity of detail the language and its fidelity to the concepts being transmitted has a significant effect on the quality of the knowledge transaction. As Tsoukas and Vladimirou [2001] argue, "when our language is crude and unsophisticated, so are our distinctions and the consequent judgments. The more refined our language, the finer our distinctions". Literal language, especially written manuals or instructions, has an inherently reductive propensity [Tsoukas 1991]. To transmit abstract knowledge, such as complex ideas and experience with greater effectiveness, techniques such as the use of metaphors and storytelling are often employed in the workplace [Martin et al. 1983; Tsoukas 1991; Crossan et al. 1999; Gibson and Zellmer-Bruhn 2001]. Vivid and emotionally engaging stories in the workplace can convey what would otherwise be difficult to enunciate [Ambrosini and Bowman 2001], such as heuristic [Tsoukas and Vladimirou 2001] and normative information. These also have the added benefit of naturally situating the knowledge transaction within a supportive social context as discussed earlier.

Storytelling is thus a significant element of both organizational socialization and knowledge transfer, and has been discussed as a discrete phenomenon in literature [Brown and Duguid 2000a]. Stories and anecdotes are particularly important to workers in tacit knowledge intensive (and therefore ambiguous) contexts as a method of continuously challenging and reinforcing perceptions of sequentiality (*X happened, which triggered Y*) and causality (*Y happened because I did X*) of actions in a complex working environment. While individual incidents may not be replicable or even directly relevant to other workers, over time, storytelling builds up patterns and cognitive models that help workers better navigate the "bounded rationality" [Cyert and March 1963] of their work environment.

An important issue related to storytelling is the likely retention or memory of a specific message. "Because stories are more vivid, engaging, entertaining, and easily related to personal experience than rules or directives" [Swap et al. 2001], this creates the danger of stories outliving their currency or value. Often the organizational environment changes and stories that are no longer applicable to the new environment still persist. Such workplace stories need to be ideally replaced by ones that are more appropriate to the new organization. Empirical data also suggests that there is also a bias towards negative stories [Swap et al. 2001]. This resonates with my earlier assertion that knowledge is not always self-evidently positive. A working environment rich in tacit, metaphor and story-based knowledge transactions could actually be inherently counterproductive to individuals within it, and constrain corporate renewal.

A strong catalyst for corporate renewal is the establishment of new metaphors and workplace stories that replace previous ones and reinforce the culture and expected norms and behavior of the new operating model. If the corporate renewal program involves training and coaching workers, in addition to conveying explicit knowledge such as new work procedures, management should consider mechanisms

of establishing appropriate storytelling that would help to clarify and reinforce new methods of working. Such storytelling should also engage workers emotionally and positively motivate them. The following action research vignette illustrates an example of a structured approach to tackling the tacit knowledge of workers during corporate renewal, and includes a strong element of storytelling.

6. Vignette: A major UK insurance company

I was recently engaged in a significant restructuring of the customer services organization of a major British insurance company. I was directly responsible for several corporate renewal strands, including:
- the re-engineering of key business processes and business rules;
- radical organizational restructuring (including establishing new customer response teams);
- migration to telephone-based service (including establishing a call center front office);
- changes to skills and IT/ telephony infrastructure to enable telephone-based service;
- introduction of workflow-based customer order management system and procedures, and fundamental cultural change (case management, customer focus, empowerment, etc.).

This was supported by an intensive training program of all the staff, which was designed to instill the required skills, both hard (e.g. how to operate the new IT and telephony systems) and soft (e.g. how to deal with angry customers). This training was delivered by an external company as a multi-media package over several weeks.

Before the whole customer services organization was trained and migrated to the new operating model, I established a small pilot unit of 30 workers taking live customer calls as per the new operating model. Despite intensive training, it became clear that certain negative elements of the old culture that we wanted to replace, such as some specific behaviors, persisted. This became even more apparent at times of stress, when for example there were long call queues. While the workers mostly adhered to the new work instructions and scripts which they learned during training (explicit knowledge), the optional and improvised elements of their work (tacit knowledge) suffered in quality and often reflected the norms of the old organization.

An example was the recording of customer case notes. In the old operating model communication with customers was primarily in writing, so customer service caseworkers only added marginal notes to the correspondence already in the customer file, and customer interaction was therefore mostly self-evidencing. In the new telephone-based operating model, caseworkers were required not only to annotate key facts from the conversation with the customer, but also use their judgment to decide what other information to record in free format that may be useful

in future interactions with the customer or in proposing other products or services to them. A specific *wrap-up time* period was incorporated into the customer service process to facilitate this. However, the quality of these notes was very poor and workers struggled to decide what to record from the sometimes long conversations with customers. Similarly, when faced with customer requests or behavior that had not been directly covered in the formal training program, some caseworkers found it difficult to cope with the task. Even seemingly trivial departures from the *normal* customer interactions covered in training, such as a call from a customer who had a poor command of English, could be a problem for many caseworkers.

As every customer interaction was unique, it would have been impossible to cover every eventuality in training or by instructions or scripts. Instead, we faced the challenge of instilling in the case workers the confidence and judgment that they needed to perform their new roles effectively; for example, how to decide what information to record and how to behave when faced with an unusual customer situation. We tackled this tacit knowledge domain with three techniques:

I. Role playing

We had earlier established a standalone training environment that simulated a call center. Once a week, we then scheduled a short training exercise in which a professional trainer would call a number of workers chosen at random, while the rest of the work group listened in on this. The trainer played the role of a customer and would deliberately choose to be *difficult* or unpredictable. The group afterwards discussed how well the worker coped with the case, what could have been done differently, and what should have been recorded in the case notes.

II. Listening in

Similarly, we decided that during this initial period, each caseworker would spend ten percent of their work time listening in on others' calls. This was intended as a mechanism both to share best practice and improve soft skills. The two workers had some time allocated at the end of the listening in period to discuss significant calls, and to compare notes that they both made.

III. Storytelling

We also allocated some time at the end of each shift for a group discussion. The team leader was coached in facilitating an exchange of stories and workers were encouraged to describe any particularly interesting, peculiar or indeed difficult, customer interactions that they had during the day. Subsequent (and often humorous) discussion not only helped to equip the team to better handle a similar interaction in the future, but also fostered a strong team spirit. It is worth noting that some of these stories have survived as popular workplace anecdotes to this day, and are still often retold to new workers as part of their induction.

The combination of these three techniques proved very successful at changing the attitudes and behaviors of the workers, and improved their soft skills. The caseworkers significantly modified their tacit knowledge to better align it with the demands of the new organization. Also, such tacit knowledge-intensive intragroup

interactions helped establish a common best practice, an identifiable team culture and group congruence, and helped to embed the social context to facilitate effective exchange of ideas and experiences in the future. Following this pilot exercise, this approach was incorporated into the training program for the whole customer services organization, and a further program of continuous improvement post corporate renewal.

7. Conclusion

In order to equip workers with the soft skills that they will need to adapt successfully to a new operating model, and to ensure that existing knowledge is not itself a barrier to change, corporations should consider techniques that directly influence the tacit knowledge of workers. Typical training programs do not address this, and management literature has not presented a coherent strategy so far. However, proven practical techniques such as storytelling and role playing, which communicate richly heuristic and otherwise not easily articulable information, can be employed as very useful enablers of corporate renewal.

References

Akgun A.E., Lynn G.S., Byrne J.C. (2003), Organizational learning. A socio-cognitive framework, *Human Relations*, Vol. 56, No. 7.

Alvesson M., Kärreman D. (2001), Odd couple. Making sense of the curious concept of knowledge management, *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 38, No. 7.

Alvesson M., Sveningsson S. (2003), Good visions, bad micro-management and ugly ambiguity. Contradictions of (non-) leadership in a knowledge-intensive organization, *Organization Studies*, Vol. 24, No. 6.

Amar A.D. (2002), *Managing Knowledge Workers. Unleashing Innovation and Productivity*, Quorum Books.

Ambrosini V., Bowman C. (2001), Tacit knowledge. Some suggestions for operationalization, *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 38, No. 6.

Badenoch D., Reid C., Burton P., Gibb F., Oppenheim C. (1994), The value of information, [in:] M. Feeney, M. Grieves (eds.), *The Value and Impact of Information*, British Library Research Policy Issues, London.

Baumard P. (1999), *Tacit Knowledge in Organizations*, Sage.

Blosch M. (2001), Pragmatism and organizational knowledge management, *Knowledge and Process Management*, Vol. 8, No. 1.

Boland R.J., Tenkasi R.V. (1995), Perspective making and perspective taking in communities of knowing, *Organization Science*, Vol. 6, No. 4.

Brooking A. (1997), The management of intellectual capital, *Long Range Planning*, Vol. 30, No. 3.

Brown J.S., Duguid P. (2000a), Balancing Act. How to Capture Knowledge Without Killing It, *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 78, No. 3.

Brown J.S., Duguid P. (2000b), *The Social Life of Information*, Harvard Business School Press.

Brown J.S., Duguid P. (2001), Knowledge and organization. A social-practice perspective, *Organization Science*,   Vol. 12, No. 2.

Chakravarthy B., McEvily S., Diz Y., Rau D. (2003), Knowledge management and competitive advantage, [in:] M. Easterby-Smith, M.A. Lyles (eds.), *Handbook of Organizational Learning and Knowledge Management*, Blackwell.

Cohen D. (1998), Toward a knowledge context. Report on the First Annual U.C. Berkley Forum on Knowledge and the Firm, *California Management Review*, Vol. 40, No. 3.

Cohen W.M., Levinthal D. (1990), Absorptive capacity. A new perspective on learning and innovation, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 35, No. 1.

Crossan M.M., Lane H.W., White R.E. (1999), An organizational learning framework. From intuition to institution, *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 24, No. 3.

Cyert R.M., March J.G. (1963), *A Behavioural Theory of the Firm*, Prentice-Hall.

Davenport T.H., Jarvenpaa S.L., Beers M.C. (1996), Improving knowledge work process, *Sloan Management Review*, Vol. 37, No. 4.

Davenport T.H., Prusak L. (1998), *Working Knowledge. How Organizations Manage What They Know*, Harvard Business School Press.

DeFillippi R., Ornstein S. (2003), Psychological perspectives underlying theories of organizational learning, [in:] M. Easterby-Smith, M.A. Lyles (eds.), *Handbook of Organizational Learning and Knowledge Management*, Blackwell.

Drucker P.F. (1999), Knowledge-worker productivity. The biggest challenge, *California Management Review*, Vol. 41, No. 2.

Earl M.J. (1994), The new and the old of business process redesign, *Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, Vol. 3.

Easterby-Smith M., Crossan M., Nicolini D. (2000), Organizational learning. Debates past, present and future, *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 37, No. 6.

Gibson C.B., Zellmer-Bruhn M.E. (2001), Metaphors and meaning. An intercultural analysis of the concept of teamwork, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 46, No. 2.

Glazer R. (1998), Measuring the knower. Toward a theory of knowledge equity, *California Management Review*, Vol. 40, No. 3.

Grant R.M. (1996), Prospering in dynamically-competitive environments. Organizational capability as knowledge integration, *Organization Science*, Vol. 7, No. 4.

Gupta A.K., Govindarajan V. (2000), Knowledge management's social dimension. Lessons from nucor steel, *Sloan Management Review*, Vol. 42, No. 1.

Hansen M.T. (1999), The search-transfer problem. The role of weak ties in sharing knowledge across organization subunits, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 44, No. 1.

Hendriks P. (1999), Why share knowledge? The influence of ICT on the motivation for knowledge sharing, *Knowledge and Process Management*, Vol. 6, No. 2.

Huber G.P. (1991), Organizational learning. The contributing processes and the literatures, *Organization Science*, Vol. 2.

Johnson P., Duberley J. (2000), *Understanding Management Research*, Sage Publications.

Johnson-Laird P.N. (1983), *Mental Models*, Cambridge University Press.

Kogut B., Zander U. (1996), What firms do? Coordination, identity, and learning, *Organization Science*, Vol. 7, No. 5.

Martin J., Feldman M., Hatch M.J., Sitkin S. (1983), The uniqueness paradox in organizational stories, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 28, No. 3.

McDermott R. (1999), Why information technology inspired but cannot deliver knowledge management, *California Management Review*, Vol. 41, No. 4.

Merali Y. (2001), Building and developing capabilities. A cognitive congruence framework, [in:] Sanchez R. (ed.), *Knowledge Management and Organizational Competence*, Oxford University Press.

Morawski M. (2009), *Zarządzanie profesjonalistami*, Polskie Wydawnictwo Ekonomiczne.

Nonaka I. (1994), A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation, *Organization Science*, Vol. 5.

Nonaka I., Takeuchi H. (1995), *The Knowledge-Creating Company*, Oxford University Press.

Orlikowski W.J. (2002), Knowing in practice. Enacting a collective capability in distributed organizing, *Organization Science*, Vol. 13, No. 3.

Pfeffer J., Veiga J. E (1999), Putting people first for organizational success, *Academy of Management Executive*, Vol. 13, No. 2.

Plaskoff J. (2003), Intersubjectivity and community building. Learning to learn organizationally, [in:] M. Easterby-Smith, M.A. Lyles (eds.), *Handbook of Organizational Learning and Knowledge Management*, Blackwell.

Polanyi M. (1962), *Personal Knowledge. Towards a Post-Critical Philosophy*, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Polanyi M. (1967), *The Tacit Dimension*, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Quinn J.B., Anderson P., Finkelstein S. (1996), Managing professional intellect. Making the most of the best, *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 74.

Reed S.K. (1998), *Cognition. Theory and Applications*, Brooks Cole.

Sanchez R. (2001), Managing knowledge into competence. The five learning cycles of the competent organization, [in:] R. Sanchez (ed.), *Knowledge Management and Organizational Competence*, Oxford University Press.

Schultze U. (2000), A confessional account of an ethnography about knowledge work, *MIS Quarterly*, Vol. 24, No. 1.

Schultze U., Stabell C. (2004), Knowing what you don't know? Discourses and contradictions in knowledge management research, *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 41, No. 4.

Snowden D. (1999), A framework for creating a sustainable knowledge management program, [in:] J.W. Cortada, J.A. Woods (eds.), *The Knowledge Management Yearbook 1999-2000*, Butterworth/Heinemann.

Stańczyk-Hugiet E. (2007), *Strategiczny kontekst zarządzania wiedzą*, Wydawnictwo Akademii Ekonomicznej we Wrocławiu.

Stein J., Ridderstråle J. (2001), Managing the dissemination of competences, [in:] R. Sanchez (ed.), *Knowledge Management and Organizational Competence*, Oxford University Press.

Styhre A. (2004), Rethinking knowledge. A Bergsonian critique of the notion of tacit knowledge, *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 15, No. 2.

Swap W., Leonard D., Shields M., Abrams L. (2001), Using mentoring and storytelling to transfer knowledge in the workplace, *Journal of Management Information Systems*, Vol. 18, No. 1.

Szulanski G. (1996), Exploring internal stickiness. Impediments to the transfer of best practice within the firm, *Strategic Management Journal*, Winter Special Issue 17.

Szulanski G., Cappetta R., Jensen R.J. (2004), When and how trustworthiness matters. Knowledge transfer and the moderating effect of causal ambiguity, *Organization Science*, Vol. 15, No. 5.

Tsoukas H. (1991), The missing link. A transformational view of metaphors in organizational science, *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 16, No. 3.

Tsoukas H. (1996), The firm as a distributed knowledge system. A constructionist approach, *Strategic Management Journal*, Winter Special Issue 17.

Tsoukas H., Vladimirou E. (2001), What is organizational knowledge?, *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 38, No. 7.

Vera D., Crossan M. (2003), Organizational learning and knowledge management. Toward an integrative framework, [in:] M. Easterby-Smith, M.A. Lyles (eds.), *Handbook of Organizational Learning and Knowledge Management*, Blackwell.

Walsh J.P. (1988), Selectivity and selective perception. An investigation of managers' belief structures and information processing, *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 31.

Webb S.P. (1998), *Knowledge Management. Linchpin of Change*, Aslib Know How Series.

Weick K. (1979), *The Social Psychology of Organizing*, Addison-Wesley.

Weiss J.W. (1996), *Organizational Behavior & Change*, West Publishing.

Wenger E. (1998), *Communities of Practice. Learning, Meaning, and Identity*, Cambridge University Press.

Winter S.G. (1987), Knowledge and competence as strategic assets, [in:] D.J. Teece (ed.), *The Competitive Challenge. Strategy for Industrial Innovation and Renewal*, Harper & Row, pp.159-184.

UŻYTECZNOŚĆ WIEDZY UKRYTEJ
W PROCESIE TRANSFORMACJI PRZEDSIĘBIORSTWA

Streszczenie: Programy transformacji przedsiębiorstwa dotyczą przeważnie elementów namacalnych takich jak struktura organizacyjna, procesy, infrastruktura, jak również wiedzy pracowników przekazywanej poprzez szkolenia lub coaching. Zazwyczaj podobne programy nie uwzględniają jednak wiedzy ukrytej pracowników. Wiedza ukryta, czyli osobista, specjalistyczna wiedza pracowników rozwijana w celu sprostania różnorodnym rolom pełnionym w organizacji, jest kluczowym zasobem przedsiębiorstwa. Dzięki niej przystosowanie się do nowych warunków funkcjonowania spółki może przebiegać szybciej i sprawniej. Często jest również silną barierą dla zmian. Artykuł odnosi się do kwestii związanych z wiedzą ukrytą w kontekście programów transformacji przedsiębiorstwa oraz prezentuje praktyczne rozwiązania mające na celu zwiększenia jej użyteczności.