

*Forthcoming in 2013 in Volume 17, Issue 2*



### Three Shapes of Organizational Knowledge

Journal:	<i>Journal of Knowledge Management</i>
Manuscript ID:	JKM-Jul-2012-0207.R2
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Knowledge management, Knowledge-Based View, Strategic management, Production, Resources, Economic Theory

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

Review

## 1. Introduction

In one of his last publications, "The Many Shapes of Knowledge", Herbert A. Simon (1999) suggested that we are becoming increasingly aware that knowledge plays a central role in economic processes. This realization has called attention to the difficult problem of gauging the cost and value of knowledge as a factor of production. Our inability to accurately measure the cost and value of knowledge presents a grave impediment to the efficient and profitable conduct of business (Simon, 1999).

The purpose of this paper is to examine the extant literature and extract a typology of knowledge that may be fruitful in facilitating research in a knowledge-based view of production (Arrow, 1999). This research is motivated by a desire to improve our understanding of how firms create value and by a desire to advance the development of a strategic theory of the firm using a knowledge-based view (KBV). This research responds to Simon's (1999, p. 34) challenge to apply "an economic calculus to knowledge".

The author proposes that for management purposes organizational knowledge, as the paramount input to all production processes, be considered in three separate classifications, tacit, codified, and encapsulated. While the bulk of previous knowledge management theory has generally focused on tacit and codified or explicit knowledge, this paper contributes to the theory by drawing attention to the often under investigated third classification, encapsulated knowledge.

1  
2  
3 Accurate measurement of the cost of inputs and the value of outputs is important  
4  
5 for the effective management of organizations. Accordingly, the cost and value of  
6  
7 knowledge needs to be estimated explicitly, to effectively determine the efficiency  
8  
9 and profitability of our organizational pursuits. This is difficult to do, because  
10  
11 knowledge is abstract and conceptual, unlike production machinery, which, being  
12  
13 concrete and tangible, can be relatively easily costed and valued (Simon, 1999).  
14  
15 Nevertheless, the urgency of competently measuring the cost of knowledge  
16  
17 increases as the productivity of our organizations and economies become  
18  
19 increasingly knowledge-dependent (Simon, 1999, p. 34). Failure to measure the  
20  
21 costs and value of knowledge dooms us to compete with obsolete strategies and  
22  
23 tactics (Boisot, 1998).  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30 Before the cost or value of knowledge may be measured, it is necessary to  
31  
32 define what is meant by knowledge. Epistemologists have been struggling with  
33  
34 defining the concept for thousands of years, yet a universally accepted definition  
35  
36 of knowledge has not surfaced. It would be the height of pretension to assume  
37  
38 that what has occupied great minds for eons could be swiftly resolved here. For  
39  
40 the conduct of business and for empirical research in KBV, however, some  
41  
42 operational notion of knowledge is required. Bollinger and Smith (2001) and Goh  
43  
44 (2002) suggest that knowledge is a strategic asset. Grant (1996) goes further,  
45  
46 suggesting that knowledge is the most strategically significant resource of the  
47  
48 firm. These notions of knowledge may therefore be considered an extension of  
49  
50 the resource-based view of the firm (Eisenhardt and Santos, 2002). While this is  
51  
52 not the only representation of knowledge in the strategy field, empirical literature  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 has largely focussed on the perception of knowledge as simply a resource  
4  
5  
6 (Eisenhardt and Santos, 2002).  
7

8  
9 Arguably though, knowledge is not merely a strategically significant resource – it  
10  
11 is the *condicio sine qua non* (essential condition) that confers resources with  
12  
13 strategic significance. Knowledge is a meta-resource since it transcends basic  
14  
15 resources and is the unique source of economic growth and value. Resources  
16  
17 are defined by knowledge of them, rather than by their physical attributes (Lee,  
18  
19 1991). “Economic growth occurs whenever people take resources and rearrange  
20  
21 them in ways that are more valuable” (Romer, 1993, p. 184).  
22  
23  
24

25  
26  
27 In the middle of the last century, the Austrian economist von Hayek had already  
28  
29 called attention to the importance of knowledge in economics and the merits of  
30  
31 giving it greater analysis in research. He took issue with the unexamined  
32  
33 assumption in neo-classical economics that knowledge was pervasive and  
34  
35 costless (von Hayek, 1945). He also suggested that distinctions between various  
36  
37 types of knowledge needed to be made and explored:  
38  
39

40  
41  
42 “Clearly there is... a problem of the *Division of Knowledge* which is quite  
43  
44 analogous to, and at least as important as, the problem of the division of labour.  
45  
46 But while the latter has been one of the main subjects of investigation ever since  
47  
48 the beginning of our science, the former has been as completely neglected,  
49  
50 although it seems to me to be the really central problem of economics as a social  
51  
52 science” (von Hayek, 1937, p. 49) (emphasis in original).  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Consideration of the various shapes or classifications of knowledge is also an  
4 essential part of specifying an operational definition of knowledge. This paper  
5 examines the literature of the knowledge-based view of the firm and, drawing on  
6 that literature, suggests a working definition of organizational knowledge, and  
7 settles on three classifications or shapes of knowledge that differ along six salient  
8 perspectives. Differences between the three classifications along the six  
9 perspectives have strategic implications for the firm.

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21 The remainder of this article is divided into seven sections. Next (section 2) is a  
22 brief discussion of specialization as a partitioning of knowledge and its  
23 fundamental role in our understanding of a KBV theory of the firm. Following that  
24 is a section (3) that suggests characteristics of specialized knowledge affect its  
25 transfer within organizations and across organizational boundaries. The  
26 subsequent section (4) argues that knowledge is *the* resource of interest,  
27 permeating all other 'resources'. Next is a section (5) discussing the difference  
28 between two shapes of knowledge: information as codified knowledge and know-  
29 how as tacit knowledge follows. The section thereafter (6) outlines how the  
30 paradox of knowledge replication suggests a third shape of knowledge – an  
31 encapsulated form. The issue of appropriation of the value of knowledge is also  
32 discussed in this section. The subsequent section of this paper (7) offers a  
33 definition of organizational knowledge and suggests a typology for advancing  
34 KBV research, classifying of knowledge as tacit, codified, or encapsulated. It  
35 continues with discussions of, the nature of organizational knowledge and  
36 provides operational definitions for tacit, codified, and encapsulated knowledge.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 The paper concludes with a brief discussion (section 8) of contributions and  
4  
5 limitations  
6  
7

## 8 9 **2. Specialization and Productivity**

10  
11  
12 That knowledge used in production has various shapes or classifications  
13  
14 proceeds logically from observations that individuals, as well as firms, specialize.  
15  
16 Specialization results in divergent courses of knowledge acquisition being taken,  
17  
18 and it generates and reinforces comparative advantages. While the literature on  
19  
20 specialization does not set out general classifications of knowledge, it does  
21  
22 suggest that partitioning of knowledge is fundamental to our understanding of a  
23  
24 theory of the firm.  
25  
26  
27  
28

29  
30 The idea that specialization is productive is generally attributed to Adam Smith in  
31  
32 his discussion of the division of labour among individual workers within a firm.  
33  
34 Demsetz (1988, 1991) extends Adam Smith's idea to consider productive  
35  
36 specialization among firms, suggesting that firms, like individuals, can improve  
37  
38 their economic prospects through specialization in knowledge acquisition. Firms  
39  
40 are "repositories of specialized knowledge and of the specialized inputs required  
41  
42 to put this knowledge to work" (Demsetz, 1988, p. 158). Hence, "Economic  
43  
44 organization, including the firm, must reflect the fact that knowledge is costly to  
45  
46 produce, maintain, and use [and that] ...there are economies to be achieved  
47  
48 through specialization" (Demsetz, 1988, p. 158). The division of knowledge  
49  
50 facilitates human-capital deepening and furthers the division of labour, which in  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 turn leads to increased productivity and economic efficiency (Becker and Murphy,  
4  
5 1992, Demsetz, 1988, 1991, Grant, 2002).  
6  
7

8  
9 Demsetz (1988) essentially argues that Adam Smith's observations regarding  
10 specialization by individuals has a parallel application when firms are considered  
11 the unit of analysis. Demsetz defines the firm as "an agreement to *specialize*"  
12 (1988, p. 156) (emphasis in original). And specialization is defined as the  
13 production for persons who are not members of the firm's team. This  
14 distinguishes specialization from self-sufficiency, which, at the other end of the  
15 specialization-generalization spectrum, implies production by and for the same  
16 person. This characteristic of the firm is consistent with price theory in which the  
17 firm does not consume what it produces, but sells it to others (Demsetz, 1988).  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 The economic value of specialization and its knowledge-based origin has also  
32 been recognized in labour economics. Nobel laureate Gary S. Becker and co-  
33 author Kevin M. Murphy (1992, pp. 1138-40) argue that specialization maximizes  
34 comparative advantage. The issue of specialization has historically been  
35 analysed from a physical labour perspective, beginning with Adam Smith's  
36 discussion of pin making. Becker and Murphy extend Smith's discussion by  
37 focusing on the specialization from a knowledge perspective, suggesting,  
38 "Specialization is what produces most comparative advantage... [and] much of  
39 the growth in specialization over time has been due to an extraordinary growth in  
40 knowledge" (1992, pp. 1140, 45).  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Grant (2002, p. 112) reiterates Demsetz's (1988) assertion that specialization  
4 defines the firm. According to Grant (2002, p. 112), the firm exists because it  
5 provides "conditions under which individuals can integrate their specialist  
6 knowledge" and because knowledge for production "requires greater  
7 specialization than is needed for its utilization". This difference between  
8 knowledge required to produce, and knowledge required to use, a product is  
9 termed the "fundamental asymmetry in the economics of knowledge" (2002, p.  
10 112). Grant goes so far as to claim that "[t]he assumptions that there are gains  
11 from specialization in knowledge acquisition and storage, and that production  
12 requires the input of a wide range of specialized knowledge... is fundamental to  
13 all theories of the firm" (2002, p. 112) (emphasis added).  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

### 31 **3. Transference of Knowledge**

32  
33  
34 The repository chosen for an assemblage of specialized organizational  
35 knowledge affects its transferability. "Knowledge properties affect... how easily it  
36 diffuses within and across firm boundaries" (Argote *et al.*, 2003, p. 574). The  
37 knowledge-based view assumes, among other things, that the transference of  
38 tacit knowledge (skills, know-how, and contextual knowledge) is costly and slow,  
39 being only manifest in application, while transference or communication of  
40 explicit knowledge between individuals and organizations is easy (Grant, 2002).  
41 The transfer of tacit knowledge requires a greater degree of intimacy and  
42 permanence than does the transference of codified or encapsulated knowledge  
43 (Hedlund, 1994). The attributes of knowledge also, in part, affect the decision to  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 transfer knowledge (Kogut and Zander, 1992, Teece, 1996, 1998, Zander and  
4  
5 Kogut, 1995).  
6  
7

8  
9 Two of the attributes of knowledge identified by Kogut & Zander (1992) as  
10 impacting the costs of knowledge transfer are codifiability and complexity.  
11  
12 Codifiability, refers to the difficulty of a firm in structuring knowledge “into a set of  
13 identifiable rules and relationships that can be easily communicated” (Kogut and  
14 Zander, 1992, p. 387). Increasing codifiability decreases the cost of knowledge  
15 transfer.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23  
24 The second characteristic of knowledge impacting transfer is complexity.  
25  
26 Complexity may be considered an increasing function of the number of  
27 operations or steps required to solve a task or the number of parameters defining  
28 a system (Kogut and Zander, 1992, p. 387). Increasing complexity increases the  
29 cost of knowledge transfer.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37 Codification and complexity are not independent characteristics of knowledge.  
38  
39 Progress in knowledge codifiability has the potential to offset increasing costs of  
40 knowledge transfer attributable to mounting knowledge complexity.  
41  
42  
43  
44

#### 45 **4. Knowledge Defines a Resource**

46  
47

48  
49 That knowledge is transferrable suggests that it may be considered a resource or  
50 factor of production. Grant suggests that a “focus on the role of knowledge as a  
51 factor of production” (2002, p. 133) unifies the knowledge-based view of the firm.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Drucker (1993) and Arrow (1999) have also proposed that knowledge be  
4 considered as a factor of production.  
5  
6  
7

8  
9 The knowledge-based view of the firm arguably completes the resource-based  
10 view of the firm: "Knowledge, in fact, *is an additional and necessary dimension*  
11 *attaching to every resource*. Without the 'knowledge' of how to profitably use a  
12 resource, it is not a resource, it has no value. Resources without knowledge have  
13 no meaning" (Lewin and Phelan, 2000, p. 71) (emphasis in original). Knowledge  
14 may therefore be considered the meta-resource that coordinates the mobilization  
15 of all other organizational 'resources' (Choo and Bontis, 2002).  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25  
26 For resources to confer competitive advantages, they must be imperfectly  
27 imitable (Barney, 1991). The knowledge a firm has about the coordination,  
28 combination and application of its resources may, in itself, be its most unique and  
29 inimitable resource. This is especially the case if the firm's other resources are  
30 lacking in distinctiveness (Grant, 1996, Penrose, 1959). Knowledge, particularly  
31 in its tacit form, is arguably the most inimitable resource because of, among other  
32 things, its nested heterogeneity (Felin and Hesterly, 2007), causal ambiguity  
33 (Lippman and Rumelt, 1982), and the time compression diseconomies it  
34 engenders (Dierickx and Cool, 1989).  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## 5. Information as Codified Knowledge and Know-how as Tacit Knowledge

The inimitability of knowledge depends on its shape. Information and know-how are informal designations for two shapes of knowledge: codified and tacit, respectively. An important characteristic of information is that it can be transmitted at low cost and “without loss of integrity” because the pattern of formation or rules governing the formation of statements, or language and grammar is commonly known or standardized between sender and recipient (Kogut and Zander, 1992, p. 386).

Information may also be defined as structured and formatted data sets that require knowledge to interpret and process them (Boisot, 1998, Cowan *et al.*, 2000, David and Foray, 2002). Information remains inert until acted upon by a knowledgeable agent whose cognitive context imparts it with meaning (Cowan *et al.*, 2000, David and Foray, 2002). David and Foray also emphasize information’s low cost of replication (2002).

Know-how, on the other hand, is practical skill or expertise permitting efficient execution and must be learned and acquired or accumulated over time through experience (Kogut and Zander, 1992, von Hippel, 1988). Possession of this category of knowledge empowers an agent to mental or manual action, and may be thought of as cognitive capacity (David and Foray, 2002). The replication of know-how is an expensive undertaking for both the firm and the individual due to the difficulty of explicitly articulating what it is we know (David and Foray, 2002).

1  
2  
3 The key differences between the two categorizations have significant economic  
4 ramifications. Information is the focus of pricing in the economics of exchange,  
5 while know-how is the focus in transforming inputs into outputs in the economics  
6 of production (Kogut and Zander, 1992).  
7  
8  
9

10  
11  
12  
13 Choo, drawing on Polanyi (1966) and Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995),  
14 distinguishes between tacit knowledge as “knowledge that is uncodified” (1998,  
15 p. 111), and explicit knowledge as “knowledge that can be expressed formally  
16 using a system of symbols” (1998, p. 112). Choo also includes object-based  
17 knowledge, “found in artifacts such as products” under the heading of explicit  
18 knowledge (2006, p. 141).  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28  
29 The term explicit, however, implies observability, and not all non-tacit knowledge  
30 is observable. Observability has important implications for transferability,  
31 replication and appropriation of value. Choo (2006), for example, recognizes that  
32 object-based explicit knowledge may remain unobservable unless it is unpacked  
33 through reverse engineering, inspection, or compositional analysis. In  
34 congruence with the arguments in the preceding section, it may therefore be  
35 useful to distinguish between non-tacit knowledge that is codified and observable  
36 and non-tacit knowledge that is encapsulated and not readily observable.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

## 48 49 **6. The Paradox of Replication drives Knowledge Encapsulation**

50  
51

52  
53 Despite imperfect imitability, firms seek to replicate knowledge within their  
54 boundaries. Unless a firm is able to increase the knowledge of its individuals or  
55 convert its skills into ‘organizing principles’, it will forever remain a small craft  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 shop (Kogut and Zander, 1992). The paradox of replication is that advantages  
4 achieved through reductions in the cost of intra-firm knowledge transfer, say  
5 through codification, also increase the risk that competitors will appropriate such  
6 knowledge.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11

12  
13 While firms may desire to codify their knowledge to increase internal efficiency,  
14 doing so also increases appropriability of that knowledge by external parties. An  
15 alternative to codification is the encapsulation of knowledge. Kogut and Zander  
16 (1992) provide the production of software code as an example of knowledge  
17 encapsulation. Encapsulation consists of the transformation of substantive  
18 knowledge into a product that requires only functional knowledge for its utility.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 Software, for example, provides utility because it is encapsulated. The user of  
29 software is only required to understand the function of the program and avoids  
30 the cost of acquiring the knowledge of software production. “[T]he possibility to  
31 separate the expertise to generate the technology and the ability to use it...  
32 permits the *nesting* of a firm’s knowledge” (Kogut and Zander, 1992, p. 390)  
33 (emphasis added).  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 Kogut and Zander’s (1992) reference to ‘nesting’ a firm’s knowledge and saving  
45 the user the cost of acquiring the substantive knowledge of production resonates  
46 with Demsetz’s (1988) emphasis on knowledge encapsulation to achieve an  
47 economic market exchange. Teece’s (2000) reference to the need to embed  
48 know-how to enable extraction of value reinforces this concept. Osterloh and  
49 Frey (2000) go so far as to claim that, “[t]acit knowledge can be efficiently  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 marketed *only* if it is encapsulated...” (emphasis added). These references  
4  
5 suggest that it may be constructive to consider knowledge organized in an  
6  
7 encapsulated configuration as a classification of knowledge distinct from codified  
8  
9 knowledge.  
10

11  
12  
13  
14 The appropriation of value is facilitated when knowledge is encapsulated  
15  
16 because codifiability and complexity of knowledge limit the appropriability of  
17  
18 value from information and know-how, respectively. Appropriability, as it is used  
19  
20 here, refers to the ability of the owner of an economically valuable assemblage of  
21  
22 knowledge to realize the value of that knowledge (Grant, 1996). The  
23  
24 encapsulation of complex tacit know-how in a product permits its indirect  
25  
26 appropriation (Grant, 1996). Appropriating value from codified knowledge, or  
27  
28 information, is on the other hand difficult since it is both a public and non-  
29  
30 rivalrous good (Langlois and Robertson, 1996). The public nature of information  
31  
32 means that others cannot be kept from using it (or made to pay for it) once it has  
33  
34 been made available. The non-rivalrous nature means that one person’s use of  
35  
36 the information does not make it less available to others. These two  
37  
38 characteristics of information or codified knowledge essentially preclude  
39  
40 appropriability in markets, absent a strong intellectual property rights regime.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

## 48 **7. An Operational Definition of Knowledge**

49

50  
51 The following is offered as an operational definition of knowledge: *the value-*  
52  
53 *endowing meta-resource that arises from thought, reflection, or experience.* This  
54  
55 definition is modeled on Grant’s concepts and those described in the preceding  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 sections. Describing knowledge as 'value-endowing' is a recognition that it has  
4  
5 strategic significance (Grant, 1996, p. 375), and gives emphasis to the economic  
6  
7 importance of knowledge as a firm asset (Boisot, 1998, Teece, 1998, 2000). The  
8  
9 adjective, 'value-endowing', does not preclude the likelihood that separate  
10  
11 evaluators will assign different valuations to any particular knowledge asset since  
12  
13 valuations tend to be context specific (Starbuck, 1992).  
14  
15  
16

17  
18 Defining knowledge as a 'meta-resource' means that it is at a higher level of what  
19  
20 is typically considered a resource, while retention of the word, 'resource',  
21  
22 signifies that it has an important role in sustaining the competitive advantage of  
23  
24 firms. Just as 'meta-data' is above, and descriptive of, data, knowledge defined  
25  
26 as a 'meta-resource' suggests that it confers value and meaning to all resources.  
27  
28  
29

30  
31 Describing knowledge as being derived from 'thought, reflection or experience'  
32  
33 pays homage to both rationalist and empiricist approaches to knowledge, and  
34  
35 recognizes that both may be value endowing. This description recognizes that  
36  
37 value may be derived from experience or thought. It also pays tribute to the  
38  
39 strategic management literature that emphasizes the process of knowing.  
40  
41 According to Zack (1999, p. 46), "Knowledge can be understood as both a  
42  
43 thing... and as a process of... knowing... [O]rganizations need to manage  
44  
45 knowledge both as object and process."  
46  
47  
48  
49

### 50 51 *7.1. Typology of Organizational Knowledge*

52  
53

54  
55 The extant literature suggests that organizational knowledge may be categorized  
56  
57 as belonging to one of three classifications: tacit, codified, and encapsulated.  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 This typology for knowledge has been highlighted because differences between  
4 each form, along a number of perspectives, have strategic implications for a firm.  
5  
6  
7  
8 The choice of what combination of each type of knowledge is applied within  
9 various stages of production may reasonably be expected to impact  
10 performance. Some empirical evidence suggests that specific combinations of  
11 tacit and codified knowledge, described as “a ‘focused codification strategy’,...  
12 greatly facilitates knowledge flows and thereby can help to boost performance of  
13 companies” (Schulz and Jobe, 2001, p. 161).  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 Boisot (1998, pp. 12-13) describes three repositories of knowledge that  
24 economize on the use of physical resources, knowledge residing in individual  
25 brains, knowledge codified as information, and knowledge embodied in physical  
26 artefacts. He uses the construction of a building as a metaphor for distinguishing  
27 between them. The accumulated stock of knowledge of human behaviour in  
28 space, and of the physical properties of materials, used by the architects in  
29 drawing the buildings plans is an example of the first repository. Construction  
30 drawings and plans are examples of the second, and a shaped brick used in  
31 constructing a building is an example of the last (Boisot, 1998). Based on these  
32 distinctions as well as those of Polanyi (1966), Kogut and Zander (1992), Nonaka  
33 (1994), Choo (1998), and others, organizational knowledge may be classified as  
34 tacit, codified, or encapsulated.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

52 Each of these three classifications of knowledge differs along a number of  
53 dimensions that have strategic and economic implications. Tacit knowledge, for  
54 example, as practical skill or expertise permitting efficient execution, must be  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

learned, acquired, and accumulated through experience (Nelson and Winter, 1982, Winter, 1987). Tacit knowledge may also be considered procedural know-how (Kogut and Zander, 1992). It has the unique characteristic of being absolutely necessary to interpret and process the structured and formatted data sets that constitute codified knowledge (Boisot, 1998, Cowan *et al.*, 2000, David and Foray, 2002). It is also expensive to transfer and diffuse requiring complex structures of interaction (Choo, 2002).

Codified knowledge has the unique attributes of being non-rivalrous and non-excludable (Langlois and Robertson, 1996, Saviotti, 1998). Unlike tacit knowledge, codified knowledge may be very inexpensively replicated, transferred and diffused (Boisot, 1998, Heiman and Nickerson, 2004, Romer, 1990). The codification of knowledge facilitates inexpensive intra-firm knowledge transfer, but also increases the risk of misappropriation outside the firm. Accordingly, firm boundary decisions are strongly influenced by strategic consideration of imitability and replicability of codified knowledge (Teece, 1998).

Encapsulated knowledge differs from both tacit and codified in its eminent marketability (Osterloh and Frey, 2000, Teece, 2000). Knowledge encapsulated in artefacts' design and functionality minimizes the cognitive load on users (Gorga, 2007). While the value of codified knowledge may be easily misappropriated absent a strict intellectual property regime, the value of encapsulated knowledge is readily appropriable through the sale of commercially valuable items or devices (Demsetz, 1988, Teece, 2000). The encapsulation of

1  
2  
3 knowledge facilitates the retention of complexity, a complexity that is necessarily  
4  
5 reduced when knowledge is codified.  
6  
7

8  
9 Tacit, codified, and encapsulated knowledge differ along a number of  
10  
11 strategically important perspectives. The costs and benefits of any given  
12  
13 productive activity may therefore depend on the unique combination of tacit,  
14  
15 codified and encapsulated knowledge chosen as factor inputs to production. It is  
16  
17 therefore reasonable to expect firms to select those combinations of tacit,  
18  
19 codified, and encapsulated knowledge-based factors of production that they find  
20  
21 most economic. It is likewise reasonable to expect that different stages of  
22  
23 production along a value chain will often rely on different combinations of tacit,  
24  
25 codified, and encapsulated knowledge.  
26  
27

28  
29  
30  
31 Table 1 overlays Boisot's (1998) three distinctions of knowledge on the  
32  
33 dichotomous tacit/explicit models suggested by Polanyi (1966), Nonaka (1994),  
34  
35 and Choo (1998), and the know-how/information model of Kogut and Zander  
36  
37 (1992). Knowledge residing in individual brains (Boisot, 1998) corresponds to  
38  
39 tacit knowledge (Choo, 1998, Nonaka, 1994, Polanyi, 1966), while explicit  
40  
41 knowledge (Choo, 1998, Nonaka, 1994, Polanyi, 1966) is may be bifurcated into  
42  
43 either knowledge codified as information or knowledge encapsulated in a  
44  
45 physical artefact (Boisot, 1998). Similarly, know-how (Kogut and Zander, 1992)  
46  
47 may be split into knowledge that either resides in individual brains or is nested in  
48  
49 physical artefacts (Boisot, 1998).  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

56 -----  
57 Insert Table 1 about here  
58  
59  
60

---

## 7.2. *The Nature of Organizational Knowledge*

The three classifications of knowledge, tacit, codified, and encapsulated, differ along a number of fundamental attributes that undergird all forms of substantive knowledge. Table 2 provides six dimensions or perspectives that may be useful as an aid in determining the most fitting classification for categorizing a specific assemblage of knowledge. They were chosen on the basis of their strategic and economic significance to a firm. For example, the degree to which knowledge is tacit has significant implications for the location of firm boundaries:

“...[B]oundary issues (such as vertical integration) are... strongly influenced by tacit knowledge and imitability/replicability considerations. ...[T]he tacit component of knowledge cannot frequently be transferred absent the transfer of personnel and organizational systems/routines. Tacit knowledge and its transfer properties help determine the boundaries of the firm...” (Teece, 1998, pp. 75-76).

Differences in relative reliance on tacit, codified, and encapsulated knowledge, as characterized in Table 2, may be fundamental in determining relative productivity between firms. Productive activity may consist primarily of the transformation of tacit knowledge into some form of explicit knowledge (Hedlund, 1994). Nevertheless, few if any stages of production rely exclusively on tacit, codified or encapsulated knowledge. After all, “...there is a limit to the extent to which one factor of production can be substituted for another...” (Robinson, 1933, p. 330).

1  
2  
3 It is possible that a specific incorporation of knowledge may not clearly fall into  
4 one of the three chosen classifications. It may therefore be more useful to think  
5 of a given assemblage of knowledge as having attributes or dimensions that  
6 place it predominantly in one classification rather than in another, instead of  
7 exclusively designating it to one classification (Saviotti, 1998).  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

16 -----  
17 Insert Table 2 about here  
18 -----  
19

20  
21  
22  
23 Each of the dimensions or perspectives used to classify knowledge has strategic  
24 implications for the firm. For example, tacit knowledge must be 'rented' from a  
25 firm's employees, suppliers, and perhaps customers. The firm cannot really own  
26 it. Codified knowledge is to a large extent commonly held, and that which is not,  
27 is subject to misappropriation absent a strong intellectual property rights regime.  
28 Encapsulated knowledge comes closest to describing a finished product for end-  
29 user consumption. Its value lies in the design and functionality delivered by the  
30 substantive knowledge concealed within it.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

### 43 *7.3. Tacit Knowledge*

44  
45

46 Tacit knowledge may be defined as *the value endowing meta-resource*  
47 *originating from thought, reflection, or experience that remains resident in the*  
48 *human mind*. This definition considers tacit knowledge to be shaped as a meta-  
49 resource "held by a knowing agent" (Boisot, 1998, p. 12). An organization's  
50 members implicitly use this knowledge as they perform their skills since it  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 remains resident in the human mind (Choo, 2002). This knowledge may be  
4  
5 gained by experience that is often incommunicable and only evident as it is  
6  
7 expressed or practiced by its possessor (Spender, 1996).  
8  
9

10  
11 Tacit knowledge may be considered more valuable than codified or encapsulated  
12  
13 knowledge because it forms the basis for their derivation. Both codified and  
14  
15 encapsulated knowledge ultimately originate from tacit knowledge. Tacit  
16  
17 knowledge may have value independent of the other two classifications of  
18  
19 knowledge, but neither codified nor encapsulated knowledge have value in the  
20  
21 absence of tacit knowledge. For value to be derived from either codified or  
22  
23 encapsulated knowledge, tacit knowledge must be brought to bear. “Deprived of  
24  
25 their tacit co-efficients, all spoken words, all formulae, all maps and graphs are  
26  
27 strictly meaningless.” (Polanyi, 1969, p. 195).  
28  
29  
30  
31

#### 32 33 34 *7.4. Codified Knowledge*

35  
36  
37 Codified knowledge may be defined as *the value endowing meta-resource*  
38  
39 *originating from thought, reflection, or experience that is expressed as*  
40  
41 *information using systems of symbols.* This definition considers codified  
42  
43 knowledge to be shaped as a meta-resource “abstracted, and incorporated in  
44  
45 check-lists, manuals, blueprints, computer programs, etc.” (Zollo, 1998, p. 26).  
46  
47 The term, ‘codified knowledge’ is used in this paper to describe information to  
48  
49 recognize that it originates from tacit knowledge (Saviotti, 1998). The unique  
50  
51 value of codified knowledge lies in its eminent replicability (Teece, 2000).  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### 7.5. Encapsulated Knowledge

Encapsulated knowledge may be defined as *the value endowing meta-resource originating from thought, reflection, or experience that is embedded in an artefact's design and functionality*. This definition considers encapsulated knowledge to be shaped as a meta-resource “embedded in physical assets, such as machines or products” (Gorga, 2007, p. 18). Encapsulated knowledge may be considered an underdeveloped concept in the knowledge-based view of the firm since it is often subsumed in the more general term, explicit knowledge. Encapsulated knowledge is not exactly explicit because it is knowledge concealed from its users, and explicitness implies observability. Encapsulated knowledge's obscurity has implications for value appropriation. Encapsulation of knowledge enables the appropriation and transfer of value by means of market transactions. While the observability of explicit codified knowledge makes it susceptible to misappropriation (Teece, 2000), the concealed nature of encapsulated knowledge limits misappropriation (Teece *et al.*, 1997).

Management literature hints at the distinct shape of encapsulated knowledge as that which is “embodied in an item or device” (Teece, 2000, p. 37), “being imbedded either in machines and other physical technology” (Langlois, 2001, p. 82), and built up in “the information structures latent in physical things” (Boisot, 1998, p. 13). According to Teece (2000), to be valued commercially, knowledge must generally be encapsulated in some way in a product.

1  
2  
3 A desire to transfer knowledge inexpensively motivates both codification and  
4 encapsulation of knowledge. Codification tends to reduce complexity, while  
5  
6 encapsulation allows for the preservation of complexity. Encapsulation of  
7  
8 knowledge creates value by making irrelevant the possession of substantive  
9  
10 knowledge in the functional use of a product. Encapsulation substitutes for the  
11  
12 need to have substantive knowledge (Gorga, 2007). The substantive knowledge  
13  
14 of how a computer or an automobile runs is not needed by the user for him or her  
15  
16 to realize utility (Pfaffmann, 1998, 2000).  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 Note, only in a few exceptional situations will production not rely upon some  
24  
25 combination of tacit, codified, and encapsulated knowledge. In the vast majority  
26  
27 of cases, a mixture of all three knowledge-based factors will contribute to  
28  
29 production.  
30  
31  
32

### 33 *7.6. Software and Music as Examples*

34  
35  
36  
37 Table 3 provides two examples of assemblages of knowledge and how they may  
38  
39 be classified as tacit, codified, or encapsulated.  
40  
41  
42

43 -----  
44 Insert Table 3 about here  
45 -----  
46  
47  
48

49  
50 The knowledge that is classified as tacit in Table 3 is located in the mind of the  
51  
52 producer (programmer or musician). As outlined in Table 2, this classification of  
53  
54 knowledge i) may transferred by teaching and example, ii) may be acquired by a  
55  
56 student through experiencing and imitation, and iii) may be evinced by a co-  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 located observer. The knowledge that is classified as codified in Table 3 is  
4  
5 comprised of a systematized set of symbols. As described in Table 2, this  
6  
7 classification of knowledge is i) easily and inexpensively replicable, ii) valuable  
8  
9 because it informs, and iii) permits many to simultaneously enjoy its benefits. The  
10  
11 knowledge that is classified as encapsulated in Table 3 is embedded in a  
12  
13 physical artefact. As described in Table 2, this classification of knowledge is i)  
14  
15 hidden from its users, ii) costly for most to replicate, and therefore eminently  
16  
17 marketable.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

## 23 **8. Discussion**

### 24 *8.1. Contribution*

25  
26  
27 This paper contributes to knowledge management theory by identifying,  
28  
29 distinguishing, and accentuating encapsulated knowledge as a knowledge-based  
30  
31 factor of production distinct from tacit and codified knowledge. This is  
32  
33 accomplished by clarifying the distinctions between tacit, codified, and  
34  
35 encapsulated knowledge along six perspectives or dimensions: locus or  
36  
37 knowledge substrate, transferability, expression, acquisition process, source of  
38  
39 economic value, and observability. The paper also defines organizational  
40  
41 knowledge as a meta-resource and argues that it is knowledge that confers  
42  
43 strategic significance to all resources. Distinguishing between the three shapes  
44  
45 of knowledge lays a foundation for the measurement of knowledge as a factor of  
46  
47 production and addressing Simon's (1999) challenge of applying an economic  
48  
49 calculus to knowledge.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 The paper provides a review of the enduring literature to delineate three distinct  
4 knowledge-based factors of production, setting the stage for addressing Simon's  
5 (1999) challenge of applying an economic calculus to knowledge. It includes an  
6 extensive examination of KBV-related papers and monographs and emphasizes  
7 the work of a number of researchers in the fields of economics and strategy. The  
8 main contribution of this paper is the identification, differentiation, and  
9 accentuation of encapsulated knowledge as a classification of organizational  
10 knowledge distinct from tacit and codified/explicit knowledge. Distinctions  
11 between the three classifications of organizational knowledge are made along a  
12 number of dimensions. Defining organizational knowledge as a meta-resource or  
13 essential condition for specifying strategic significant resources, and  
14 distinguishing between its three shapes lays a foundation for the measurement of  
15 knowledge as a factor of production.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 The distinctions between the three classifications of knowledge, while presented  
36 as being clearly discernible in theory, may be less defined in practice. In practice,  
37 the classification of knowledge in which a specific assemblage of knowledge falls  
38 is dependent on the tacit knowledge being applied by the user. For example, a  
39 software program may be encapsulated to a retail user, but codified to its creator.  
40 The omission of any discussion of this conundrum is the main limitation of this  
41 paper.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## 8.2. Implications for Practitioners and Researchers

An awareness, recognition, and appreciation of the differences between the three shapes of organizational knowledge could help practitioners in four ways. First, an appreciation of the differences between the three shapes of knowledge could assist practitioners in determining the most economic combination of knowledge to use in production. As technology progresses, it may become economical to produce with reduced reliance on lower-intensity tacit knowledge (manual labour, for example) and increased reliance on encapsulated knowledge in combination with higher-intensity tacit knowledge (machine and operator, for example).

Second, an appreciation of the characteristics between the transferability of knowledge could direct practitioners to consider ways to transfer knowledge more effectively within and across organizational boundaries. The need to transfer complex, difficult to articulate, tacit knowledge between internal organizational units may suggest a transfer of personnel between the units. On the other hand, the need to transfer knowledge that is readily codifiable may suggest the implementation of a simpler communication system.

Third, appreciating differences between firms in productive use of tacit, codified, and encapsulated knowledge could assist practitioners in the determination of the most economic location of firm boundaries. Differences in knowledge productivity along a value chain between raw material suppliers and ultimate consumers may suggest that intermediation (for example, by distributors, wholesalers, retailers) may prove beneficial.

1  
2  
3 Finally, an appreciation by practitioners of the distinct shapes of knowledge could  
4 help ensure that value generated in production is appropriated for the firm. In  
5  
6 some cases a firm may be able to maximize profit by licensing codified  
7  
8 knowledge, but in other cases, where the excludability is limited, a firm may be  
9  
10 better off encapsulating and concealing knowledge in a saleable artefact.  
11  
12

13  
14  
15 For knowledge management researchers, it becomes important to move beyond  
16  
17 the dichotomous tacit/explicit paradigm and recognize encapsulated knowledge  
18  
19 as a distinct form of organizational knowledge that is neither tacit nor explicit.  
20  
21 Knowledge that is encapsulated is not explicit, but often incomprehensible, to  
22  
23 ultimate consumers who make functional use of it. Encapsulated knowledge  
24  
25 facilitates the retention of complexity that may only be made explicit through  
26  
27 reverse engineering, inspection, or compositional analysis (Choo, 2006). The  
28  
29 identification, distinction, and accentuation of encapsulated knowledge can aid  
30  
31 researchers in better understanding of how firms create value and assist us in  
32  
33 advancing the development of a strategic theory of production using a  
34  
35 knowledge-based view. In congruence with the arguments in the preceding  
36  
37 section, it may therefore be useful to distinguish between non-tacit knowledge  
38  
39 that is codified and observable and non-tacit knowledge that is encapsulated and  
40  
41 not readily observable.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

### 50 *8.3. Limitations to Research and Findings*

51  
52

53  
54 Many others have contributed to the richness of the knowledge-based view of the  
55  
56 firm from related or different perspectives, beyond that which is presented here.  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Limitation of time and space preclude examination of all contributions to KBV.  
4  
5 Some of these seminal works include von Hayek's (1945) assertion that the  
6 economics is a problem of knowledge utilization, and Arrow's (1974) observation  
7 that "the scarcity or information handling ability is an essential feature for the  
8 understanding of... organizational behavior" Other works include those that  
9 discuss the broad topics of knowledge creation (Nonaka, 1994), knowledge  
10 assimilation (Cohen and Levinthal, 1990), and knowledge recombination  
11 (Antonelli *et al.*, 2010, Krafft and Quatraro, 2011, Quatraro, 2011, Saviotti, 2004).  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## References

- Antonelli, C., Krafft, J. and Quatraro, F. (2010), "Recombinant knowledge and growth: The case of ICTs", *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics*, Vol. 21, No. 1, pp. 50-69.
- Argote, L., McEvily, B. and Reagans, R. (2003), "Managing Knowledge in Organizations: An Integrative Framework and Review of Emerging Themes", *Management Science*, Vol. 49, No. 4, pp. 571-82.
- Arrow, K.J. (1974), *The Limits of Organization*, W.W. Norton & Company Inc., New York.
- Arrow, K.J. (2000), "Knowledge as a factor of production", in Pleskovic, B. and Stiglitz, J.E., (Eds) *Annual Conference on Development Economics*, 1999, World Bank, Washington, D.C., pp. 15-20.
- Barney, J.B. (1991), "Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 17, No. 1, pp. 99-120.
- Becker, G.S. and Murphy, K.M. (1992), "The Division of Labor, Coordination Costs, and Knowledge", *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 107, No. 4, pp. 1137-60.
- Boisot, M.H. (1998), *Knowledge Assets: Securing Competitive Advantage in the Information Economy*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Bollinger, A.S. and Smith, R.D. (2001), "Managing organizational knowledge as a strategic asset", *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 8-18.
- Choo, C.W. (1998), *The Knowing Organization: How Organizations Use Information to Construct Meaning, Create Knowledge, and Make Decisions*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Choo, C.W. (2002), *Information Management for the Intelligent Organization: The Art of Scanning the Environment*, American Society for Information Science and Technology, Medford.
- Choo, C.W. (2006), *The Knowing Organization*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Choo, C.W. and Bontis, N. (Eds) 2002, *The Strategic Management of Intellectual Capital and Organizational Knowledge*, Oxford University Press, New York.

- 1  
2  
3 Cohen, W.M. and Levinthal, D.A. (1990), "Absorptive Capacity: A New  
4 Perspective on Learning and Innovation.", *Administrative Science*  
5 *Quarterly*, Vol. 35, No. 1, pp. 128-52.  
6  
7  
8 Cowan, R., David, P.A. and Foray, D. (2000), "The Explicit Economics of  
9 Knowledge Codification and Tacitness", *Industrial and Corporate Change*,  
10 Vol. 9, No. 2, pp. 211-53.  
11  
12  
13 David, P.A. and Foray, D. (2002), "An introduction to the economy of the  
14 knowledge society", *International Social Science Journal*, Vol. 54, No. 171,  
15 pp. 9-23.  
16  
17  
18 Demsetz, H. (1988), *Ownership, Control, and the Firm*, Basil Blackwell Ltd.,  
19 Oxford.  
20  
21 Demsetz, H. (1991), "The Theory of the Firm Revisited" in Williamson, O.E. and  
22 Winter, S.G. (Eds) *The Nature of the Firm: Origins, Evolution, and*  
23 *Development*. Oxford University Press, New York.  
24  
25  
26 Dierickx, I. and Cool, K. (1989), "Asset Stock Accumulation and Sustainability of  
27 Competitive Advantage", *Management Science*, Vol. 35, No. 12, pp. 1504-  
28 11.  
29  
30  
31 Drucker, P. (1993), *Post-Capitalist Society*, HarperCollins, New York.  
32  
33 Eisenhardt, K.M. and Santos, F.M. (2002), "Knowledge-Based View: A New  
34 Theory of Strategy?" in Whittington, R. (Ed.) *Handbook of Strategy and*  
35 *Management*. SAGE Publications, London.  
36  
37  
38 Felin, T. and Hesterly, W.S. (2007), "The Knowledge-Based View, Nested  
39 Heterogeneity, and New Value Creation: Philosophical Considerations on  
40 the Locus of Knowledge", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 32, No.  
41 1, pp. 195-218.  
42  
43  
44 Goh, S.C. (2002), "Managing effective knowledge transfer: an integrative  
45 framework and some practice implications", *Journal of Knowledge*  
46 *Management*, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 23-30.  
47  
48  
49 Gorga, É. (2007), "Knowledge Inputs, Legal Institutions and Firm Structure:  
50 Towards a Knowledge-Based Theory of the Firm", *Northwestern*  
51 *University Law Review*, Vol. 101, No. 3, pp. 1123-206.  
52  
53  
54 Grant, R.M. (1996), "Toward a knowledge-based theory of the firm", *Strategic*  
55 *Management Journal*, Vol. 17, No. Winter Special Issue: Knowledge and  
56 the Firm, pp. 109-22.  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Grant, R.M. (2002), "The Knowledge-Based View of the Firm" in Choo, C.W. and  
4 Bontis, N. (Eds) *The Strategic Management of Intellectual Capital and*  
5 *Organizational Knowledge*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.  
6  
7  
8 Hayek, F.A. (1945), "The Use of Knowledge in Society", *American Economic*  
9 *Review*, Vol. 35, No. 4, pp. 519-30.  
10  
11 Hedlund, G. (1994), "A Model of Knowledge Management and the N-Form  
12 Corporation", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 15, No. Special Issue:  
13 Strategy: Search for New Paradigms, pp. 73-90.  
14  
15  
16 Heiman, B.A. and Nickerson, J.A. (2004), "Empirical Evidence Regarding the  
17 Tension Between Knowledge Sharing and Knowledge Expropriation in  
18 Collaborations", *Managerial and Decision Economics*, Vol. 25, No. 6-7, pp.  
19 401-20.  
20  
21  
22 Kogut, B. and Zander, U. (1992), "Knowledge of the Firm, Combinative  
23 Capabilities, and the Replication of Technology", *Organization Science*,  
24 Vol. 3, No., pp. 383-97.  
25  
26  
27 Krafft, J. and Quatraro, F. (2011), "The dynamics of technological knowledge:  
28 from linearity to recombination" in Antonelli, C. (Ed.) *Handbook on the*  
29 *System Dynamics of Technological Change*. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham.  
30  
31  
32 Langlois, R.N. (2001), "Knowledge, Consumption, and Endogenous Growth",  
33 *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, Vol. 11, No. 1, pp. 77-93.  
34  
35  
36 Langlois, R.N. and Robertson, P.L., (1996), "Stop Crying over Spilt Knowledge: A  
37 Critical Look at the Theory of Spillovers and Technical Change", University  
38 of Connecticut, Department of Economics, August 1996  
39  
40  
41 Lee, D.R. 1991. *The Perpetual Assault on Progress*. St. Louis: Center for the  
42 Study of American Business, Washington University in St. Louis.  
43  
44  
45 Lewin, P. and Phelan, S.E. (2000), "An Austrian Theory of the Firm", *Review of*  
46 *Austrian Economics*, Vol. 13, No. 1, pp. 59-79.  
47  
48  
49 Lippman, S.A. and Rumelt, R.P. (1982), "Uncertain Imitability: An Analysis of  
50 Interfirm Differences in Efficiency under Competition", *Bell Journal of*  
51 *Economics*, Vol. 13, No. 2, pp. 418-38.  
52  
53  
54 Nelson, R. and Winter, S.G. (1982), *An Evolutionary Theory of Economic*  
55 *Change*, Belknap Press, Cambridge.  
56  
57  
58 Nonaka, I. (1994), "A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation",  
59 *Organization Science*, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 14-37.  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 Nonaka, I. and Takeuchi, H. (1995), *The Knowledge Creating Company: How*  
5 *Japanese Companies Create the Dynasties of Innovation*, Oxford University  
6 Press, New York.  
7

8  
9 Osterloh, M. and Frey, B.S. (2000), "Motivation and Knowledge Transfer",  
10 *Organization Science*, Vol. 11, No. 5, pp. 538-50.  
11

12 Penrose, E.T. (1959), *The Theory of the Growth of the Firm*, Basil Blackwell,  
13 Oxford.  
14

15  
16 Pfaffmann, E. "How Does a Product Influence the Boundaries of the Firm?: A  
17 Competence-based Theory of Vertical Integration and Co-operation", in  
18 *DRUID Summer Conference on Competence, Governance, and*  
19 *Entrepreneurship*, June 9-11 1998 Bornholm, Denmark, pp. 32.  
20

21  
22 Pfaffmann, E. (2000), "Knowledge Maturity, Modularity, and the Vertical  
23 Boundaries of the Firm" in Mahnke, V. (Ed.) *Competence, Governance,*  
24 *and Entrepreneurship - Advances in Economic Strategy Research*. Oxford  
25 University Press, Oxford.  
26

27  
28 Polanyi, M. (1966), *The Tacit Dimension*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.  
29

30 Polanyi, M. (1969), *Knowing and Being: Essays by Michael Polanyi*, Routledge,  
31 London.  
32

33  
34 Quatraro, F. (2011), "Knowledge Structure and Regional Economic Growth: The  
35 French Case" in Libecap, G.D. and Hoskinson, S. (Eds) *Entrepreneurship*  
36 *and Global Competitiveness in Regional Economies: Determinants and*  
37 *Policy Implications*. Emerald Group, Bingley.  
38

39  
40 Robinson, J.V. (1933), *The Economics of Imperfect Competition*, Macmillan,  
41 London.  
42

43  
44 Romer, P.M. (1990), "Endogenous Technological Change", *Journal of Political*  
45 *Economy*, Vol. 98, No. 5, Part 2, pp. S71-S102.  
46

47  
48 Romer, P.M. (1993), "Economic Growth" in Henderson, D.R. (Ed.) *The Fortune*  
49 *Encyclopedia of Economics*. Warner Books.  
50

51 Saviotti, P.P. (1998), "On the dynamics of appropriability, of tacit and of codified  
52 knowledge", *Research Policy*, Vol. 26, No. 7-8, pp. 843-56.  
53

54 Saviotti, P.P. (2004), "Considerations about the Production and Utilization of  
55 Knowledge", *Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics*, Vol. 160,  
56 No. 1, pp. 100-21.  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4 Schulz, M. and Jobe, L.A. (2001), "Codification and Tacitness as Knowledge  
5 Management Strategies: An Empirical Exploration", *Journal of High*  
6 *Technology Management Research*, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 139-65.  
7  
8  
9 Simon, H.A. (1999), "The Many Shapes of Knowledge", *Revue d'Économie*  
10 *Industrielle*, Vol. 88, No. 2e trimestre, pp. 23-39.  
11  
12  
13 Spender, J.-C. (1996), "Organizational Knowledge, Learning and Memory: Three  
14 Concepts in Search of a Theory", *Journal of Organizational Change*  
15 *Management*, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 63-78.  
16  
17  
18 Starbuck, W.H. (1992), "Learning by Knowledge-Intensive Firms", *Journal of*  
19 *Management Studies*, Vol. 29, No. 6, pp. 713-20.  
20  
21 Teece, D.J. (1996), "Firm organization, industrial structure, and technological  
22 innovation", *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, Vol. 31, No. 2,  
23 pp. 193-224.  
24  
25  
26 Teece, D.J. (1998), "Capturing Value from Knowledge Assets", *California*  
27 *Management Review*, Vol. 40, No. 3, pp. 55-79.  
28  
29  
30 Teece, D.J. (2000), "Strategies for Managing Knowledge Assets: the Role of Firm  
31 Structure and Industrial Context", *Long Range Planning*, Vol. 33, No. 1,  
32 pp. 35-54.  
33  
34 Teece, D.J., Pisano, G.P. and Shuen, A. (1997), "Dynamic capabilities and  
35 strategic management", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 18, No. 7, pp.  
36 509-34.  
37  
38  
39 von Hayek, F.A. (1937), "Economics and Knowledge", *Economica*, Vol. New  
40 Series, 4, No. 13, pp. 33-54.  
41  
42  
43 von Hayek, F.A. (1945), "The Use of Knowledge in Society", *American Economic*  
44 *Review*, Vol. 35, No. 4, pp. 519-32.  
45  
46 von Hippel, E. (1988), *The Sources of Innovation*, MIT Press, Cambridge.  
47  
48 Winter, S.G. (1987), "Knowledge and Competence as Strategic Assets" in Teece,  
49 D.J. (Ed.) *The Competitive Challenge: Strategies for Industrial Innovation*  
50 *and Renewal*. Ballinger, Cambridge.  
51  
52  
53 Zack, M.H. (1999), "Managing Codified Knowledge", *Sloan Management Review*,  
54 Vol. 40, No. 4, pp. 45-58.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Zander, U. and Kogut, B. (1995), "Knowledge and the Speed of the Transfer and Imitation of Organizational Capabilities: An Empirical Test", *Organization Science*, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 76-92.

Zollo, M. (1998), *Knowledge Codification, Process Routinization, and the Creation of Organizational Capabilities: Post-Acquisition Management in the US Banking Industry*, Doctoral Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

For Peer Review

**Table 1: Three classifications of knowledge**

Tacit	Codified	Encapsulated	
Knowledge residing in individual brains	Knowledge codified as information	Knowledge embodied in physical artefacts	(Boisot, 1998)
Tacit knowledge	Explicit knowledge	Explicit knowledge (found in artefacts)	(Polanyi, 1966), (Nonaka, 1994), (Choo, 1998)
Know-how	Information	Know-how (nested)	(Kogut and Zander, 1992)

For Peer Review

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Table 2: Classifications of knowledge by perspective

Perspective	Tacit	Codified	Encapsulated
Locus or knowledge substrate (Boisot, 1998, p. 156)	Human mind; "Tacit knowledge probably comes packaged most efficiently in the form of individuals" (Hedlund, 1994, p. 79)	Signs, symbols, codes and display rules	Concealed in an artefact's design and technology; imbedded in machines and other physical technology (Boisot, 1998, p. 156, Gorga, 2007, Grant, 1996, p. 112, Langlois, 2001)
Transfer and diffusion (Choo, 2002, p. 265)	Difficult to verbalize; requires "rich modes of discourse" (Choo, 2002, p. 265) and "physical co-presence" (Boisot, 1998, p. 46); requires some "intimacy and permanence" (Hedlund, 1994, p. 79); costly to diffuse broadly	Easy and low cost transfer and storage; subject to involuntary transfer; requires common 'language'	Speed, extent, and cost of transport all dependent on physical characteristics
Expression	Implicit in action-based skills (Polanyi, 1966) and conversation (Simon, 1999)	Rules, routines and recipes based on a system of symbols (Nelson and Winter, 1982)	Embodied in artefacts (Boisot, 1998, Langlois, 2001); "a tangible product is knowledge in a highly articulated form" (Hedlund, 1994, p. 79)
Acquisition Process	Experiencing and doing, observation and imitation, costly internship and apprenticeship (Nelson and Winter, 1982); "...teachable even though not articulable" (Winter, 1987, p. 171)	Interpretation of signs, symbols, codes, and displays; dependent on IPR regimes	High inherent tradability (Teece, 1998)
Source of Economic Value	Capacity to make intuitive judgements, discoveries and innovations	Informing the interpreter; Low cost replication; non-rivalrous nature (Heiman and Nickerson, 2004, Romer, 1990)	Function of the artefact without requiring substantive knowledge; consumption; appropriability (Demsetz, 1988, Teece, 2000)
Observability	Requires co-location	Limited excludability (Langlois and Robertson, 1996, Saviotti, 1998)	Requires costly experimentation and reverse engineering (Teece <i>et al.</i> , 1997)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For Peer Review

**Table 3: Examples of classified assemblages of knowledge**

Assemblage of Knowledge	Tacit Knowledge	Codified Knowledge	Encapsulated Knowledge
Software program	Tacit knowledge is applied by the programmers writing the software and required by users to employ features encapsulated in the program.	The software program's code may be considered codified knowledge by its creator (and those programmers with the tacit knowledge required to make sense of the code).	Software programs may be classified as encapsulated to users. There is no need for users to understand how the programs are coded, how it accomplishes its tasks, or the language used in its development. The software's economic value to its users is in the circumvention of knowing how to write code and to the programmers in being able to appropriate the fruits of their labour.
Music	Tacit knowledge is applied by musicians making music.	A musical score may be considered codified by those composing it and those able to read it.	A piano may be classified as encapsulated knowledge. How it is constructed to emit certain sounds is hidden from the pianist in the design and functionality of the instrument. The piano's economic value (to a pianist) comes from both not having to know how to build one to enjoy its benefits and (to a piano maker) from being able to sell one's piano building skills.

For Peer Review