

Organizational Memory: A Preliminary Model Based on Insights from Neuroscience

Isabel Ramos, Linda Levine

Corresponding author: iramos@dsi.uminho.pt

The concept of Organizational Memory (OM) has been evolving for decades, drawing upon contributions from psychology, sociology, organizational behavior and information systems. This article presents a model of organizational memory based upon neuroscience and current understanding of human memory (Baddeley, 1997). Human memory is used by analogy and as a metaphor for conceptualizing collective memory. This concept of collective memory, in conjunction with theory on how knowledge is captured and stored by organizations and social groups, comprises the organizational memory model—and its sensory, communicative, cultural, and political components.

If the term memory is also used in an organizational context, then it should be possible to observe functions and dysfunctions similar to those that have been attributed to human memory, particularly with regard to the distributed capabilities of experience encoding and storage as well as recalling past experience.

We begin with a review of the literature that highlights precepts and assumptions associated with the study of organizational memory, identifying those aspects that have been explored separately by researchers (Hirst and Manier, 2008; Rowlinson et al., 2010; Assmann and Czaplicka, 1995; Barnier et al., 2008; Hirst and Manier, 2008; Ricoeur, 2004; Halbwachs, 1992). These studies show that many of the functions of the human memory, such as rapid recognition of external "objects," creation of coherent experiences and storage of autobiographical memories, have been identified in organizations. Similarly, disorders attributed to human memory, for example delusions, false memories and attention deficit, have also been associated with organizations (Girard, 2005; Pollitt, 2000; Othman and Hashim, 2005; Wentworth, 2002).

Recently, much has been said about collective intelligence and the tools to achieve this. However, there is no existing framework for understanding how people collectively and seamlessly, store, reason and apply knowledge to act more intelligently (Ackerman and Halversin, 2004; Lehner and Maier, 2000; Casey and Olivera, 2003; Nevo et al., 2008). Our OM model is intended as a starting point to define a framework that can support the development of information technology tools that can more effectively support organizational

cognition.

In this article, we explore the potential value for this holistic understanding of organizational memory to intervene in organizations more assertively in order to improve systems and the way knowledge is managed—and how it is encoded, stored and retrieved. Suggested next steps for validation studies of the organizational memory model and its implications are offered.

REFERENCES

- ❖ Ackerman, M. and C. Halverson (2004). Organizational memory as objects, processes and trajectories: an examination of organizational memory in use. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work*, 13 (2), pp. 155-189
- ❖ Assmann, J. and Czaplicka, J. (1995). Collective Memory and Cultural Identity. *New German Critique*, pp. 125-133
- ❖ Baddeley, A.D. (1997) *Human memory: Theory and Practice (Revised Edition)*. Hove: Psychology Press.
- ❖ Barnier, A.J., J. Sutton, C.B. Harris and R.A. Wilson (2008). A Conceptual and Empirical Framework for the Social Distribution of Cognition: The Case of Memory'. *Cognitive Systems Research* (Special Issue, 'Perspectives on Social Cognition'), 9(1), pp. 33-51
- ❖ Casey, A. and F. Olivera (2003). Learning from the past: a review of the organizational memory literature. In: *The proceedings of Organizational Learning and Knowledge*, 5th International Conference 30th May – 2nd June, 2003. Lancaster University
- ❖ Girard, J. P. (2005). Taming Enterprise Dementia in Public Sector Organizations. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 18(6), pp. 534-545
- ❖ Halbwachs, M. (1992). *On collective memory*. Edited, Translated, and with an introduction by Lewis A. Coser. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- ❖ Hirst, W. and D. Manier (2008). Towards a psychology of collective memory. *Memory*, 16(3), pp 183-200
- ❖ Lehner, F., and Maier, R. K. (2000). How can organizational memory theories contribute to organizational memory systems? *Information Systems Frontiers*, 2(3/4), pp. 277-298.
- ❖ Nevo, D., Furneaux, B., & Wand, Y. (2008). Towards an evolution framework for knowledge management systems. *Information Technology Management*, 9(4), pp. 233-249
- ❖ Othman, R., and N.A. Hashim (2004). Typologizing Organizational Amnesia. *Learning Organization, The*, 11(3), pp. 273-284
- ❖ Pollitt, C. (2000). Institutional Amnesia: A Paradox of the 'Information Age'? *Prometheus*, 18(1), pp. 5-16
- ❖ Ricoeur, P. (2004). *Memory, history, forgetting*. Translated by Kathleen Blamey and David Pellauer. London: University of Chicago Press
- ❖ Rowlinson, M., C. Booth, P. Clark, A. Delahaye and S. Procter (2010). Social Remembering and Organizational Memory. *Organization Studies*, (31)1, pp. 69-87
- ❖ Wentworth, D.K. (2002). The schizophrenic organization. *Industrial-Organizational Psychologist, The*, 39(4), pp. 39-41