



Worlds

*The Nature of
Work
and Organizational
Transcendence*

Apart

By Douglas Harris, Phd.

This white paper highlights how the nature of work has changed. It explains the urgent need companies have to develop new systems and tools for promoting more effective intellectual work, and presents a model to best develop those systems.

Employees today, are spending increasingly more time performing thinking tasks than doing physical work. Effective Intellectual Work has phenomenal value to the modern organization, and may be the determining factor in organizational survival during the 21st century. Most of the tools and systems used today for managing work do not properly address the needs of the modern organization or its knowledge workers. While these methods are still prevalent they are nonetheless outdated, having been developed to manage an entirely different kind of work than that which is going on in the modern workplace. The need to develop new practices, systems, and tools which are in step with the changing nature of work is paramount to a company's success.

The correct approach to these efforts requires a thorough understanding of how physical work, intellectual work and creative work relate to one and other. A model for understanding these three types of work, "The Nature of Work Matrix" emphasizes the differences between these three types of work and highlights the challenges to the modern manager in conducting them effectively. The natures of physical work and intellectual work are shown to oppose each other until creative work reconciles them. This creative reconciliation overcomes the conflict and is manifest in new understandings and organizational abilities.

The model refers to this as organizational transcendence or the state when an organization is lifted to a higher plane. It can be viewed as a better way of doing its business or gaining the competitive edge. Today, however, organizational transcendence can never be enjoyed for very long. Soon what was new and innovative becomes the competitive norm. Only a serious and enduring commitment to organizational learning will bring about the development and implementation of the right systems and tools. The Nature of Work Matrix is offered as a guide to help those who have made such a commitment.

Worlds Apart

The Nature of Work and Organizational Transcendence

In this unfolding "Idea Economy" there are few who have not yet recognized that the "Nature of Work" is changing. Workers today are spending increasingly more of their time performing thinking tasks than doing physical work. This dramatic shift in work behaviors is changing the modern workplace. Most industry leaders agree that today the pace is faster, the decisions are tougher, and the stakes are higher than ever before. Their company's survival now depends upon them making an unprecedented commitment to accelerating learning and collaboration within their organizations.



Many companies have already experienced some limited success with early knowledge work endeavors, yet, so many of these efforts have fallen short of their potential because they were implemented around the wrong philosophy to begin with. This paper offers a model, which explains the very different natures

of physical work, intellectual work and creative work and suggests a solid foundation for developing successful knowledge work initiatives. If the nature of work has changed, wouldn't it seem right that the tools we use for accomplishing it must also change?

In an article entitled Ideas Rule (Godin, 2000), Seth Godin places this significant change in work behaviors in its historical context. He sees "the first 100 years of our country's history," being about, "who could build the biggest, most efficient farms," the second 100 years, as being about a "race to build efficient factories," then he states, "Welcome to the third



This one is about ideas." The changing nature of work is redefining everything we thought we understood about management and what is of value

to the modern organization. Writing on the changes being faced by the 21st century Corporation, Peter Coy (2000) states that "the industrial economy is giving way to the Creative Economy, and corporations are at another crossroads. They will have to change, dramatically." Coy views these changes as nothing less than a "Darwinian struggle," to adapt most successfully to the unfolding new world.

"At the moment," says Godin, "nobody knows how to build a farm for ideas, much less a factory for ideas. This much we do know: ideas are driving the economy, ideas are making people rich, and most importantly, ideas are changing the world." This kind of talk has been going on for years, but who's getting it?

Apparently company leaders worldwide seem to be getting the message. More than 70% of the Fortune 500 companies have already taken steps to acquire or develop a Chief Knowledge Officer. While the official titles

change, from one organization to the next, the role of the CKO is becoming almost universally understood - help the organization achieve its goals by leveraging knowledge. The question is: How?

Now that the need is known there is no shortage of proposed solutions: Vignette's approach promises it will "Turn on Your Brain." Novell would like you to attend its annual Brain Share Seminar guaranteed to "Swell Your Thinking." J.D. Edwards is currently preaching "Collaborate and Thrive," a variation on its earlier message of "Collaborate or Die." Seibel is offering "Intelligent Intelligence," and SAS the "Power to Know." Through all of this recent rhetoric IBM formidably clings to its almost age old admonition of "Think," while Apple defiantly retorts, "Think Different." Who will emerge as the definitive leader in showing the world how effective intellectual work occurs and how it can happen within organizations in a routine and robust way?

At Gartner's annual IT expo symposium French Caldwell (Caldwell 2001) predicted the initial shakeout will take place by 2006 when all of the "knowledge management hype" will subside. Then, Caldwell says KM will be "accepted as a valid academic and business discipline, with formal certifications, credentials and proven practices." By this same time, he believes the percentage of knowledge workers will more than double dramatically increasing the demand for, as well as a short supply of, competent knowledge workers.

Diane Morello (Morello 2001) writing on how to "Tap into the Top Talent" believes that market savvy knowledge workers will turn the tables on employment interviewing, such that by 2004 more than 40% of potential employers will miss their recruitment goals by a substantial margin (Morello 2001). By 2005 she is predicting an 80% likelihood that 60% of innovation focused knowledge workers will use "Cultural Fit" as the primary reason for accepting or declining an employment opportunity. She says they will be looking for environments which have already shifted from the "command and control thinking," to one of "leadership and collaboration," and where there is a continuing commitment to improving that environment with systems, and tools which better "support and enhance their (the knowledge worker's) value contribution."

In his article, the Future of Collaboration, Simon Hayward (Hayward, 2001) warns that 60% of the investments companies make in such collaborative projects will fail to achieve the anticipated benefits due largely to an insufficient consideration for "people processes." So, how can leaders evaluate the myriad solutions being offered? What criteria can be used to insure investments in KM actually accomplish that for which they are intended?

The KM industry is still plagued by many such difficult questions, most of which are posed by its vehement critics and skeptics. For these, the tried and true management practices of yesteryear will continue to take preference over what they perceive may be just another pop-management fad. For some, the

notion of trying to manage an unstructured, free flowing, egalitarian work force is a frightening proposition. This is especially true if you are the person held accountable, to the shareholders, for quarterly results.

It's hard to let go of what has worked in the past, when so much is riding on each decision. Certainly, there is cause for concern. Which organizational leader, today, hasn't observed a variety of ebbs and flows in management theory? Who hasn't observed a near endless stream of the "same old thing," packaged just a little differently? Is KM just a fad? Will it be replaced? The message of the current KM movement is unequivocal - It's here to stay.

Most of the KM pioneers and current visionaries are in agreement. Modern industry is facing a watershed change, which will dramatically affect the pecking order of the world's organizational landscape. As expressed by Peter Coy (2000) "The attributes," which made companies and managers, "ideal for the 20th century, could cripple them in the 21st." So, what exactly is it that has changed? What exactly is it that leaders need to learn to adapt to in the unfolding new world?

The competitive edge, which leaders seek for their companies, will be a direct result of how fast they can get their people to learn, and apply and adapt what they have learned to the ever increasing complexities of an accelerated world of knowledge. The computer, once touted as a device which would make companies less dependent upon people, has had just the opposite effect. The world of information,

beget the world of knowledge, which has now in turn begat the world of ideas. The world of ideas is a very human place.

People, are phenomenally well equipped to take the raw knowledge of organized data and leap to the discovery of an entirely novel idea. People, with their myriad diversities, can apply novel ideas, in seemingly limitless ways. People afford society, not only the ability to learn, but the ability to teach. Aristotle once criticized the value, to the world, of an athlete who could jump just a little bit higher than all others, by asking "how would the world be better?" He then suggested that a man who could conceive and share a new idea with others had the power to alter the whole world. What leaders need to focus on now, more than ever before, is the question, "How do I help my people learn and apply what they have learned for organizationally beneficial purposes?"

Learning makes the world new. One amazing property of learning is that it has the ability to edit, and update all of our preconceptions, making the whole world new again. While excellent examples can be found from all facets of life experience perhaps the easiest to grasp are from industry. Consider what might have been the popular world view before and after the following inventions, each of which were developed upon world altering innovations: written language, the printing press, the steam engine, the electric light, the internal combustion engine, photography, penicillin, the telephone, radio, airplanes, television, xerography, the computer, the satellite, or the Internet.

Each of these inventions had the ability to expand the popular world view. Things which were considered impossible before were made common place after. Questions which could not even have been imagined before the discovery seem to burst forth after, from the minds of many, accelerating progressively richer veins of new discovery. It is in this way that learning brings about a transcendence, which many organizations today seek with a passion.

While they may refer to it as innovation they are nonetheless seeking

Organizational Transcendence

Aren't they seeking a higher plane, a better way of doing things, a better way of being in business?

The problem with innovation and organizational transcendence is that we have little, if any, predictable access to it. Who will make the discovery? When will it take place? How can we apply it to something useful and practical? Which vein of thought will be the most productive? Can we count on it happening this quarter? Is it something we can budget for, or develop our organizational plans around? Is there a system, which would compel innovation?

In 1948, George De Mestral, an amateur Swiss mountaineer, invented the highly profitable hook and loop fastening system, which he named Velcro. George's discovery occurred after picking burrs from his wool trousers. Wanting to know why they were so sticky, he observed them under a microscope, which

revealed their hooked end. Countless others, for generations, had similarly pulled burrs from their clothing, and perhaps some had even observed the hook on the end of the burr, but what was it that spurred on the desire, in George, to learn and the capacity to innovate? The burr wasn't hiding any mystery. It was there, in plain view, even drawing attention to itself in a most annoying way.

The same could be said of fossil fuels, which were considered the scourge of the landscape. They certainly weren't hiding from us. Long before they were harnessed as a fuel they were stinking up the air, poisoning the ground waters, and in general being a blight of nature. That perception changed rather quickly after just a few world altering discoveries. Once again learning changed the world. That which had once been considered worthless was transformed into that which was precious. In hind sight, there is little disagreement that the world before the refining of fossil fuels and the internal combustion engine was a vastly different world than the one we live in today.

Today, we share a world, where little children secure their running shoes with hook and loop fasteners, and where fossil fuels propel us to the most distant locations across the globe in just a few hours. Just considering a few of the world changing discoveries makes you wonder, "What's going to be next."

Gerhard Mensch (1975) in his book *Stalemate in Technology* cites several examples of key innovations and the time it took

offering. It also requires an educated market place.

In the previous example there is also a need for people who

public of yesteryear was leery of inventions, the public of today anxiously awaits them. Today we live in a world where previously incurable diseases are conquered and hope is always just around the corner. We live in a world of rapid communications in which information and discovery is difficult to keep private.

If organizations don't act quickly and decisively on what they learn they will face the same type of unnecessary failure dramatized by the Xerox Corporation. Confident in the phenomenal profitability it was guaranteed, by strong international patents, Xerox failed to develop several world altering technologies, which were innovated within its famous Palo Alto Research Center. Even though Xerox is recognized as the birthplace of the personal computer, the Ethernet, the mouse interface, and the ink jet printer, other companies went on to profitably develop them into the world altering products they are today. Xerox management was unable to recognize what they had learned. Xerox researchers were unable to recognize, or convey to management, the potential in what they had discovered. The Xerox fiasco smacks of the same managerial limitations imposed upon that company as those represented in the now classic quote of Digital Equipment's former president, "Who would want a computer in their home?"

Lest we think that it is only a few executives who would ever make such glaring errors we can turn to any current business periodical to find scores of examples of poor thinking, and short sightedness, within normally well run

New Concept	Years Between Innovation and Invention
Photography	111
Gas Heating	95
Electrical Production	92
Aniline Dyes	89
Lead Battery	79
Sodium Carbonate	70
Aluminum	60
Ball Point Pen	50
Aspirin	45
Automatic Drive	35
Helicopter	32
Television	29
Telephone	27
Gasoline Motor	26
Penicillin	19
Xerography	16
Nylon	11
Transistor	10

Table 1: Examples of Key Innovations

for an idea to move from innovation or discovery, to invention or practical use. Several of his examples are cited in table 1.

While he acknowledges many factors, including economic circumstances, political climate and cultural changes that have an affect on this cycle, by far the largest impediment to rolling out new inventions is that of gaining the critical mass necessary to warrant the vast costs associated with bringing the invention to market. This critical mass takes many forms. It may be that an invention like photography needs a chemical industry, a paper manufacturer, and a camera manufacturer, before an idea, which was created in the lab, can be replicated as a viable product

know what to do with a camera and the images it's capable of producing. An 1873 issue of a Boston Newspaper cited by Richardson Bond and Write (1954) published an article entitled, Beware the Inventor. The article castigates a, 46 year old, man named Joshua Coppersmith, and praises the authorities, who arrested him for soliciting investments in the newly formed New York Telephone Company. The article goes on to state "Well informed people know that it is impossible to transmit the human voice over wires as may be done with dots and dashes and signals of the Morse Code, and that were it possible to do so the thing would be of no practical value." Well... that was then, and this is now. The slow cycle of learning and embracing discovery is gone. While the

companies. These organizational ills reflect upon the organization as a whole but most prevalently upon the senior executive. Consider just a few of the headlines taken from Business Week, during the year 2000: Can Compaq Escape from Hardware Hell, Ford ... It's Worse than You Think, Nike - Just do Something, Polaroid's Pain, Razor Burn at Gillette, Sorry Cisco - The Old Answers Won't Work, Can Procter & Gamble Clean up its Act, Lucent - A Large Battleship with Gaping Holes, Sunbeam's Sole Ray of Hope, J.C. Penney's last Chance, Amazon's Go Go Growth - Gone, Delta would Fly Farther without Excess Baggage.

Each of these stories is centered in a dilemma, which must be resolved for the company to thrive. Each of these stories involves a real life drama, of people and systems being led by a senior executive. Each of these stories has associated with it immense costs and pain. The most important common thread to all of these stories, however, is that the solution to each of these problems will occur when the right idea is considered and recognized by those who can empower it to take place. Wouldn't it be nice if there was a way of getting at that idea?

This is the point at which the Knowledge Work Industry should step forth with an answer, a definitive answer, something sure and right. But, has it an answer? If so, how sure is the solution? Will it lead these companies in correct paths or promote a new headline to embarrass the senior officer and the organization as a whole? Can it be implemented throughout the organization or are we constrained to making only small incremental progress in

isolated situations? What does the Knowledge Work Industry really have to offer?

At present the KM industry has five basic approaches to Knowledge Management:

- 1) Intellectual Capital Management
- 2) Process Knowledge
- 3) Information Management and Access
- 4) The Knowledge Workplace
- 5) E- Business.

Simon Hayward (2001) writing for Gartner research acknowledges that Enterprises seeking effective KM solutions through 2004 will be required to integrate multiple products from these various areas of KM as there are no approaches which yet provide a definitive standard for comprehensive Knowledge Work. Wouldn't it seem that the aim of any White Paper addressed to the KM industry should push toward the development and creation of that standard, by critically examining what is presently being offered and suggesting new ways of considering its offerings?

One of the problems with the KM industry is that there are many terms being used, which will become increasingly more important to define, pin down, and to reach consensus on, as to what they mean, and how they will be used. Consider for a moment the term "Knowledge Work Management." At present this term represents an industry label, which implies a false hope - that knowledge work can actually be managed, the way we manage physical work activities. During the industrial economy the measure of success was efficient production. Value was placed upon practices and tools, which

could insure a competitive advantage.

Remember the Hawthorne studies? Management tools were then developed around the notions that physical work was observable, and as such it could be, effectively measured by numbers, interpreted by statistics and managed by authority. Today, however, with work activities consisting more often of thinking tasks than physical tasks there is a definite challenge in promoting this new type of work - intellectual work. Unlike its physical counterpart, intellectual work is not outwardly observable, nor can it truly be performed collectively. It occurs privately within the realm of an individual's thoughts, and as such defies being outwardly managed, counted, or controlled and its greatest value is not in its quantity, but its quality.

Similar problems exist in using the notion of Intellectual Capital as a metaphor for how effective intellectual work occurs. The IC metaphor wrests upon the notion of converting tacit knowledge to explicit knowledge, where explicit knowledge is captured in some sort of interactive database. Another way of looking at it is the process of taking what an individual knows and thinks and converting it to a "bookable" company asset. The metaphor is based upon the hope that individuals within the organization will come to this vault of knowledge and make withdrawals, which will in turn get leveraged for the benefit of the organization, and repaid with interest.

Yet, this approach, based upon knowledge elicitation models and expert systems, still has something

fundamentally wrong with it. It is centered in the activity of capturing knowledge and incarcerating it as information. While great strides have been made in documenting repetitive procedures which certainly benefit organizations, and improve efficiencies this model does little to promote innovation or discovery of the "novel idea." In fact there are many aspects of the IC model that actually inhibit thinking. The implied notion that what a person knows can be captured to any significant level in a static database is itself personally insulting.

Give me an hour and tell me all you know. In addition, documenting, archiving and organizing such vast quantities of data, hoping that IT systems can harvest them by employing the use of sophisticated algorithms is a daunting and expensive undertaking. While the industry is to be commended for starting here, it must begin to recognize that the IC model is but another baby step towards effective organizational learning. If a comprehensive model is needed to provide organizations and leaders with what they truly need to thrive in this idea economy, what should go into it? How would it be developed? How would we recognize its value?

Any model, which would attempt to propose such a comprehensive approach to intellectual work, should not be developed in a vacuum. It should be based on solid research and should work in practice as well or better than it works in theory. It should take into consideration myriad diversities, of the people and the organizations it serves, as well as the variety of ways in which they work. It should be adaptable to

the dynamics of an unfolding future and be based upon concepts, which are intuitively obvious.

It should be a model, which makes infinite sense to us and supports the needs of the executive as well as the worker. It is precisely that type of model, which is being presented here. I suppose it will fall to great scrutiny and may be subject to criticism for it has set out an ambitious objective, but once comprehended it has the ability to suggest and refine, tailor and implement truly effective practices for accomplishing the goals of an organization as a whole and all of the individuals who comprise it.

When I consider how the nature

The Nature of Work

of work has changed I find myself reflecting on my grandfather, who has become, for me, somewhat of a personal icon of the physical worker of past generations. He was a large man, of tremendous physical power. I recall vividly his broad shoulders, thick wrists and iron grip. He ate four meals every day, the largest of which was just before going to bed. He rose early every morning and for all but the last few years of his life he would work until after dark.

For him and most men and women of his generation "work" was comprised primarily of physical tasks. During his 92 years he turned his hand at various occupations including farming, construction, and mining. While I initially place emphasis on the physical work he performed, in fairness to Grandpa, he also prided himself on working smart; it was what he

believed kept him in demand. Nonetheless, when Grandpa said he'd had a "long hard day," it was his muscles, which ached, and sleep came easy. Doesn't it seem to be just the opposite today?

The shift in work behaviors we observe today is not centered in how we as humans are equipped to conduct work, but in how the tasks have changed. The modern knowledge worker does not perform intellectual work to the exclusion of physical work. There is always a need to produce some type of physical work product, usually in the form of a document, like: a design, a specification, an RFP, a blue print, an application, a proposal, a plan, a program, or presentation. To the modern knowledge worker, however, the amount of effort and time given to the thinking facet of producing that document is predominant.

The two biggest tasks facing today's knowledge workers are, first generating the right idea, and second expressing it. The right response to an RFP gets the business. The right design specification scoops the competition. The right presentation gets the research grant. The right application gets FDA approval. Yet, without the expression of the idea there is no beneficial result. How is the world improved if a person considers the right idea, but never expresses it? What value is created if the right ideas aren't shared with those who have the power to see them enacted? Which is more important, generating the idea or getting the results?

If today's leaders are to achieve the results they seek they must

begin to appreciate, equally, the value of both intellectual work and its physical work counterparts. They must empower and accelerate the rate of both types of work, such that the right ideas are continuously being conceived and expressed as some tangible and beneficial product. To do this they face an immense challenge because physical work and intellectual work are not only different from one and other, but their very natures are actually opposed to each other.

This suggests that what motivates the one, inhibits the other, and that which empowers the one disengages the other. To give it an image suggestive of the immense conflict between these two different types of work, consider the fictitious Dr. Doolittle's "Push-Me Pull-You," a llama-like animal comprised of two heads and fronts, where each head is facing the opposite direction. Now place a sign around each of the necks. On one write "Intellectual Work," and on the other "Physical Work." Now, how does such an animal move ahead? Which way is ahead? It's no wonder why management theory itself is so fractured on the subject, with both advice and criticism abounding.

Unsure executives tend to stay the course of proven practices than stray into the uncharted territories of popular management theory. For example, I haven't met an executive yet who really feels comfortable with "Chaos" being anything more than a theory. The "real world," realities are just too compelling for them to try something, which can't prove certain results this quarter. Can business leaders stay the current

course, or are they going to have to change? What of these opposing natures of physical and intellectual work, will they compel a different way of doing things?

Consider the Nature of Work Matrix, a model, which presents: the ways in which Physical Work and Intellectual Work oppose each other. It explains how the behaviors of these two different types of work actually pull away from each other, stretching apart the fabric, which holds the known world in place. It explains how this pulling apart creates a tear between the present known world and the hoped for future. As the tear is expanded and the conflict intensifies a large void between the two perspectives is created. Only when the void is sufficiently large can the real magic of creative discovery rush in and fill the breach with a new type of understanding.

This understanding has the ability to envelop both the attributes of the old physical world and the hopes of the imagined intellectual world, creating, as it were, an entirely new world, at peace, reconciled, unified and transcendent. The model explains the vital importance of both the physical work realm of shared reality and the need to explore the unknown realms of new ideas. It suggests that limitless discovery awaits those who are willing to endure the conflict, permit the breach and enjoy the emergence of continuous epiphany. When we discover this bridge to discovery, we begin to appreciate the essential role which conflict plays in learning. The conflict we would normally avoid is actually the catalyst in creating space for transcendent thought.

The model proposes a framework for effective physical and intellectual work within an accelerated world and poses several questions. How fast do you want your organization to learn? How much conflict is your organization equipped to sustain? Have you grasped the idea, that the transcendent world you seek is already a reality, but one, which you haven't yet made room for? Is it uncomfortable for you, to think in this way? Does this notion seem out of place, in the world, which you have come to know and trust? Might the conflict you feel reinforce the notion that learning requires the creation of a gap in understanding?

These are difficult questions, but all learning is uncomfortable. Consider how children present us with a marvelous model of how an organization learns. Children have an insatiable appetite for discovering the world. Infants are constantly testing hypotheses about what something feels and tastes like. Toddlers observe and explore their environment and practice techniques for operating within it. Children learning to speak experiment with language in combining words in novel and ingenious ways to effect change in their world. Children are constantly asking questions, unashamed of not knowing, fully expecting they will receive an answer. Children revere their teachers and are willing to accept their teachings. Once they possess reading skills, they passionately devour knowledge from books. In their teens they tirelessly test the boundaries imposed upon them. Is it hard, to consider this topic of how children learn, in a White Paper whose primary audience is comprised of highly motivated, successful

business leaders? Are you wondering how this could possibly apply to you?

Well, here is the interesting distinction we must come to appreciate in any quest for learning. It is a distinction between what children exemplify and what adults disdain. Consider how everything internalized by a child reinforces their need to learn as well as their capacity to learn. At first they don't even know how to eat, or move their hands. They are totally dependent upon others. Their early social context is one entirely dominated by adults and filled with an increasing number of foreboding new experiences. Yet, in all of this they gain confidence in their ability to learn.

Mistakes lead to successes. Which normally functioning child will repetitively touch the hot stove? The attitude of a child is one of humility and appreciation for those who can show the way. Most adults, conversely, suppose themselves to have achieved a certain, supremacy of stature in life, superior to that of children. To sustain this false notion they become content to seek only those experiences at which they feel adept, avoiding any situation, which does not reinforce their sense of competency and superiority. Hence there is little in the outward world which would suggest their need to learn, or that there might be anything worth learning, of interest to them. For so many, as soon as they have obtained a position in the world sufficiently comfortable, to their personal liking, they stop learning and stop engaging in situations, activities, tasks, social encounters, entertainment or discourse which would require them to be at risk in any way, or

suggest they have any need to learn. Does this sound like any of the people you know?

How many of our modern workers are complacently riding along on the organizational momentum created by others who were willing to endure the conflict necessary to learn, discover and create? What would your organization be like if managers felt their role was one of provoking and unsettling the complacency of their workers by constantly suggesting that there are things unknown which must be learned, essential to the organization's survival? What changes would take place in your company if all of your workers found a matter worthy of their passion? What could be accomplished if your organization not only understood the conflict and discomfort necessary to learn, but had systems in place to sustain it and productively channel it?

The Nature of Work Matrix helps create a framework for understanding this conflict and suggests ways in which it can be productively applied to any learning endeavor. The Matrix considers the world from five perspectives: 1st, vision, or how one views the world, 2nd, Action, or the activities one engages in, 3rd, Power, or that which enables the activity, 4th, Motivation, or the reason for doing, and 5th, the manner in which the activity is accomplished. These five views are not suggestive of being all inclusive. They are intended however to provide the individual, who is earnestly seeking understanding, a method for considering myriad ways in which the physical and intellectual realms are associated and to suggest how each of us can easily

access the realm of creative discovery when we are ready for it, by creating a receptive place for the epiphany to fill.

The Nature of Work Matrix is best understood when built one block at a time, until the whole has been completely unfolded. As you consider these ideas, ask yourself questions, which will help the concepts to become familiar to you. Allow the answers to these questions to come from your own personal experience. Does this idea seem correct? Have I experienced this? Is this how it is in my company? What do these ideas cause me to think? What am I feeling as I consider these ideas? What conflicts am I experiencing which could be alleviated if I could only learn the correct answer? How might these ideas apply to every facet of my life?

Vision

The term "existency," suggests that we consider the physical realm to be the realm of reality.

conventional thinking, and as such allows us a power to predict expected results. If I act a certain way, or say a certain thing a predictable outcome will occur. It

seems to be like and the vision of what it could be ... if only. Have you ever seen things different than the others around you? Were you aware, at the time, of how unsafe the environment was, how unpopular your view, and how disapproving others might be at your sharing a view different from theirs?

Were you in some way constrained to keep you ideas to yourself because you could in some way predict what pejorative consequences might

follow from being in discord with those around you?

Those who are truly engaged in learning, constantly experience this disparity. They are continuously waiting for others to catch up. Gingerly, and tentatively, they suggest, and stretch the views of others as much as they dare. They learn to walk a fine line between going on in the directions and interests which have consumed their attention and in giving up that which holds their passion and interest in a desire to maintain the peace and accord of those who are not engaged in thinking the same way.

On one hand the known realm is so much easier and less threatening, but conversely the longer one stays limited in the Existent world the more mundane and quotidian it becomes. The Existent realm is one comprised day in and day out of the "same old grind," while the realm of possibility is fresh and enticing albeit extremely elusive. It is not difficult for most to recall comments like, "get your head

	The Physical Work Realm	The Intellectual Work Realm
Vision	Existency (forgive the literary License*) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Familiar ▫ Shared ▫ Observable ▫ Answers <i>Our present way of being</i>	Possibility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Strange ▫ Unique ▫ Imagined ▫ Questions <i>Our hope of becoming</i>

*Once while presenting this paper I was informed by a listener that the correct word was "existence," not existency – I chose, nonetheless, to retain the use the latter contrived word, which I feel better expresses the nature of the existent state and as you will soon understand it just fits better into the model.

We have little difficulty accepting it as the "real world," because it is anchored to the space, which we share with others. Within the existent realm we find a high level of agreement between ourselves, and others as to how we collectively perceive the world. Descriptive terms have a high level of congruency from one user to the next. "That is a black dog." "Yes, that is a black dog."

The existent realm is one based on that which is known. In most companies, great expense and efforts are made to train "new hires" so that they can share a common view of the world, the company goals and the way the company will go about achieving them. The existent world reflects

is a wonderful reassuring world in which the successful application of our knowledge results in predictable outcomes. To this extent, that which is familiar, and understood by others becomes that which is real. Wouldn't the world be a different place if what we knew and understood put us at odds with the rest of the people we had to associate with every day?

The Intellectual realm however, is one, which is primarily a realm of unproven ideas. Mere notions, which suggest the possibility that the world is in fact other than we presently conceive it to be. Every great visionary has faced the challenge of extending a new world view to others who were not initially ready to receive it. In the realm of Possibility we imagine the world to be different, frequently better in some regard. As Possibility is empowered progressive notions can be supposed and postulated which challenge the accepted concepts of the shared physical world.

These ideas begin to create a disparity between what the world

out of the clouds," or "that's well and fine in theory, but here in the real world..." Sometimes I wonder, "How many world altering events have to take place before the common sociality of the Existent realm embraces the idea that unlimited new realms of thought can be manifest as reality, as soon as we are prepared to receive them?"

The physical work realm is observable. Tangible artifacts can be pointed to as evidence of its reality. This observable nature of physical work is what has made us so very productive. We can count the units of production, and schedule inventories to arrive at just the right time. A single ratio can report the production activity of an entire division to the president of the company. At a glance we can know if a department is tracking or deviating from its plan.

In industry almost every activity can be equated to digits of cost and the benefits of any given action can be similarly equated to the bottom line, in black and white. When we all view the world in the same way, there is great harmony and accord. If you look at the numbers, it's impossible to disagree. The number will always reflect accurately that which was accurately counted. But humans live in both a physical realm and a realm of thought, and within the thought realm there can be multiple meanings which merit consideration. A simple number could suggest myriad causes and effects. There are valid scientific reasons why statistics are said to be inferential only. So, how do ideas and intellectual work get introduced to the physical work realm? How do leaders evaluate the benefits to the organization,

of a person or group of people, who are engaged in unexpressed intellectual activities?

This is one of the biggest challenges to the intellectual skunk-works existent in many high tech companies. There is hardly a vehicle for ideas to ever make it from the private enclave into the extremely unsafe environment of the physical work place. The farther out the thinking the less able the thinkers are to reach back to those still anchored in the Physical Work Realm.

Consider for a moment a highly specialized expert like those who write computer code. If you are a novice computer user it will be difficult at best for these experts to explain to you what exactly they do. The more expert one becomes the less accessible one's ideas become to non-experts. If an expert is permitted to continuously move further and further away from the shared world, we risk never being able to benefit from that which the expert learns.

The physical work realm is one in which the novel ideas of the one must find an expression before they will ever become the accepted and shared reality of the others. How far out should we allow our cutting edge thought to go, before we rein in back in? What systems and procedures do we have for encouraging new thinking? What means have we put in place for valuing the deviant thinker? Can we recognize value in reasonable people who are engaged in considering ideas, which seem unreasonable? Is accepting the notion of ignorance to other possibilities so uncomfortable that we stifle our own growth?

Another critical way in which Physical Work differs from Intellectual Work is that Physical Work is all about having and knowing answers. In the Physical Work Realm we do, what we know how to do. Conversely in the Intellectual Work Realm, having questions is of primary importance. Its a realm of wondering, which seems to fly in the face of those anchored to the Physical World where there is little benefit in doing anything but staying on task. With just a little experience most people who become engaged in learning discover its a lot more interesting to be asking than it is to be telling. What do people think of you, when you tell something? What do they think of you when you ask them for their opinion?

The Physical Work Realm is a reflection of our present way of being, while the Intellectual Work Realm is a realm where we explore our hopes and dreams. Wouldn't it seem reasonable that both have an important and essential place in this unfolding era of ideas? Wouldn't it be important for both to inform the other? How, shall we reconcile the need for common understanding and the disparate ideas of our explorative pioneers?

Action

We have just discussed how Physical Work is performed to achieve an expected result, one, which we can rely upon, and how Intellectual Work is involved in exploring the unknown where there is no certainty in the value of our efforts.

Not only is the aim of these two types of work different but, also the activities and behaviors for performing them. Since there is such a high level of agreement as to the nature of the Physical Work Realm there is also a high level of agreement as to what needs to be done.

It is a realm of Necessity, where we expect benefits from our labors. If we plant, we expect to harvest. If we harvest we expect to eat. Most would understand the necessity of such pragmatic action. In one sense the Realm of Necessity is quite comfortable. Within this realm that which is expected of us has already been determined. There really isn't any need to think about it or question it.

The only need within the Physical Work Realm is to do that which has already been decided upon. In one sense it's much easier to get by in the Physical Work Realm. Life will be great so long as you don't make any waves, stay on task, and do only that which is in your job description. Remember "Ours is not to question why, ours is but to do or

die." But vehemently pitted against this type of behavior is the core behavior of the Intellectual Work Realm - constant questioning. Intellectual Work

it not produced countless benefits?

We must give the Physical Work Realm its due. Truly the idea

	The Physical Work Realm	The Intellectual Work Realm
Action	<p>Necessity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Pragmatic ▫ Limitations ▫ Mundane ▫ Required <p><i>Our present way of doing</i></p>	<p>Discovery</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Questioning ▫ Challenging ▫ Testing ▫ Experimenting <p><i>Other ways of doing</i></p>

activities are centered in challenging the known, and the status quo. What would it be like if buildings could be built from the roof down? What would it be like if you could hurl ink through the air and have it land on the page just where you wanted it? Intellectual Work revels in debate and testing hypotheses. Much of what is done in the realm of Discovery, however, is interpreted as criticism, and complaining, in the Physical Work Realm.

The natural brand of a maverick is "You're just not being a team player." Those who have conceived a better way and choose to investigate it will always find themselves engaged in an uphill battle with those who remain anchored to the Physical Realm of Necessity: "Why are you doing, this?" "Can't you just fly straight?" "Everyone else sees it this way, why don't you just let go of it?" Yet, today we live in a world where roof trusses are built at the same time foundations are being poured, where ink jet printers hurl ink through the air to land on the page in intelligent patterns. Should we be so critical of the Physical Work Realm? Has

economy could never have evolved without the infrastructure of the Physical Work Realm. Today, we enjoy the luxury of accelerated learning largely due to the fact that essential life supporting functions are built into our modern society. Almost every major industry makes an essential contribution to the expanding idea economy. If it weren't for highly specialized producers none of us would have the time to consider anything beyond obtaining for ourselves the most basic necessities of life, which in times past was the primary full time job for most people.

The industrial economy promised the world a better life, one of culture, arts and education, learning and refining of the human kind. Yet, relatively few have actually availed themselves of the opportunity created. What we have observed is the phenomenal momentum of production has not liberated the masses at all, but merely promoted an equally insatiable appetite for consumption. This in turn has created a realm of real limitations, and finite quantities,

where multiple interests are constantly competing for the resources necessary to sustain them. This competition has begat multiple dysfunctional behaviors, but ones we seem presently powerless to overcome. This is especially true within commercial enterprise where the Physical Work Place is frequently an environment where that which what we do each day is influenced by overly ambitious goals, unreasonable expectations, limited resources, performance pressures, and where chronic crisis management perpetuates inordinate levels of stress for just about everybody.

It is a space in which political agendas, personal prejudice, and self-serving interests can impair judgment, diminish efforts and usurp fairness. Have you ever found yourself vying for budgetary support? Have you ever been told, "I'm sorry but our hands are tied"? Have you ever watched on as the right thing was pushed aside in favor of the seemingly expedient thing?

The Physical Work Realm is steeped in its own myths and history, an outward manifestation of the organizational mind-set and its accepted standards. Those willing to ponder and suppose a better way may try suggesting how it could be different. Regardless of whether their vision is met with resistance, apathy or support the challenge in overcoming the inertia of the Physical Work Place always seems too heavy to move

very far. What we think we are impairs what we believe we can be, and what we think we are is a reflection of what we do. In this way, our behavior is constantly informing us who we are. If we continue to do the "same old, same old," we will never grow. How do we break the pattern of compliance? How long do we embrace the accepted standard before we raise the bar? How can people of vision get their ideas out to those who haven't even begun to question?

The Physical Work Realm is one, which reflects our present way of doing things while the Intellectual Work Realm is constantly testing other ways of doing things. In some ways it seems so much easier to stay just where we are, with what we know and understand. Don't you wonder what there is for you and your company to learn if you could merely facilitate the right questioning and exploration? How might life really be better?

Power

Physical work responds exceptionally well to the notion of authority. The laborer does what the boss says to do.

doesn't know what to do, the question moves on up to the boss's boss and so on until an answer has been received. Decisions for many are made by the few, who are in the know. This model worked much better when managers knew more about the work than the workers they supervised. Today that is infrequently the case, as knowledge workers become increasingly more specialized. Today managers are selected for their skills in organization, communication and leadership.

More often than not they oversee work that is understood by them only at the abstract level. In order to succeed they are more dependent on those they supervise than ever before. If you suppose that the modern new knowledge worker hasn't yet grasped this concept, check out the "Clue Train Manifesto," at www.cluetrain.com, a site dedicated to conveying the message that the power base has shifted from those in authority to those in discourse. For them it's only a matter of time, before sweeping changes will flow through industry. But, what type of changes? Can industry learn and

	The Physical Work Realm	The Intellectual Work Realm
Power	<p>Authority</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Control ▫ Responsibility ▫ Jurisdiction ▫ Sovereignty <p>Stewardship</p>	<p>Equality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Fairness ▫ Justice ▫ Impartiality ▫ Equity <p>Agency</p>

Any questions go to the boss and the boss decides. If the boss

adapt in a positive way, or must it be compelled? Aren't the knowledge workers mutually

dependent upon the infrastructure and the organizations, which employ them? What changes would have to occur to create a cooperative environment for both leaders and those who support them?

It used to be that a manager could watch and observe the work, as it was taking place. If a job superintendent asked for a stack of bricks to be moved from here to there, the work could be inspected at the end of the day. There could be little dispute between the superintendent and the laborer, either the bricks were moved or they weren't. The same is not true of Intellectual Work. A manager has no window into the minds of the workers.

Frequently people are brought together for collaborative meetings, in which the manager has little indication of anything that those people attending are actually thinking. They may have a great idea, but for reasons of a personal agenda choose to withhold it. They may be reluctant to share their thinking because the environment is not hospitable enough or just too risky. It just doesn't cut it any more for the manager to state, "I'm the boss you will now give me all of your great ideas."

Workers today don't feel subordinate to authority in the same way as the workers of the industrial era. They feel equal. Is it hubris or the power of the idea, which levels the playing field?

Workers today, recognize something unique about themselves and the ways in which they have patterned the knowledge they have received. They understand the genesis, which permitted them to generate the novel idea to begin with. They perceive their ideas as their own property, regardless of what documents the company may have had them sign at the onset of their employment. Today's knowledge workers may even thumb their nose at authority in an attempt to demonstrate how desperately dependent leaders truly are on the workers.

In fact the most prevalent notion of the KM world is that the idea (the right idea) is supreme, regardless of where it came from. How many times has the now near proverbial example been stated, "Even if it came from the janitor." Yet, we have a long way to go before janitors are empowered sufficiently to contribute any strategically altering ideas to our companies. Doesn't someone still have to make the decisions, set the plan in motion and underwrite the choices made? Aren't leaders and managers equally essential in this new Idea economy? How will their roles change?

In the Physical Work Realm of Authority the stewardship of the boss was paramount, today in the Intellectual Work Realm of Equality the prevalent notion is that of personal agency: the notion of knowledge workers becoming "free agents," like NBA players is, just now hitting the radar nets. The ability to live anywhere, and be connected to those who value your ideas and thinking is a present day reality. What began with tele commuting, is melding into a virtual organization, which can come and go as projects come and go.

People will be looking less for jobs than they will be for ways to apply what they know. Yet, the accountability managers have for achieving results is none diminished. Somebody has to take the lead - don't they? How are managers to contend with all these free flowing, "loosey goosey" organizational models? Could we really empower people to be equal? Would it wreak havoc on our organizations? Is there another way?

Motivation

Physical Work is compelled by Reciprocity, where Intellectual

	The Physical Work Realm	The Intellectual Work Realm
Motivation	Reciprocity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Accountability ▫ Liability ▫ Reprisal ▫ Obligation Fear	Privacy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Anonymity ▫ Passion ▫ Sanctuary ▫ Safety Faith

Work can only flourish in a realm

of Privacy where there is no reciprocity for exploring an idea. The reciprocity of slave labor was very clear, do the work or the taskmaster will whip you. Do or die, is a very clear reciprocity. The reciprocity of earlier generations was so strong that physical work could be coerced.

Today, we may think more that reciprocity suggests a fair days pay for a fair days work. But at the same time we are abundantly aware that reciprocity suggests if you mess up... heads will roll- the idiomatic expression that you will get your head chopped off if you don't perform as expected. These archetypal notions of fear seem to cling to us. In the moving of the bricks example cited above this is the great leverage of the manager. If at the end of the day the bricks have been moved as expected you get a paycheck. If on the other hand they have not been moved you get a pink slip.

This may work well with physical work tasks, where there is a high level of agreement between what the manager can observe of the work performed and what the worker can demonstrate of the work performed. How can you argue with results? At the end of the day both manager and worker know if the illustrative "bricks" have been moved or not. This is not true with Intellectual Work. Frequently we are asked to provide ideas and despite our best intentions the ideas we share could prove to be either good or bad for the company. If you were placed in such a position what might you do?

Consider the advertising executive who has been given 90 days to come up with an ad campaign which will make the company's product number one in its market.

The executive could rack his/her brain for weeks, go through reams of fodder paper, and finally pitch an idea, which the board of directors approves and funds. Yet, even as the check is being written for all of the advertising billboards, radio and T.V. spots the executive still doesn't know for sure if the "bricks" have been moved. That won't be known till after the resources have been spent. Yet, the reciprocity hangs overhead like a hangman's noose.

Countless high-level executives, placed in a similar position have successfully skirted the dilemma by simply hiring consultants. In the consultant game, everyone knows, "You get what you pay for." If things don't work out, you can always say, "Hey, I hired the very best." The problem with external consultants is they rarely know as much as your own people. The difference is they don't give a damn about reciprocity so long as you pay their fee. Chances are in their favor that the ideas they provide and the activities they perform will pay off, and even if they don't they are only out a contract not a job.

There are plenty of other needy executives. This is not to suggest there is not a valid place for consulting. Often it is the only avenue open to management to obtain an untainted view of what's really going on. The question is, wouldn't it be a lot nicer, and more beneficial if there was a way to obtain that good thinking from within ones own house, from those who are already being paid to do the work?

When you look at what the Physical Work Realm of

Reciprocity has to motivate workers, it almost all boils down to fear. Yes, there is the potential upside for reward and recognition, which is also part of reciprocity, but once someone has been elevated by virtue of reward, promotion and career advancement, increased earnings and the like, the commensurate amount of fear from falling from such a new and lofty level is equally pervasive. For even the highest executives, those written about earlier, those who head the largest companies, the corner office and the salary attached are no protection from "falling from grace."

Each day difficult decisions must be made and with each one the potential for error exists. Executives today need the ideas of their people more than ever before, yet the overwhelming fear of reciprocity looms dangerously over the heads of most of their people. What do leaders have to offer their people as incentive to speak out, to engage, and to contribute? Is there anything, which can overcome the fear of retribution for the wrong idea?

It's not as simple as merely making an anonymous suggestion box. All kinds of anonymous ideas systems have been implemented over the years, in a variety of forms. There is an offset to the Privacy Needs of the modern Knowledge Worker. They also want to be recognized, rewarded and enjoy the fruits of their labors. They want to have their cake and eat it too. Yet, the Knowledge Worker is already equipped for Privacy. They are free to explore any thought with no fear of reprisal, whatsoever, so long as they never express the idea. They can disagree, vehemently with management.

They can return to their homes, families, and buddies at the end of the day and commiserate the horrible state of things at the office. They can know what to do, and lavish their advice on everyone except the person who controls their future within the company.

Privately they can develop their ideas, while on the payroll of their sponsoring company, only to ditch the company later, for the promise of greater rewards in the entrepreneurial arena. What luxury they enjoy, in having another company fund their R&D. Their loyalty to the organization, which feeds them, is only as deep as their moral fiber. Yet, its difficult to be a moral employee, when the organization for which you work is an amoral employer. O.K., if we take away reciprocity, what have we got to manage with? If payment and punishment are out, what's in? Have you ever been able to have your cake and eat it too? What haven't we yet understood?

What motivates today's knowledge worker is passion for discovery. Safe within the privacy of their own minds they can explore any notion, any possible manner of organizing the data. They can develop great and elaborate structures of ideas all unexpressed except to a trusted few. Wouldn't it be nice if the organization, which empowers them to learn, would be included among the trusted? Doesn't an employee, venturing out into the entrepreneurial arena need to acquire all the very infrastructure which is already in place at the

organization which helped provide the incubus for the idea itself?

Wouldn't the company, the employee and society as a whole be benefited, if the ideas generated in house didn't walk out the door to become the new competition? What could prevent that from happening? What could make it such that managers and employees alike had confidence in the essential roles they both play in taking great ideas and producing them in the shared world for the benefit of the organization, the employee and all those who would appreciate their value? If it isn't the fear of reciprocity what is it? What can organizations offer the knowledge worker that will promote their faithful exploration and discovery and the reciprocal sharing of that which they have learned?

already learned about teams and collaboration, this is merely the essential refining of those ideas.

If we are ever to move ahead with effective knowledge work en masse, we must realize that there truly is no "Vulcan Mind Meld." Collaborative thinking is an illusion. Collaborative work is not. We each must of necessity do our own thinking. There is no true collaboration of thinking until that which we are thinking gets expressed in the shared Physical Work Realm. Which realm we have already determined can be immensely unsafe for saying what you actually think. Where and how do we promote collaboration?

A "Barn Raising," is a great example of how collaboration accomplishes that which a single individual could never do alone,

	The Physical Work Realm	The Intellectual Work Realm
Method	Community <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Cooperation ▫ Teamwork ▫ Collective ▫ Cumulative <i>Additive</i>	Autonomy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Individual ▫ Diversity ▫ Extracting ▫ Differentiating <i>Separative</i>

Method

One of the most misunderstood aspects of physical work and intellectual work is this fact; the work product in physical work can be increased by adding people - Its additive in nature - where intellectual work is autonomous, meaning one mind at a time. Now, don't panic. You don't have to forget everything you

regardless of how long that individual worked. If you have ever seen a barn raising you would recall that all of the structure is created with massive timbers on the ground, and then raised in place by hundreds of people who have convened for the day. Early settlers cooperated in this manner to establish agricultural communities. After the count, "One, Two, Three, Pull..." everyone would pull on their ropes

and the walls would come up, slide into place, and be fastened.

In a single afternoon a massive barn would stand where previously there had only been a vacant pad. The manager today can't call out "One Two Three, think," then sit back and wait as ideas spew forth onto the conference table. It just doesn't map on to the old work metaphor, in the same way. Even if you can get people to engage in thinking, how do you get their ideas out of their heads and into the organization where they can be used?

What we are really talking about when we consider Knowledge Work is a type of behavior. Instead of a physical doing, we are seeking to promote an intellectual doing and sharing of that within the physical realm. Behavior is all about what people think. Even dysfunctional behaviors are considered by the person doing the behaving to be rational. We must acknowledge the true diversity of our workforce, but not in the way, which is being popularly taught.

Promoting diversity is divisive. One need only look to countries like Canada and Belgium to see what promoting language diversity has done to their community. While Belgium has suffered through years of Flemish French riots Canada continues to face succession ballots at its national elections. The same is true when we promote diversity within our organizations. The more beneficial approach is anchored in a profound respect for ideas, regardless of the source or from whom they come. Most intellectual work models employed today use a convergent thinking strategy where we seek

early for consensus long before all of the ideas have been explored. This is like the activity of a meeting in which ideas are withheld or repressed then a manager brings closure to the meeting by making a decision to move ahead in the only viable direction manifest during the meeting.

Unfortunately, many alternative ideas, occurring within the privacy of individual minds remain unexpressed and limit the manager's effectiveness. But within the Physical Work Realm there is a real limit placed upon how long you can sit in a meeting. The need to come to a conclusion, make a decision and move forward with whatever plan seems to be frequently a function one's tolerance for sitting in a chair or operating on diminished blood sugar levels. The preferred divergent thinking model gleans ideas from many sources and expresses them within the Physical Work Realm. The question, which continues to elude the KM industry is how?

For those tasks which are additive in nature, we can add bodies, but for tasks which require individual thinking and the myriad diversities of our workforce we have a challenge. Additive processes are easy to facilitate and track. We can calculate how many more hands we need. With thinking work, it is feasible that all but one of the people within a division could have the wrong idea. How do we find the one? Do we have to scrutinize the ideas of all to ferret out the one of value? If it were possible to get all of the ideas on the table, who would be empowered to decide which are the right ideas?

Unlike numeric data, such as the

quantities of production measured in Physical Work, Intellectual Work deals with words, or qualitative data. This is a type of data, which defies compression. You can't sum it up and say 95% feel we should do such and such and go with the majority rule. The very answer you seek could be buried in the 5%. How can executives who want access to the thinking of their people possibly handle the infinite generation of ideas?

Already inundated with e-mail any additional level of input is just more overload, making the situation near hopeless. Recently IBM Corporation hosted a, world-wide, company meeting in which more than 50,000 suggestions were logged in. "We'll be mining this data for years," said a company spokesman who heralded the meeting as a tremendous success. But, some of those ideas would only be timely now, and would need responses now. Some of the ideas could leave the company, get picked up by competitors or lose the timeliness of the opportunity. How does an organization deal with such phenomenal disparity between the number of ideas it is capable of generating and the few, which it is able to enact?

Pulling **Apart** and
Coming Together



The
Physical
Work Realm

The
Intellectual
Work Realm

	Pulling Apart Creating a Breach	
Existency	VISION	Possibility
Necessity	ACTION	Discovery
Authority	POWER	Equality
Reciprocity	MOTIVATION	Privacy
Community	METHOD	Autonomy

If it wasn't clear before, this model should adequately demonstrate that the two work realms are so disparate from each other that they create a massive gap between them. This is a gap in understanding, a gap in behavior, a gap in what has interest and meaning, a gap in what is valued and a gap in procedure. In every way the knowledge worker is redefining the modern work place. Leaders are definitely at a "cross-roads." A solution is needed but there are few on the horizon of any lasting consequence.

From this discussion it should also be appreciated that the one realm is never without the other. In so

many ways they are actually co-dependent upon each other. Like the "Push Me-Pull You" discussed earlier, they inform each other and only progress when they alternatively ratchet up. What this model indicates is a phenomenal void, which is created between the vision of the Intellectual Work Realm and the understanding of the Physical Work Realm. But voids are not empty for long. The inordinate pressure to fill a void works in the work realm as well.

Like George de Mestral's leap in understanding a single novel idea has the power to fill the void, reconcile the two worlds and restore equilibrium. The emergence of this novel idea we

call creativity, and it can only take place when the space is sufficiently large to receive it. In other words, if we never start questioning what we know, if we never tear apart the fabric of current thinking, we will never create an opening for a new thought.

Emergence of
the Creative Work Realm
is the magic
we seek.

	The Physical Work Realm	The Creative Work Realm	The Intellectual Work Realm
Vision	Existency	Transcendancy <i>Realizing Actualizing Epiphany Understanding</i>	Possibility
Action	Necessity	A Better Way Of Being Capacity <i>Ability Faculty Adeptness Mastery</i>	Discovery
Power	Authority	A Better Way Of Doing Unity <i>Harmony Solidarity Unanimity Wholeness</i>	Equality
Motivation	Reciprocity	A Fellowship Morality <i>Honesty Kindness Integrity Truth</i>	Privacy
Method	Community	Knowledge Synergy <i>Accelerating Awakening Stimulating Vitalizing</i> Collaborative	Autonomy

Only after making space for a new idea, can the world be recreated all over again, and true transcendence take place. We have witnessed it countless times. Not only has technology changed our world, but mere notions have brought about sweeping social and economic realities.

An example of such world altering thought is expressed by Ayn Rand who was once asked what she thought was the greatest contribution America had made to the world. Her comment was simply, that America showed the world that "wealth could be created." Up until that time wealth was something,

which a person either inherited or had bestowed upon them by royalty.

Today we are just beginning to scratch the surface of what man is capable of learning. Unfortunately, at a time in life when Knowledge Workers are the most capable of learning, the organizational structures they live with impede them and prevent them from contributing the good they are capable of.

Wouldn't it seem that a thorough understanding of these two opposing work realms could help us generate models for combined Physical and Intellectual Work?

The Physical Work Realm

We can manage Physical Work

The Creative Work Realm

We must allow Creative Work to emerge

The Intellectual Work Realm

We can only facilitate intellectual Work

After studying work behaviors for more than a decade, I am convinced that progress will be made when we learn to manage Physical Work, using all the tools of management science available to us, and when we facilitate Intellectual Work by creating what I refer to as an Organizational Idea Culture within our companies which in effect implements a safe haven environment for thought and discovery. Organizational Idea Cultures are not easy to create but they are worth the effort. If we do these two activities well, we can be assured that they will create the tear in the fabric of our organizational understanding sufficient to allow the emergence of an entirely new way of thinking. This new way of thinking will perform its own work within our organizations by redefining all of our preconceptions.

What we are left with after the nascent idea becomes firmly routed in our patterns of thinking is a whole new way of being, an increased capacity, a new unity in purpose and a sense of fairness and synergy. Companies that pay this price will enjoy a better way of being a better way of doing, a true fellowship within their organization enhanced knowledge and true collaboration.

The real power of this organizational transcendence is enjoyed as euphoria experienced by companies, which are able to replicate it routinely. The whole thing is really quite self-sustaining.

A final message, why fear the tear? Go ahead, rip it open and see what comes!

Douglas Harris, Phd.