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INTRODUCTION

A general challenge in communities of practice (CoP) research and practice is how this concept can be distinguished from related terms such as project teams, workgroups, and knowledge networks. What criteria determine whether a group qualifies as a CoP? While these different concepts share several common characteristics, there are also important distinguishing features. Acknowledging these differences is important when assessing which former knowledge and research streams to build upon, and for increasing the level of precision in CoP research. In this article we provide a brief comparison of related terms, based on a set of distinguishing dimensions.

DEFINITIONS

A general definition of CoPs is: “Groups of people who share a concern, a set of problems, or passion about a topic, and who deepen their knowledge and expertise in this area by interacting on an ongoing basis” (Wenger, McDermott & Snyder, 2002). However, being able to bring out the distinguishing characteristics of CoPs requires a more fine-grained perspective. Table 1 presents a comparative analysis of CoPs and three related terms, using the following dimensions: purpose, membership, degree of formality, time frame, management, and role of ICT.

DISCUSSION

The emergent, self-organizing characteristic of CoPs based upon voluntary membership and participation is in contrast to using formal controls to support knowledge exchange, such as contractual obligation, organizational hierarchies, or mandated rules. Instead CoPs promote knowledge flows along lines of practice through informal social networks on a continuous basis.

Knowledge networks extend beyond the concept of communities of practice, and they are often acknowledged by management to increase innovation and organizational efficiency (Büchel & Raub, 2002). In addition knowledge networks are more visible in the organization than CoPs which exist beside the organizational structure. The organization could achieve more benefits from knowledge networks since they are more acknowledged than CoPs in respect of allocated resources and time to participate frequently. In organizations where knowledge networks are acknowledged, one aim is to link different knowledge networks together to a constellation of networks by applying boundary practices and knowledge brokers to consciously ensure organizational learning.

The choice to participate in a CoP is reciprocal, in that the community chooses their members, and members of a community choose whether to participate or not. This property seems to be the most exceptional compared to the other organizational groups.

Finally, both CoPs and different categories of knowledge networks differ from project teams that are formally mandated, deadline- and goal-oriented, and from workgroups that are formal organizational entities that build upon job descriptions and task performance (Hackman, 1990).