LEADING KNOWLEDGE WORKERS AND THE POWER OF EXPERTISE
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Introduction

As industry continues to leverage technology and data with greater effect and frequency, the level of informational noise has risen to a roar. Expert knowledge, in the context of a job, means having a framework to evaluate and incorporate new and relevant information into an existing mix of experiences, insights, intuition and technical know-how. That may sound a bit heady, but it also helps explain why an organization would value an employee who routinely engages in knowledge work: expertise makes an impact by filtering the signal from the noise.

There are many ways to assemble a description of what constitutes a knowledge worker. Some have defined a knowledge worker as “anyone tasked with continual innovation and creativity.”¹ Other researchers have stated that knowledge workers “bring to an organization their prior education, experience, knowledge and skills, and as they interact within the organization they draw on this experience to develop their skills and knowledge further, thus adding to their human capital and to the value of the organization.”² Combining the two definitions, it would be fair to say that knowledge workers are important to a company due to both the immediate and future impacts that their abilities can produce when working toward organizational goals.

However, from the vantage point of a leader, a knowledge worker is an employee who knows more about the job than the leader does. Very often, knowledge workers have considerably more subject matter expertise than their leaders, as a function of working through highly technical tasks day-to-day and/or a specialized educational background. So, how does a leader go about influencing knowledge workers in such a dynamic? As a tool of influence, expert power is based on the perception that one possesses subject matter knowledge, judgment and experience—and when dealing with technical or

ambiguous matters, particularly during times of organizational change, a leader may not wield those three things him- or herself. For instance, an article in Training Industry Magazine\(^3\) recounts the tactics that Alan Mullaly, as the new CEO (2006) of Ford Motor Company, employed to steer an executive team toward positive organizational change.

What Mullaly brought to Ford was not a deep expertise in automobile manufacturing, or a wealth of experience in the auto industry, but judgment and problem-solving skill. In turn, the members of the executive team were empowered to leverage the cumulative expertise of both themselves and the functions they led to craft a strategy that helped rescue Ford from impending insolvency. Why did this type of approach actually work? It worked because Alan Mullaly knew both the strengths and the limitations of his own expertise and how to work within those parameters to maneuver the executive team (and Ford, by extension) back in the direction of profitability.

To examine the relationship between leaders and knowledge workers in greater detail, The Center for Leadership Studies and Training Industry, Inc. conducted a study to examine how knowledge workers perceive their leaders’ expertise and influence attempts. In Q1 of 2017, 318 employees across a range of industries and companies completed a confidential survey reporting their level of knowledge work, their perception of the expertise of the manager or supervisor who leads them, and the effectiveness of their leaders’ efforts to influence employee behavior.

---

Defining Knowledge Work

While there are many ways to conceptualize knowledge work, as mentioned in the introduction, mapping an array of jobs across industries and organizational levels to create an index to compare jobs can be a daunting task. To revisit one of the definitions, knowledge workers “bring to an organization their prior education, experience, knowledge and skills, and as they interact within the organization they draw on this experience to develop their skills and knowledge further, thus adding to their human capital and to the value of the organization.”⁴ For our purposes, there are two key components to this definition: the depth of an employee’s background and the impact of their interactions over time with work tasks, coworkers and leaders. Through this lens, a knowledge worker in one industry can be compared against another in a different industry.

For this research, we adapted the knowledge-in-practice scale (KIPS) developed in 2016 by McIver and Wang of Western Michigan University.⁵ The KIPS was designed to classify knowledge workers independent of the context-specific and multi-faceted nature of their jobs. In other words, it allowed this research to look at all jobs through the KIPS framework rather than identifying jobs likely to be knowledge work by classifying titles. The framework for this scale is comprised of two continuums: learnability and tacitness:

**Learnability** is defined as “the type and amount of effort, study, accumulated comprehension and expertise that is involved in understanding the information and know-how for accomplishing work practices.”

**Tacitness** is defined as “the degree to which the know-how involved in an organizational practice is unobservable, difficult to teach, unspecifiable, and/or highly embedded in the work setting.”

Figure 1 shows how these two variables interact to classify jobs, regardless of differences in organizational functions or levels. Based on the KIPS framework, there are four categories of employees that can be defined by the content of their work:

---


Basic Skills jobs are characterized by tasks that are high in learnability and low in tacitness. McIver and Wang also referred to this category as “enacted information.” These jobs are easy to learn, don’t require a particular career background and easily lend themselves to quantifying work outputs.

Apprenticed Know-How jobs are characterized by tasks that are high in both learnability and tacitness. These jobs are also easy to learn, but the job content is less quantifiable than in the Basic Skills category. To that end, these jobs may take longer to learn and be harder to separate into discrete, teachable tasks that employees could learn away from the job environment.

Hours of Study jobs are characterized by tasks that are low in learnability but also low in tacitness. McIver and Wang also referred to this category as “accumulated information.” These jobs are easy to quantify, similar to the Basic Skills category, but the breadth and complexity of the knowledge and skills needed for the job are significantly harder to learn and take more time to develop. These jobs can be thought of as “walking encyclopedia” roles, where an employee needs to have a lot of often difficult and interconnected information at their immediate disposal.

Artistry/Mastery jobs are characterized by tasks that are low in learnability and high in tacitness. McIver and Wang also referred to this category as “talent and intuitive know-how.” These jobs are what most people think of when talking about “knowledge work”—it is difficult to identify and explain everything one would need to learn to do such a job, and it is difficult to learn what can be identified and explained about the job content.
For purposes of this research, we’re defining the two categories of Hours of Study and Artistry/Mastery as describing jobs that entail a high degree of knowledge work, based on both categories being low in learnability. Even though jobs that fall in the Hours of Study category are low in tacitness, they still represent roles where employees need to have a command of multifaceted knowledge, skills and abilities. As shown in Figure 2, a combined 45 percent of the respondents to this research fall into these knowledge work categories.

**Figure 2.** Knowledge Work Categories of Research Sample

![Figure 2](image)

Of note is that these knowledge work categories span all types of workers across many industries. Similarly, Figure 3 displays the categories broken down by the generation of respondents. As shown, there are some distinct differences in knowledge work across generations. Millennials represent the largest portion of Basic Skills workers and the smallest portions of Apprenticed Know-How and Hours of Study workers, but they are on par with Generation X employees when it comes to representation in the Artistry/Mastery category of jobs. Boomers, in contrast, are represented mostly in the Apprenticed Know-How category and trail millennial and Generation X employees in the Artistry/Mastery category. Despite these trends, it is nevertheless clear that the idea of a “knowledge worker” does not correspond to the length of an employee’s career, and all generations of employees are represented in each of the four knowledge work categories.
Perceptions of Managerial Influence

The reasons why knowledge workers respond to the requests of their managers was examined by administering a set of questions that measures managers’ bases of power, which is a framework that characterizes the various avenues through which influence attempts succeed or fail across different situations. The seven bases of power as used in this research and operationalized by The Center for Leadership Studies are defined as follows:

- **Coercive power** is based on the perception that one can administer consequences for unacceptable behavior.
- **Connection power** is based on the perception that one is associated with important and influential people.
- **Reward power** is based on the perception that one can distribute rewards and recognition.
- **Legitimate power** is based on the perception that one’s influence attempts and decisions are appropriate for someone with one’s title or role.
- **Referent power** is based on the perception that one displays behaviors and personal characteristics that earn the respect and trust of others.
- **Information power** is based on the perception that one has access to information that is valuable to others.
- **Expert power** is based on the perception that one possesses subject matter knowledge, judgment and experience.
It should be noted that power can be formally granted to an individual by an organization (such as coercive, reward and legitimate power) or informally gained through interactions with others (such as referent and expert power). In practice, attempts to influence the behavior of others typically relies on a combination of these seven sources, such that they represent a process of influence that occurs over time. Accordingly, when a base of power is defined on the previous page as having multiple facets, as is the case for legitimate, referent, and expert power, respondents to this research were presented with multiple items. This was done in order to distinguish, for example, expert power founded on judgment from expert power founded on experience, or referent power that earns respect from referent power that earns trust, as listed in Figure 4b. In doing so, a more nuanced portrayal of these bases of power can be discussed in the context of the overall findings.

As shown in Figures 4a and 4b, employees will generally respond to attempts to influence through the use of any base of power. However, the bases of power represented in Figure 4a, which are typically those granted to managers by their job title and/or governance role in the company, do not garner the volume of “extremely likely” ratings compared to the more informal and emergent bases of power represented in Figure 4b. Particularly for expert power, there is a clear pattern toward such “earned” bases of power being among the most likely drivers of employee behavior change. This was especially true for expert power related to subject matter expertise compared to decision-making judgment and prior experience.

**Figure 4a. “Granted” Managerial Bases of Power**
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Figure 4b. “Earned” Managerial Bases of Power

Exploring the data further, Figure 5 shows the “extremely likely” responses for each base of power broken down by its endorsement within each knowledge work category. As shown, expert power was found to be more influential for the two classifications of knowledge workers whose jobs are low in learnability (i.e., Artistry/Mastery and Hours of Study).

Figure 5. Managerial Bases of Power across Knowledge Workers

The results shown in Figure 5 suggest that somewhat paradoxically, one of the best ways for a manager to influence the work behavior of an expert knowledge worker is through
the use of any facet of expertise available to that manager. However, particularly for the Artistry/Mastery category of workers, appeals based on experience will have more traction compared to influence attempts that rely on judgment or subject matter expertise.

Of interest in this research was whether organizational change has a bearing on the way knowledge workers respond to influence attempts by their managers. In this sample, 40 percent of respondents came from companies that had not experienced significant change in the preceding 12 months; 39 percent of respondents came from companies that had experienced local or regional changes, such as changes in reporting structures; finally, 21 percent of respondents came from companies that had experienced enterprise-wide changes, such as a re-branding or merger, in the preceding 12 months. In effect, a combined 60 percent of respondents to this research survey come from organizations that had experienced some degree of change in the previous year.

As shown in Figure 6, which breaks down “extremely likely” ratings across the three categories of organizational change described above, expert power appears to be especially effective during times of enterprise-wide changes.

**Figure 6. Managerial Bases of Power and Organizational Change**

Though all work environments are dynamic to some extent, the interactions between an employee and the leader to whom he or she reports are especially important during change management. What a leader does and says (and omits to do or say) signals to employees about not only the logistical path forward but also the leader’s opinion of the
goals of change efforts. It is a time in an organization when employees may expect reorganization, resource actions (i.e., layoffs) and so on. Since change is often met with resistance, leaders are the keystone to guiding individual employees, teams, departments and the entire enterprise through the change process. According to Figure 6, expert power is one of the main conduits through which leaders can make this happen.

Perceptions of Managerial Expertise

As already discussed, the way a leader wields expert power can take many forms, based on combinations of expertise related to subject matter, judgment and/or experience. However, the use of expert power to influence the behavior of knowledge workers doesn’t necessarily mean these employees will simply defer to their leaders on such matters—the leader still has to possess and display some form of expertise, both directly and by proxy (i.e., through sourcing expert opinions and insights from others). To explore this matter, survey respondents were asked a series of questions about their opinions and observations related to the expertise of their leaders.

As shown in Figure 7, most managers are best at relying on their own past experiences and appropriately incorporating the input of others but are less effective when it comes to demonstrating either basic or specialized technical knowledge. It should be noted that relatively few respondents endorsed “not effective” ratings, suggesting that most leaders are rather consistent at leveraging various aspects of expertise.

**Figure 7. Respondent Perceptions of Managerial Expertise**
Next, respondents were asked about the ways in which their manager/supervisor might display behaviors that demonstrate an awareness of the boundaries of that manager’s technical expertise. These behaviors covered a range of potential scenarios, whether identifying attempts by a manager to improve his or her own level of knowledge, or by appropriately deferring judgment to or drawing on the knowledge of expert members of a workgroup. From the list of statements shown in Figure 8, respondents indicated which behaviors they could recall their manager/supervisor engaging in at some point over the past 12 months. As shown, slightly less than half of managers rely on the knowledge, skills or judgment of others on the team to solve problems and refine existing processes.

**Figure 8. Behaviors Demonstrating Managerial Expertise**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relied on the skills/judgment of an expert to solve a problem</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relied on the technical knowledge of an expert to solve a problem</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relied on the skills/judgment of an expert to refine an existing process</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relied on the technical knowledge of an expert to refine an existing process</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read documentation/articles to learn more about products or processes</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended a leadership development program</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used professional networks to gain outside perspectives/ideas</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended a technical training as a knowledge/skills refresher</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended a technical training to gain new knowledge/skills</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended a conference and brought back new ideas for the company</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read documentation/articles to learn specialized technical knowledge</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read documentation/articles to learn basic technical knowledge</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As noted in the preceding figures, relying on the experience, judgment and skills of followers is one of several ways a leader can demonstrate their comprehension of the limitations of their technical abilities. To explore this idea in more detail, respondents were asked several questions about whether their manager was well-informed about the collective skills and expertise of others on the team or workgroup. As shown in Figure 9, nearly three-fourths of survey respondents agreed that their leaders are appropriately aware of the variety of knowledge, skills and abilities of employees.

---

Knowledge Workers and Non-Expert Managers

To this point, this research report has established that expertise is one of the most important conduits to influencing the behavior of knowledge workers, and the ways in which a leader utilizes his or her expert power comes in many flavors. That said, the leader-knowledge worker dynamic is certainly not devoid of challenges on matters of expert knowledge, judgment and experience. To dig deeper into how such challenges may manifest in the workplace, the following open-ended question was posed to respondents of this research:

“In your opinion, what is the biggest challenge to working with your manager or supervisor on matters where you have significant expertise?”

Below is a qualitative exploration of some of the themes of the responses. These comments have been organized by the respondents’ category of knowledge work to permit highlighting the differences and commonalities across the employee categories. First are excerpts from the two categories of knowledge workers whose jobs are low in learnability. In other words, these sets of comments are from employees with jobs that are more difficult to learn.
Comments – “Artistry/Mastery” Knowledge Workers

Employees in this category have jobs in their organizations that are typically complex and can be highly matrixed, while also somewhat obscured by the tacitness of the tasks that make up the work these knowledge workers perform.

One of the themes that came up repeatedly concerned leaders relying on their legitimate power at the expense of seeking or incorporating expert input:

- “Getting them to listen and see past titles or how they perceive me.”
- “Getting them to understand that while they are the boss, I have the technical and SME background to get the job done, support them, and make them look good.”
- “Manager cannot see from another point of view.”
- “My supervisor does not defer to my expertise in areas that I am more versed in.”
- “He rarely uses my knowledge.”

Perhaps unsurprisingly, several respondents commented that their leaders simply lack expert knowledge (or it has eroded) and are unwilling to defer to knowledge workers:

- “Supervisor lacks basic knowledge of the job I do on a daily basis. Also lacks expertise in the programs set forth by our specific department.”
- “Sometimes my manager is not up to date with technology.”
- “She used to do my job. But it was much simpler then.”

Several respondents also specifically called out their leader’s breadth of experience as a significant challenge:

- “She doesn’t have the experience to do what we do in our department.”
- “Mismatch between my area of expertise and her experience.”
- “He doesn’t have the expertise or experience in the same areas.”

Lest it seem like the comments provided by respondents were entirely negative, it was also notable that several respondents in this knowledge worker category did not note any challenges to working with their managers:

- “None - she requests my input and she values what I have to say.”
- “I have a great supervisor, I don’t run into challenges.”
Comments – “Hours of Study” Knowledge Workers

Employees in this category have jobs in their organizations that are typically complex and can be highly matrixed, although the tacitness of their work is low. This means that what these employees are doing is easier to quantify and describe, despite the higher level of effort required to amass the knowledge and skills to complete job tasks.

A dominant theme for this category of knowledge workers was the challenge of reporting to leaders with a limited (or absent) understanding of the work domain:

“My knowledge is wide-spread and encompassing of many techniques and theories while their knowledge is narrowly-focused and based on only a few techniques and theories.”

“My supervisor is more theoretical rather than being practical and expects me to be productive in the same way, which sometimes seems very challenging for me.”

“Her lack of knowledge of the actual job.”

Several respondents in this knowledge worker category also reported leaders being suspicious or outright dismissive about the value of an employee’s expertise:

“Knowing the answer to something and the manager not understanding how to accept that.”

“An ongoing challenge for me to work on matters/projects for my manager/supervisor is feeling confident that I can prepare and provide what they expect.”

“She never seems to value or respect my opinion. I have been there longer than her and she makes me feel invisible and insignificant at times.”

“The biggest challenge is creating context to a technical issue and then convincing him that my approach to solving the issue is technically sound.”

Again, it was notable that several respondents in this knowledge worker category did not note any challenges to working with their managers:

“I give my input when I feel needed and its always respected.”

“Nothing- she trusts me fully and defers to me on matters of my expertise.”

“There really aren’t any. He trusts me to do my job.”
Comments – Non-Knowledge Workers

The final two categories represent jobs that may not be considered “knowledge work,” as the content of these jobs is considered easy to learn. Although employees in these two categories may not possess deep expertise about the job they hold, they still had substantive comments about their leaders’ use of expert power and the challenges that can arise as a result. First, several respondents noted that their leaders were often obstinate about taking input and sometimes willfully ignored alternative informed perspectives:

“Because I am using digital systems every day that he rarely uses, he has only read about them. He doesn’t understand how to resolve certain situations and it’s hard for him to accept that he doesn’t know as much about our computer system.”

“Her perception of her role based on her title, her ‘old school,’ traditional mindset about leadership and her insecurities prevent her from seeing the perspective of someone with a job title below vice president or Ph.D.”

“They tend to give orders but never demonstrate or participate, they just dictate.”

“She doesn’t trust me because of my age. I will always be seen as the youngest member of the team; therefore, I have no experience or my opinions are irrelevant.”

Relatedly, some respondents shared that their leaders’ lack of expertise had direct impacts on their jobs:

“My advice is not always taken, and then I am tasked with the cleanup as a result of things not being done the way I suggested.”

“She is unwilling to listen to anyone else’s opinion and wants to micro-manage everything without sufficient knowledge or experience.”

“Her utter lack of experience and inability to understand the issue. She fails to acknowledge team experience, and takes credit for others work.”

It was notable, however, that other respondents still reported positive relationships, despite their leader’s extant lack of expertise:

“My supervisor is very open to listening to my ideas and what I have to say, but sometimes doesn’t fully understand the complexity of the situation or potential implications, especially related to technology.”

“My supervisor cannot guide me in terms of sophisticated strategies and solutions directly related to my work. More importantly, it isn’t an area of passion for him. He makes up for it in his support for my professional success and desire for success for the team.”
Conclusions

In general, the results of this research support the notion that knowledge workers are most likely to respond to a leader’s attempts to influence their behavior when that request is centered on the use of expert power—whether based on subject matter, judgment or experience. These influence attempts are particularly effective during times of change, and knowledge workers tend to be more receptive to the expertise of their leaders. Further, most leaders are best at relying on their experience to solve problems and incorporating input from others; however, leaders are not seen as being great at directly demonstrating deep technical knowledge. Behaviorally, leaders rely on the skills, judgment and specialized knowledge of experts to solve problems or refine existing processes more often than reading documentation to gain basic/technical knowledge themselves.

To consider these findings from another angle, correlations between several of the measures reported in the preceding pages were calculated and are summarized in Table 1. Below is an overview of relevant findings from this correlational analysis:

Managerial Expert Power and the Learnability/Tacitness of Knowledge Work

Expert power, whether in the form of a manager being a SME, possessing sound judgment, or drawing from his or her experience, was found to be significantly correlated with the learnability dimension of knowledge workers’ jobs, but not the tacitness dimension. This means that as jobs within an organization are harder to learn across individuals, the employees in such jobs are more likely to respond to influence attempts by their manager. The more or less tacit the knowledge is that’s required by a job does not appear to bear any linear relationship to the effectiveness of a manager’s attempts to influence employees through expert power.

Managerial Expert Power and Managerial Behavior

Expert power, whether in the form of a manager being a SME, possessing sound judgment, or drawing from his or her experience, was found to be significantly correlated with the breadth of a manager’s expertise-related behaviors. In other words, the more behaviors a manager engages in related to the use of expertise, the more employees see that manager as a source of expert power.
Managerial Expert Power and Knowledge Worker Expertise

To the extent that knowledge workers see themselves as an expert, they are more likely to respond to their managers’ influence attempts using expert power related to judgment, but not when the type of expert power being leveraged is related to subject matter expertise or past experience. However, knowledge workers who see themselves as technical experts are also more likely to have managers who themselves exhibit expertise-related behaviors.

Of particular note from this analysis is that there was no significant relationship between expert power and either the age of a knowledge worker’s manager or the tenure of that manager. We interpret this to mean that the use of expert power is not necessarily driven by a manager’s seniority or experience. Similarly, there was no relationship between expert power and a knowledge worker’s age. However, there was a significant, albeit not strong, relationship between expert power and a knowledge worker’s tenure. This suggests that the expert power a manager uses to influence knowledge workers may be built up informally over time as a function of the manager’s interactions with a knowledge worker and his or her coworkers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tacitness</th>
<th>Learnability</th>
<th>Self-Expertise</th>
<th>Expert Power - SME</th>
<th>Expert Power - Judgment</th>
<th>Expert Power - Experience</th>
<th>Leader Expertise Behavior Frequency</th>
<th>Leader Age</th>
<th>Leader Tenure</th>
<th>Knowledge Worker Age</th>
<th>Knowledge Worker Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Correlations between Knowledge Work Characteristics, Expertise, Age and Tenure

N = 318, bold denotes p < .05 statistical significance
Study Demographics

Figures 10 through 15 provide context on the 318 survey respondents who participated in this research. The figures that follow summarize the companies the respondents represent, the functional areas/departments supported by their roles within the organization, and the distribution of job tenure and age in the respondent sample.

**Figure 10.** Organizational Size (by Total Number of Employees)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fewer than 100</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-500</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-1k</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1k-5k</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5k-10k</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10k-20k</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20k-50k</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50k+</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 11.** Industries Represented

- Health Care/Medical/Pharma: 23%
- Banking/Finance/Insurance: 16%
- Education: 15%
- Government: 11%
- Technology/Telecom: 8%
- Business Services/Consulting: 5%
- Durable Goods/Consumables: 3%
- Non-Profit: 3%
- Manufacturing: 3%
- Entertainment/Hospitality: 3%
- Training and Development: 2%
- Utilities: 1%
- Other: 7%
**Figure 12.** Departments Represented

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;D/HR</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance/Accounting</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing/Advertising</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 13.** Job Roles Represented

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyst</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainer</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Designer</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Level</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 14. Respondent Job Tenure

- <1y: 10%
- 1-2y: 15%
- 3-5y: 19%
- 6-10y: 23%
- 11-15y: 13%
- 16-20y: 7%
- >20y: 13%

Figure 15. Respondent Age

- Early Millennial, 18-25y: 4%
- Late Millennial, 26-33y: 22%
- Early Gen X, 34-41y: 19%
- Late Gen X, 42-49y: 20%
- Early Boomer, 50-59y: 24%
- Late Boomer, 60-68y: 10%
- Silent Generation, >69y: 1%
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