

Walden University

COLLEGE OF MANAGEMENT AND TECHNOLOGY

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Jacob Ogunlade

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee

Dr. Nikunja Swain, Committee Chairperson,
Applied Management and Decision Sciences Faculty

Dr. Raghu Korrapati, Committee Member,
Applied Management and Decision Sciences Faculty

Dr. Louis Taylor, Committee Member,
Applied Management and Decision Sciences Faculty

Chief Academic Officer

Denise DeZolt, Ph.D.

Walden University
2009

ABSTRACT

Assessing the Collaborative Knowledge Management of the Market Dominant
Organization

by

Jacob Olusola Ogunlade

MBA., Dowling College, 2003
B.S., University of Memphis, 1991

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
Applied Management and Decision Sciences

Walden University
March 2009

ABSTRACT

Dominant firms enjoy economic strengths which enable them to compete effectively in relevant markets through the use of collaborative knowledge management (CKM). While the literature is replete with general guiding principles for companies to adopt successful business strategies, there is very limited empirical research on effectively using CKM to improve company performance and market domination. The purpose of this study was to evaluate strategies for information sharing by companies to achieve better operations management and control, a wider range of customers, and stronger competitive edge in the global economy. Epistemological foundation for the study was provided by the literature on knowledge management and organizational dynamics. Data were collected by an electronically self-administered questionnaire on a convenience sample of 80 employees of three small businesses in Memphis, Tennessee. A quantitative method using Poisson regression was applied to test the hypotheses about relationships between six independent variables of value proposition, culture building, responsibilities, information technology, approaches and assessment and the dependent variable, collaborative knowledge management. Results indicate that value proposition, information technology, and building an organizational culture of responsibilities and best practices play significant roles in effective CKM. Social change implications of the study suggest that high-intensity collaborative knowledge management would produce creative leaders and workers, improved leader-worker collaboration, and more effective use of information technologies in organizational intelligence and decision making.

PREVIEW

Assessing the Collaborative Knowledge Management of the Market Dominant
Organization

by

Jacob Olusola Ogunlade

MBA, Dowling College, 2003
BS, University of Memphis, 1991

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
Applied Management and Decision Sciences

Walden University
March 2009

UMI Number: 3366982

Copyright 2009 by
Ogunlade, Jacob Olusola

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform 3366982
Copyright 2009 by ProQuest LLC
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

DEDICATION

To my family, who make it all worthwhile and to the remnants of Metropolitan Baptist Church, Memphis, Tennessee from January 2003 to March 2009, who inspired my love of learning, and prayer warriors, who helped put my dissertation into the best position for a breakthrough.

PREVIEW

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Help came from many directions in the writing of this dissertation. The completion of this paper would not be possible without the generous support of many people. I am particularly grateful to my advisors, Nikunja Swain, Raghu Korrapatti, and Louis Taylor, who offered numerous discussions and suggestions. Dr. Swain read countless drafts, and kindly and patiently provided constructive criticism. He often suggested better alternatives to approach the problems that arose, and helped me improve my work. For all this, I thank him. Dr. Korrapatti constantly reminded me to work harder and finish my dissertation so that I could do something else in life. Dr. Korrapatti checked the validity of the problem statement and offered numerous suggestions. Dr. Taylor praised and admired my knowledge concerning this topic and suggested many resources for assuring accuracy and correctness. Dr. Barbara Davis, University of Memphis, and Dr. Patricia McRaven, University of Missouri, read countless drafts and provided constructive criticism. In addition, special thanks to numerous friends, prayer partners, pastors, church members, cousins, uncles (both here and across the ocean) for their email, and phone calls. Thanks

Covey (1995) stated the following:

To achieve great results, you must have motivation. Motivation is a fire from within. If someone else tries to light that fire under you, chances are it will burn very briefly. Motivation is not a product of external influence; it is a natural product of your desire to achieve something and your belief that you are capable to do it. (p. 1)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY	1
Introduction.....	1
CKM, Knowledge, and Collaboration	2
Importance of Collaborative Knowledge Management.....	2
Knowledge an Instrument for Evaluating Organization	3
Knowledge Revolution	5
Barriers to Collaboration.....	7
Effective Collaboration.....	8
Competitive Strategy	9
Collaboration Challenge to 19 th –Century Theory.....	12
CKM Embraced Supply Chain Management	13
Business Drivers for Today’s Information Systems	15
Collaboration and Partnership.....	15
Globalization of the Economy	15
Electronic Commerce and Business.....	16
Security and Privacy	16
Knowledge Asset Management	17
Business Processes.....	17
Problem Statement	18
Nature of the Study	19
Research Questions.....	21
Research Hypotheses	21
Hypothesis 1: Perceived Value Proposition.....	22
Hypothesis 2: Perceived Culture Building.....	22
Hypothesis 3: Perceived Roles and Responsibilities	23
Hypothesis 4: Perceived Roles of Information Technology	23
Hypothesis 5: Perceived Roles’ Best Practices (Approaches).....	23
Hypothesis 6: Perceived Roles’ Measurements (Competitive Intelligence).....	23
Purpose of the Study	24
Significance of the Study	24
Social Change	26
Scope and Limitation	26
Assumptions.....	27
Limitations and Future Studies	27
Definition of Terms.....	29
Summary	31
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	32
Introduction.....	32

Business Trends and Competitive Advantages Based on Information Systems.....	33
Business Trends that Influence Market-Dominant Organizations.....	33
Collaboration Strategies.....	34
Rationale for Collaborative Knowledge Management	35
Characteristics of Collaborative Organization.....	35
Leadership in CKM Environment.....	35
Professional Virtual Community	36
Collaboration Challenges to 19 th -Century Theory.....	37
Business Strategies and Concepts of Knowledge	38
Business Level Strategy.....	38
The Concept of Knowledge	39
Knowledge Acquisition	40
Collaborative Learning Environments.....	40
Theories Related to Collaboration	42
Game Theory	42
Group Dynamic Theory	44
Force-Field Analysis.....	45
Building Collaborative Ways of Knowing	48
Elements of Social Theory of Collaboration	48
International Business Collaboration Strategies and Social Changes.....	49
Export Strategy	49
Globalization Strategy	49
Transnational Strategy	50
Multinational Strategy	50
Processes for Managing Global Complexity	51
Collaboration and Global Competencies	52
Collaboration Communication for Global Management	53
Effective Global Collaboration.....	54
Strategic Benefits Alliances.....	55
Success Factors for Collaboration and Specific Examples.....	56
Collaboration: The Critical Behaviors for Competing and Winning.....	57
Success Factors in Industry/University Collaboration.....	58
The Faces of Collaboration.....	59
Access to Facilities and Work Opportunities.....	59
Changing Technology.....	59
Service Trends	60
Collaboration Strengthens Legal Compliance	61
Cost Savings.....	61
Economies of Scales and Scope.....	62
Synergies Benefits from Collaboration.....	62
Types of Synergies in Collaboration.....	63
The Degrees of Uncertainty in Collaboration.....	64
Existence of Uncertainty.....	64
Culture Building.....	65

Unity and Power	65
Summary	66
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	67
Introduction	67
Research Design and Approach	67
Sampling Technique	69
Variables	73
The Survey Instrument.....	73
Drawing on Existing Instruments	73
Validity and Reliability	74
Data Collection	78
Data Analysis	81
Description of CKM Assessment Module	83
Value Proposition.....	83
Culture Building.....	84
Structure and Roles/Responsibilities	84
Information Technology	85
Approaches	85
Measurements	85
CKM Assessment Procedure	86
Competitive Intelligence Function Characteristics	87
Culture and Communication Building	88
Business Social Responsibilities.....	89
Descriptive Analytical Tools	91
Measurement Outcomes.....	91
Criteria	92
Summary	94
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS.....	95
Introduction.....	95
Data Collection Procedures.....	95
Description of the Survey and Procedure	95
Problems Encountered	96
Participation	97
Response Rate.....	97
Data Analysis	98
Coding Topics and Categories	98
Participant Survey Results	99
Respondent Demographic Data	100
Research Questions	102
Research Question 1	103
Tests of Hypothesis of VP	105
Results and Interpretation	111

Research Question 2	111
Tests of Hypothesis.....	112
Results and Interpretation	118
Research Question 3	118
Tests of Hypothesis.....	119
Results and Interpretation	125
Research Question 4	126
Tests of Hypothesis.....	127
Results and Interpretation	132
Research Question 5	132
Tests of Hypothesis.....	133
Results and Interpretation	136
Research Question 6	137
Tests of Hypothesis.....	138
Results and Interpretation	144
Summary.....	144
CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMENDATIONS.....	146
Introduction.....	146
Summary of Findings.....	148
Results from Hypotheses 1: Perceived Value Proposition	148
Results from Hypotheses 2: Perceived Culture Building	149
Results from Hypothesis 3: Perceived Roles and Responsibilities.....	150
Results from Hypothesis 4: Perceived Roles of Information Technology	151
Results from Hypothesis 5: Perceived Roles' Best Practices (Approaches)	152
Results from Hypothesis 6: Perceived Roles' Measurements (Competitive Intelligence)	152
Conclusion	153
Implication for Social Change	157
Recommendations.....	157
REFERENCES	160
APPENDIX A: SURVEY COVER LETTER AND CONSENT FORM.....	174
APPENDIX B: SURVEY INSTRUMENT	177
APPENDIX C: LIST OF ACRONYMS.....	203
CURRICULUM VITAE.....	204

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Forces Against New Computer Systems	47
Table 2. Questionnaire Modules.....	79
Table 3. Demographic Characteristics of the Participants.....	101
Table 4. Participants by Age, Gender, and Rank in Organization.....	102
Table 5. Value Proposition Communalities Variables.....	104
Table 6. Value Proposition Component Matrix.....	105
Table 7. Value Proposition Case Processing Summary.....	107
Table 8. Value Proposition Categorical Variable Information	107
Table 9. Value Proposition Goodness of Fit.....	109
Table 10. Value Proposition Tests of Model Effects.....	110
Table 11. Culture Building Communalities	112
Table 12. Culture Building Component Matrix.....	113
Table 13. Culture Building Case Processing Summary.....	113
Table 14. Culture Building Categorical Variable Information	115
Table 15. Culture Building Goodness of Fit.....	117
Table 16. Role and Responsibility Communalities.....	119
Table 17. Perceived Roles and Responsibilities Component Matrix.....	121
Table 18. Roles and Responsibilities Case Processing Summary	122
Table 19. Roles and Responsibilities Categorical Variable Information.....	123
Table 20. Roles and Responsibilities Goodness of Fit	124
Table 21. Roles and Responsibilities Tests of Model Effects	125

Table 22. Information Technology (IT) Communalities	126
Table 23. IT Case Processing Summary	128
Table 24. IT Categorical Variable Information	129
Table 25. IT Goodness of Fit	130
Table 26. IT Tests of Model Effects	131
Table 27. Approaches Communalities	133
Table 28. Approaches Case Processing Summary	134
Table 29. Approaches Goodness of Fit	135
Table 30. Approach Tests of Model Effects	136
Table 31. Measurement and Assessment Communalities	137
Table 32. Measurement/Assessment Component Matrix	138
Table 33. Measurement/Assessment Case Processing Summary	139
Table 34. Measurement/Assessment Categorical Variable Information	141
Table 35. Measurement/ Assessment Goodness of Fit	143
Table 36. Measurement/ Assessment Tests of Model Effects	144
Table 37. Summary of Results and Interpretation of Hypothesis Testing	156
Table 38. Summary Item Statistics of Reliability	156

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Inter- relationships among business strategies, skilled workers, and market dominant organizations.....	21
Figure 2. Sample size calculator	71
Figure 3. Collaborative knowledge management assessment alignments model	80

PREVIEW

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Introduction

Today's businesses are faced with a number of economic and technological challenges because of the global nature of our new-millennium markets. Many organizations have started using knowledge management (KM), in general, and collaborative knowledge management (CKM), in particular, to address some of these problems by tapping into the cumulative and individual knowledge of all their personnel, as well as customers, suppliers, and business partners. According to Laudon and Laudon (2002), "KM is the set of processes developed in an organization to create, gather, store, maintain, and disseminate the firm's knowledge" (p. 373). CKM is a combination of sharing knowledge roles, skills, and knowledge management workers within the organizations to gain economic advantage to growth globally. There are numerous papers and books written on the topic of KM, and the KM literature is very rich, but the same is not true for CKM. Very few guidelines exist today in CKM, and there is very limited empirical research on how organizations use CKM to improve their performance and dominate the market. The study evaluated strategies and faces of collaboration that enable efficient operation management and control, achieve a wider range of customers, and raise status in the global economy. The study aimed to add to the existing knowledge on CKM. Since CKM is a combination of collaboration and knowledge management, a section of this chapter is devoted to brief discussions on these topics, with a detailed discussion of the KM and CKM literature in chapter 2.

CKM, Knowledge, and Collaboration

Importance of Collaborative Knowledge Management

In the past, corporations could compete successfully by exploiting scale and scope economies or by taking advantage of imperfections in the world's goods, labor, and capital markets. Besanko, Dranove, and Shanley (2000) defined "economies of scales as the production of a specific good or service over a range of output when average cost (i.e., cost per unit of output) declines over that range" (p. 72). Furthermore, Besanko et al. (2000) stated that "economies of scope exist if the firm achieves savings as it increases the variety of goods and services it produces" (p. 73). However, this is no longer true because collaboration and partnership are significant business trends that are influencing information systems applications (Hansen and Nohria, 2004; Whitten, Bentley, and Dittman, 2004). Collaboration of knowledge workers involves challenges and time to achieve measurable outcomes, and it needs constant evaluation, whether such workers are making the most of collaboration (Weiss, Anderson, and Lasker, 2002). In addition, CKM is called interunit collaboration, which is formed through alliance, collaboration, and partnership (Hansen and Nohria).

CKM is necessary for a company to remain competitive, adapt to a rapidly changing environment, be able to innovate, respond to the demand of e-business, fully capitalize and develop its people, and support effective relationships with suppliers, partners, and customers (Hansen and Nohria, 2004, p. 23; Smith, 2001, p. 4). According to Tollinger, McCurdy, Vera, and Tollinger (2004), at NASA, "CKM allows groups of scientists and engineers to view space in shoulder-to-shoulder collaboration to do free

form drawing and do strategic planning” (p. 30). In addition, CKM is used in the health care industry, as Guptill (2005) found:

It is long-term, sustainable commitment to changing the culture of health care to become more collaborative, more transparent, and more proactive. Knowledge management, implemented well, will transform the health care delivery system over the next few decades, into a more cost-effective, error-averse, and accountable public resource. (p. 10)

Moreover, Guptill added that “knowledge management is more than the centralized repository of data, documents, and other information, but it encompasses the social context of other experiences and the lessons learned in the process” (p. 11). She continued, “Knowledge management should result in changed behavior as a result of knowledge sharing” (p. 12). As Logan and Stokes (2004, p. 1) phrased it, “Organizations and individuals must be competitive to collaborate, and at the same time they must collaborate to compete.”

Knowledge: an Instrument for Evaluating Organization

Knowledge is the psychological result of learning, reasoning, and perception of agreement or disagreement of at least two ideas (Locke, 1894). According to Santosus and Surmacz (2002), “Knowledge management is the process through which organizations generate value from their intellectual- and knowledge-based assets” (p. 1). Collaboration is the combination of people’s creativity, resources, passion, culture, innovation, and intellectual abilities to raise the standard and to gain global economical advantage.

Tiwana (2002) defined knowledge as “a fluid mix of framed experience, values, contextual information, expert insight, and intuition that provides an environment and framework for evaluating and incorporating new experiences and information” (p. 4). According to Nonaka (1998) “knowledge is the source of the highest-quality power and the key to the powershift that lies ahead. Knowledge Is Power. Knowledge is the new competitive resources and what makes the new society unique” (p. 7). Organizations that embrace knowledge, skills, attitudes, culture, and support systems create a collaborative knowledge organization. It is able to function as an intelligent system because information and knowledge are shared more quickly and effectively (Davenport & Prusak, 2000; Haag, Cummings, & McCubbery, 2004; Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1998; Tiwana, 2003). Nonaka and Takeuchi (1998) developed the spiral of knowledge of knowledge creation, which is the organizational knowledge creation, and is a continuous and dynamic interaction between tacit and explicit knowledge.

According to Nonaka and Takeuchi, this interaction is shaped by shifts between different modes of knowledge conversion, which are, in turn induced by such triggers as socialization, externalization, internalization and a combination of both. First, the organization gets involved with the community (socialization). Through socialization the members share experiences and mental models. Second, through the externalization mode, the organization is engaged in dialogue. Third, the combination mode results in networking. Finally, “learning by doing” results in internalization (Nonaka & Takeuchi, p. 70). The spiral of knowledge creation helps a manager’s intuitive sense of market trends to become the catalyst for an important new product concept. The spiral of

knowledge creation helps the manager to understand the internal logic of intellectual activity in the following ways: (a) sharing tacit knowledge; (b) creating concepts; (c) justifying concepts by providing access to sources of knowledge rather than by transfer, (d) building an archetype by providing links among sources of knowledge to create a wider breadth and depth of knowledge flows; and (e) cross-leveling of knowledge through enhancement of intellectual capital by supporting the development of individual and organizational competencies. In addition, Bali (2005) stated, “The structured spiral of knowledge creation offered by Nonaka and Takeuchi has been adopted a positive perspective” (p. 108). It helps companies to be more competitive by hiring, developing, and retaining excellent managers who accumulate knowledge assets (Kazuo & Nonaka, 2007, p. 121). Knowledge assessment is an instrument for analyzing trends as well as a tool that can be used to analyze company capabilities for participation in the knowledge revolution (Malhotra, 2003, p. 1). It measures a nation’s trend competencies and capabilities that are deemed essential for economic growth, competitive advantage, human development, and quality of life.

Knowledge Revolution

Tiwana (2002), Nonaka (1995), Davenport and Prusak (2000), Davenport (2005), Malhotra (2003), and other researchers have engaged in exploratory knowledge revolution. Knowledge revolution is a process that results from rapid growth information and communication technologies (ICT). Nonaka (1995) stated, “Knowledge has become the resource, rather than a resource, and is what makes the new society unique” (p. 6).

The knowledge revolution is the acceleration of technical change and the intensification of globalization. The knowledge revolution requires knowledge workers, investment in education, information infrastructure, research, and development (R&D), and intensive and constant innovation. Moreover, knowledge workers use their skills to achieve superior performance and competitive advantage, and they stay current with technology to reduce the uncertainty (Heinrichs & Jeen-Su, 2005).

Behaviorists (Skinner, 2002; Watson, 1998) termed knowledge as a “repertoire of behavior,” which can be further stated as stored sequence lines of a computer program that runs later. Learning is regarded as a sign of intelligence, in contrast to the functioning of internal organs or to instinctive performances, which are classified as sub-intelligent (Skinner). Learning is a permanent change in a person’s capability to execute motor skills because of practice or experience (Coker, 2004).

Collaboration and cooperation are equivalent. Collaboration refers to the humanistic process of organizations, families, cities, and nations. Collaboration shares the same mode processes with the knowledge spiral mode processes which are socialization, externalization, internationalization, and a combination of the mode processes (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995, p. 70).

Barriers to Collaboration

Collaborative organizations are flexible and better able to adapt to changing business conditions. Their members are able to develop greater sets of skills and competencies. Similarly, they can be used wherever within the organization skill are needed (Allen & Jarman, 1999; Logan & Stokes, 2004).

The barriers to collaboration include a reluctance to share with other unknowns others, a fear that may have already solved the problem, and a belief that collaboration may result in others having power over them. Logan and Stokes (2004) stated that “effective collaborators must possess the cognitive skills, the technical skills and the ability to communicate to be able to contribute to the collaboration process” (p. 132). Logan and Stokes (2004) found the following:

The ideal collaborative behavior that is desired is one in which tasks and objectives are achieved not by sacrificing relationships but rather by building productive relationships that will serve one’s long-term interests. Individuals act collaboratively not just for the sake of building relationships; but rather because they can better achieve their objectives with the cooperation of their colleagues who find themselves in a similar position. (p. 130)

Additional barriers to collaboration may include (a) skills that undermine action, (b) personnel and information systems that make it difficult to act, (c) bosses that discourage actions, and (d) formal structures that make it difficult to act (Olson & Singer, 2004).

According to Leslie (2006), “When it comes to joint ventures and wider collaborations crucial to the success of industry, too many conflicting views, hidden agendas and egos lead to failure” (p. 40). For example, Leslie added for the Aerospace, Defense, and Energy sectors, the most significant barriers to collaboration are:

1. Concerns over intellectual property rights;
2. Protection of competitive advantage;
3. The problem of benefits being seen to be intangible;
4. The risk of becoming involved with untested collaborative ventures;
and
5. Mindsets. (p. 41)

The people who have these characteristics are reluctant to share their knowledge because knowledge is perceived as power. In addition, barriers to collaboration involve the avoidance of previously performed research or knowledge that was not originally developed within the group/institution. For example, technological barriers to online collaboration include security and proprietary software. Social barriers to online collaboration exist because people work differently.

Effective Collaboration

Since ancient times, people, and organizations have expanded their businesses in a collaborative manner as far as technology allowed. According to Logan and Stokes (2004), “computers and other forms of IT have transformed the nature of manufacturing and commerce” (p. 3). To be successful in business today, “organizations must undergo a transformation; operate effectively within a dynamic, fast-paced, and changing economic environment” (Haag et al., 2004, p. 5). Collaborative transformation aligns values and objectives of employees and management, respects and produces a climate of mutual trust, diversifies skills, and decentralizes decision making (Logan & Stokes). In order to achieve collaboration organization activities must be visible and control by business and technology processes that focus on enforcing process discipline within the organization itself.

CKM improves the performance of teams by supporting the sharing and flow of information. In addition, it increases R&D, efficiency of mechanisms, and net profit.

Leslie (2006) found the following:

Effective collaboration must have good coordination where people share objectives (inclusive and not exclusive), trust, and understanding of the need to advance an organization. To achieve coordination among the groups, a problem-resolution mechanism must be applied. Effective collaboration must develop good cooperation, appreciate other people, and understand the benefits that come with collaboration processes. To achieve cooperation, frequent consultation and knowledge sharing must take place between participants, there must be a clear role of definition, and the participant must use correct problem-solving methods. Effective collaboration can be achieved with the right mix of people, collaboration skills, and practice in collaborating. Collaboration is a complex people issue which means dealing head-on with people's different preconceptions, personalities, and approaches to joint working (p. 41).

Competitive Strategy

The two relationship domains between an organization's competitive strategy and its knowledge strategy are external domains (opportunities/threats) and internal domains (capabilities/arrangements). The external domain involves three dimensions: scope (what the firm must know), competencies (what the critical characteristics of the required knowledge are), and governance (how to obtain the required competencies). The scope dimensions deal with the specific domains of collaborative knowledge that are critical to the firm's survival and advancement strategies. Survival strategies aim at securing profitability, while advancement strategies aim for future profitability (Von Krogh et al., 2000). The competencies dimension focuses on the utilization characteristics of knowledge that contribute positively to the creation of new business. These characteristics include:

1. Accessibility, the extent to which organizational collaboration knowledge