Chapter 18 Integration of Competing Values and Knowledge Organisational Activities in a New Model

Amir Hossein Dastaviz University of Malaya, Malaysia

ABSTRACT

In recent years, various models have been introduced in knowledge management; however, it seems that making a combination of these models can improve the performance of the models in knowledge based organisations. In this paper, two models are considered. The first one is competing values and the second one is organisational activities of knowledge management. Competing values is consisted of two exes: control and environmental interaction. The extent of control differs from high to low and the environmental interaction in the organisation varies from internal to external tendencies. These two axes form different values in the competing value model. Each organization, based on its dominated values, can trigger the organisational activities of knowledge management. This paper proposes a conceptual model that applies dominant competing values status and facilitates organisational activities of knowledge by integrating organisational activities of knowledge chain and competing value models. This model will enrich the knowledge management literature, especially on knowledge organisational activities, while being the basis for other researchers and authors to develop the process of organisational activities regarding organisational structure and environmental interaction.

INTRODUCTION

The initiative factors in Knowledge Management (KM) practice have an inevitable role in organisations. These prerequisite factors can lead to success or failure of KM activities. These KM enablers include structure, technology and culture of the people in the organisation (Liao & Wu, 2010). Identifying these enablers contribute to efficient KM practices. Each factor attracts the attention of a wide range of

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-5225-1913-3.ch018

researchers in KM, for example, Alavi, Kayworth & Leidner (2006) studied how organisational culture values (formalization, innovativeness, collaboration and autonomy) influence KM. Besides, Mahmoudsalehi, Moradkhannejad & Safari (2012) identified the impact of organisational structure on KM and Pee and Kankanhalli (Pee & Kankanhalli, 2009) surveyed the impact of technologies along with people and process in KM. In addition, each enabler is studied from various aspects using relevant models. As an example, Chegini (Chegini, 2011) studied the relationship between organisational culture (Denison Model) and KM and Balthazard & Cooke (2004) investigated the relationship between organisational culture (Constrictive, passive and aggressive culture) and KM. One of the organisational culture models, which is widely used in KM, is the Hofsted model. Hofested defined culture as "the collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the members of one society from change as others." (Hofstede, 1980) This included shared beliefs, values and practices that distinguished one organisation from another".

Each of the organisational culture models have their own advantage and disadvantage regarding their specific field of applications. However, in KM, the most significant factor in culture is values rather than general and broad concept of culture. The values, which are associated with the organisational structure and behaviour, are represented in competing value model.

Knowledge chain model (KCM) was established by Holsapple in 2001 (Holsapple & Joshi, 2001). KCM is consisted of two groups of activities, organisational and managerial. This article adopted organisational activities of knowledge chain for the conceptual framework.

KCM tries to promote values by knowledge practices for performance and competitive advantage. Therefore, the appropriate model which can be matched with knowledge chain model is competing value because in this model competing value tries to evaluate the values in the organisation which is originated or created by employees inside of the organization. The difference between competing value and other organizational cultures is that this model can create four types of values by the organisation. The organisational structure and behaviour with environment forms these types of values, which are highlighted in literature review section.

The competing value model is more adapted with KM practice due to possessing two major initiative KM activities in compare with other models. This model considers several aspects of knowledge enablers, such as the structure of the organisation and the way that the organisation deals with the environment, in one unique model. In other words, competing value model can be considered as a thorough model for organisational values since it focused both on the structure of the organisation and how it interacts with the environment, which demonstrates the highlighted values in the organisation.

KCM is working as a chain of activities; each activity is able to run the next activity or other activities simultaneously. However, triggering the first organisational knowledge practice is the issue. What can run the organisational knowledge in a proper way? As mentioned above, there is a need for more deep prerequisite elements than the general concept of organisational culture. Here, the values, which are produced from the inside of the organisation, are the best answer. This is illustrated in competing value framework. The new proposed model aims to boost the organisational knowledge practice by available and accepted values in one model.

LITERATURE

The aim of this section is to illustrate the relationship between competing value framework components and organisational activities of knowledge chain, which is examined previously in empirical researches.

12 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage:

www.igi-global.com/chapter/integration-of-competing-values-and-knowledgeorganisational-activities-in-a-new-model/177581

Related Content

Developing a Taxonomy for Identifying Stakeholders in National ICT Policy Implementation

Frank Makoza (2019). International Journal of R&D Innovation Strategy (pp. 44-65).

www.irma-international.org/article/developing-a-taxonomy-for-identifying-stakeholders-in-national-ict-policy-implementation/250273

Towards a Sharing Economy: Factors, Trends, Risks, and Prospects

Olga Demushina, Natalya E. Buletova, Jun Liand Mohamed Mohmoud Atwa Youssif (2021). *Impact of Disruptive Technologies on the Sharing Economy (pp. 218-237).*

www.irma-international.org/chapter/towards-a-sharing-economy/280768

Managing Customer Satisfaction and Customer Loyalty in Organizations: Strategies and Initiatives

Pratap Chandra Mandal (2022). *Journal of Business Ecosystems (pp. 1-16)*.

www.irma-international.org/article/managing-customer-satisfaction-and-customer-loyalty-in-organizations/314599

Exceeding the Recommended Energy Limits Due to Age and Gender in Occupational Aerobic Workloads

Cesar Omar Balderrama Armendariz, Jose de Jesus Flores Figueroa, Judith Lara Reyesand Ludovico Soto Nogueira (2019). *Advanced Macroergonomics and Sociotechnical Approaches for Optimal Organizational Performance (pp. 128-142).*

www.irma-international.org/chapter/exceeding-the-recommended-energy-limits-due-to-age-and-gender-in-occupational-aerobic-workloads/219096

THEIA: Thermal Insulation - A Business Strategy

Paulo Botelho Pires, António Correia Barrosand José Duarte Santos (2022). Cases on Digital Strategies and Management Issues in Modern Organizations (pp. 119-149).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/theia/291728