

Chapter 19

Distributed Knowledge Management

Roberta Cuel

University of Verona, Italy

Paolo Bouquet

University of Trento, Italy

Matteo Bonifacio

University of Trento, Italy

Category: Managerial Aspects of Knowledge Management

INTRODUCTION

In dynamic markets (characterized by the specialization of work, outsourcing processes, just-in-time and distributed productions, etc.), firms have moved from hierarchical structures to networked models. These are based on both intraorganizational networks among strategic units, divisions, groups, and so on; and interorganizational networks, such as industrial districts and knowledge networks (Hamel & Prahalad, 1990). Production is based on the coordination of a constellation of units, some of which are part of the organization (administration, R&D [research and development], etc.), and others refer to different companies (such as specialized

outsourcing production, logistics, etc.). All these units might not totally be controlled by a unique subject, and might grow and differentiate their activities in an autonomous way, coexisting as in a biofunctional system (Maturana & Varela, 1980) and creating unexpected combinations of processes and products (Chandler, 1962).

From a knowledge management (KM) point of view, the need of sharing knowledge among units in a very complex organization, or among networked organizations, increases the importance of introducing new ICT technologies and effective KM systems. For a long time, KM systems and ICT technologies have been proposed and applied as neutral tools whose implementation within the firm does not have any impact on knowledge flows. In particular, for technical reasons, centralized systems (for instance, enterprise knowledge portals [EKPs]) have been developed with the aim of making knowledge sharable and available in

a general, objective, context-independent form, avoiding the persistence of noncorrect and non-consistent information. Opposed to that point of view, studies focused on structuration theories (Giddens, 1984; Orlikowski, 1991) do not consider technology as a neutral asset of organizations. According to these theories, there are strong relationships and interdependencies among human actions, institutional roles (the organizational model de facto), and the technology architecture of KM systems applied within the company. One of the most important results in this area is that ICT technologies and KM systems should be shaped on the processes, practices, and the organizational models in which they are implemented; otherwise, they are bound to failure. As a consequence, in a complex organization composed by a constellation of units that manage in an autonomous way specialized processes, ICT technologies and KM systems must take into account the distributed nature of knowledge, and should allow coordination among autonomous units. In such a scenario, a KM system should satisfy two different needs: supporting the creation of specialized knowledge within a unit, and enabling the coordination of knowledge (and activities through which knowledge is exchanged) among units. These dual needs reflect the tension between the necessity for both highly specialized organization of work and flexible intergroup cooperation within and outside the organizations. This is reflected in the duality between the need for highly articulated local perspectives that make up the communication and knowledge-creation tissue of each community, and the need for sharing cultures and instruments that allow communication across different units (Mark, Gonzalez, Sarini, & Simone, 2002).

The first aim of this article is to describe how, according to structuration theories, a centralized KM system can be replaced or supported by a distributed one, in which the fact of having multiple and specialized “local knowledge bodies” is viewed more as an opportunity to exploit than as a problem to solve. The second aim of this article

is to present a specific approach to designing systems for managing knowledge distributed across different units, called distributed knowledge management (DKM), whose principles and main concepts will be introduced and explained in the second part of this article.

BACKGROUND

Even though current KM systems use different technologies, tools, and methodologies (for in-depth discussion, see Davenport & Prusak, 1997; Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995; Stewart, 2001; Wenger, 1998), most projects eventually lead to the creation of large and homogeneous knowledge repositories, in which corporate knowledge is made explicit and is collected, represented, and organized according to a single, supposedly shared, vision. Such a vision is meant to represent a shared conceptualisation of corporate knowledge, and thus to enable communication and knowledge sharing across the constellation of units composing the entire organization. All these activities are based on the common assumption that raw forms of knowledge, called implicit knowledge by Nonaka and Takeuchi, and tacit knowledge by Polany (1966), can be “cleaned up” from all contextual elements, and that the resulting “objective form” of knowledge can be explicitly represented in an abstract (independent from the original context) and general (applicable to any similar situation) form. This standard architecture of KM systems reflects a traditional view of management, in which managers try to centralize the control on the company processes by allocating and distributing resources and tasks to employees, and monitoring the proper execution of tasks and use of resources. This view of the managerial function leads to an approach to KM where processes of knowledge (resource) production and dissemination (tasks) must be centrally driven (allocated) and controlled (monitored). This condition is met only if knowledge is thought of as an object, which can therefore

9 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/distributed-knowledge-management/48970

Related Content

An Integrated Risk Management Framework: Measuring the Success of Organizational Knowledge Protection

Stefan Thalmann, Markus Manhart, Paolo Ceravolo and Antonia Azzini (2014). *International Journal of Knowledge Management* (pp. 28-42).

www.irma-international.org/article/an-integrated-risk-management-framework/117903

System Support for Knowledge Work: Bridging the Knowing-Doing Group

Dick Stenmark and Rikard Lindgren (2006). *International Journal of Knowledge Management* (pp. 46-68).

www.irma-international.org/article/system-support-knowledge-work/2682

The Lifecycle of a Knowledge Management System for Organizational Learning: A Case Study

Lynne P. Cooper, Teresa Bailey, Rebecca Nash and Tu-Anh Phan (2007). *Knowledge Management in Modern Organizations* (pp. 371-389).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/lifecycle-knowledge-management-system-organizational/24998

The English Science Cities: A New Phase in Science-based Urban Strategy

David R. Charles and Felicity Wray (2015). *International Journal of Knowledge-Based Organizations* (pp. 46-61).

www.irma-international.org/article/the-english-science-cities/124855

KM Approach for Improving the Labor Productivity of Vietnamese Enterprise

Quoc Trung Pham and Yoshinori Hara (2011). *International Journal of Knowledge Management* (pp. 27-42).

www.irma-international.org/article/approach-improving-labor-productivity-vietnamese/56363