

Chapter 3.21

Knowledge Management under Coopetition

Claudia Loebbecke

University of Cologne, Germany

Albert Angehrn

Centre for Advanced Learning Technologies (CALT), INSEAD, France

ABSTRACT

This article deals with Knowledge Management under Coopetition and, in this context, illustrates the concept of Coopetitive Learning and Knowledge Exchange Networks (CoLKENS). It investigates the setting for inter-organizational knowledge management initiatives focusing on issues related to cooperation-competition-dilemmas and intentional/unintentional knowledge transfer.

INTRODUCTION

Behind the emerging digital façade, companies have started to operate in a distributed fashion. The intricate connectivity among these firms implies the exchange of valuable resources like knowledge and information. Such ‘cooperation’ or ‘collaboration’ is what enables organizations and individuals to make decisions collectively, learn from one another, communicate effectively, and thus create knowledge (Brown & Duguid, 1991; Huber, 1991; McDonald, 1995; von Krogh & Roos, 1995; Grant & Baden-Fuller, 2004).

However, cooperating organizations often simultaneously compete (coopetition). While reciprocal knowledge sharing may enhance the total

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-60960-783-8.ch3.21

and individual added value, inter-firm knowledge sharing may also affect the uniqueness and thus competitive contribution of a firm's knowledge repository. Opportunistic behavior of counterparts may erode anticipated benefits of cooperation and result in unevenly distributed value.

The inherent balancing act between cooperation and competition requires designing and implementing specific management processes to enable economic value maximization for participating individuals and firms. The value-driven balancing act is becoming increasingly relevant in business practice.

The article introduces the scientific literature on Knowledge Management under Coopetition and then describes the concept of 'Coopetitive Learning and Knowledge Exchange Networks' (CoLKENS), their components and their generic structure. It reviews CoLKEN fundamentals and components and suggests a CoLKEN taxonomy. Key research questions are followed by generalized key insights from studying CoLKENS as the setting for Knowledge Management under Coopetition. The article then examines the levers for managing CoLKENS and closes with future trends and brief conclusions.

BACKGROUND

The following literature review provides broad definitions and discussions relevant to Knowledge Management under Coopetition.

Fundamental Components of Knowledge Management under Coopetition

Knowledge is a complex concept and difficult to define, and when seen from a management perspective it exhibits unique properties that are distinctly different from the ones of traditional corporate resources, such as land, labor and capital. Intellectual resources are not naturally

scarce (Suchmann, 1989; Argyres & Silverman, 2004); knowledge may increase in value the more it is used, with investment in knowledge and knowledge-creating capabilities characterized by increasing returns (Teece, 1998; Smith, Collins, & Clark, 2005). These properties tend to make knowledge less amenable to management (Polanyi, 1966; Hedlund, 1994; Nonaka, 1994; Boisot, 1995; Grant & Baden-Fuller, 2004).

Who are appropriate knowledge agents for Knowledge Management under Coopetition? Who is intellectually capable, the organization or its individual employees? Does knowledge reside at individual and the organizational level? Among others, Drucker (1993) or Grant (1996) stress the predominant importance of individuals. Others (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995; Spender, 1996; Boisot, 1998; Lane & Lubatkin, 1998; Matusik & Hill, 1998; Crossan, Lane, & White, 1999; Inkpen, 2000; Dyer & Hatch, 2006; Inkpen & Pien, 2006) consider organizational cognition or organizations as cognitive entities a suitable unit of analysis. In the organization science literature, organizational learning is a central tenet (Huber, 1991; Simon, 1991; Argyris & Schön, 1996; Reagans & McEvily, 2003; Hansen, Mors, & Lovas, 2005) and is believed to lead to competitive advantage (Senge, 1990; Moingeon & Edmondson, 1996; Hansen & Nohria, 2004; Dyer & Hatch, 2006; Lavie, 2006). It is closely intertwined with inter-organizational learning (e.g. Larsson, Bengtsson, Henriksson, & Sparks, 1998, 1998; Greve, 2005) as the learning entities in both concepts positively affect each other (Doz & Hamel, 1998; Child, 2001; Holmquist, 2003).

Knowledge Networks are commonly defined as formally set up mechanisms, structures, and behavioral patterns that connect knowledge agents who were not previously connected because of functional, hierarchical, or legal boundaries between organizations. Inter-organizational knowledge networks (e.g. Mowery, Oxley, & Silverman, 1996; Klein, 1996; Inkpen & Tsang, 2005; Dyer & Hatch, 2006; Inkpen & Pien, 2006)

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/knowledge-management-under-coopetition/58147

Related Content

Internet Based Collaboration Tools

Lori Wahland Allen Kitchel (2017). *Remote Work and Collaboration: Breakthroughs in Research and Practice* (pp. 105-123).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/internet-based-collaboration-tools/180097

Entrepreneurship Strategies in the Arab World: Analytical Perspective vs. Practice Perspective

Ahmad Yacoub Nasereddin (2019). *Strategic Thinking, Planning, and Management Practice in the Arab World* (pp. 92-111).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/entrepreneurship-strategies-in-the-arab-world/224516

Coping With Deviant Workplace Behavior Through Employee Participation: An Exploratory Study

Shikha Rana and Anchal Pathak (2020). *Analyzing Workplace Deviance in Modern Organizations* (pp. 270-283).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/coping-with-deviant-workplace-behavior-through-employee-participation/236393

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

Gap Analysis: Comparison of Job-Related Attributes Between Importance and Satisfaction

Chang Lee (2018). *Social Issues in the Workplace: Breakthroughs in Research and Practice* (pp. 443-459).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/gap-analysis/192330