
Organizational Knowledge Management Movement Strategies

Author: Alen Badal, Modesto, California, abadal3@aol.com

Organizational behaviour is often dependent on the strategic movement of internal knowledge for success. Organizational knowledge management methodologies require the involvement of stakeholders. In large organizations, involved stakeholders shall be selected by the entire membership. Key involvement roles and considerations should be offered to/involve the 'least likely to participate'. Suck stakeholders often possess the most influential power to move the stakeholders; if not, they demonstrate a true commitment to involve all in the movement of knowledge. The purpose of this article is to discuss organizational involvement strategies for the optimal movement or organizational knowledge management.

Keywords: *organizational behaviour; knowledge management; strategic management; organizational communication.*

Introduction

An effective characteristic of organizations is their ability to move knowledge that is both vertically and horizontally aligned, understood, supported, implemented and assessed. Too often organizations expend both human and monetary resources on ensuring effective communication strategies are in place and received by the stakeholders within organizations.

The process of managing knowledge is both an art and a science. Conventional methodologies of managing human intellect and contributions, once appropriate manners are in place, shall not be

predicated on face-to-face, micromanaging techniques often in practice. The key is to set up an environment where stakeholders freely produce and willingly will share how much 'they love their job'! Such unsolicited validations ensure allegiance, follow-thru, and ultimately, if not immediately, the steps towards desired organizational outcomes. The environment is productively predictable with respect to organizational behaviour, work responsibilities, etc.

The salient factor which remains unclear is how to specifically manage and move knowledge, organizationally? The aim of this article is to outline processes and procedures intended to serve as a benchmark for organizations interested in effectively implementing not only knowledge management principles and practices, but also dispersing it organization-wide. All too often leadership may benefit from a rotation back to associate levels to phenomenological experience roles, duties, and procedures, etc. They are in place to lead. Perhaps leadership should start by serving 'undercover' akin the award-winning show (broadcasted on an international basis) by Stephan Lambert, entitled "Undercover Boss". There is no single best way for leadership to understand the underpinnings without 'living the job'. It is not enough to have promoted up to leadership and it's done; we must recycle our visions of the business on a regular basis by way of direct involvement as a stakeholder (non-leadership role).

Leadership must understand how messages/knowledge is heard and perceived. All too often knowledge is disseminated from a top-down basis, without a true understanding as to how it's perceived and accepted. Regardless, the timing, pace, amount, and depth of knowledge requires benchmarks, control, and justification.

Knowledge Management

Knowledge management within the context of this article is defined as the communication of written and/or oral material intended to inform, conform, structure, etc. a movement of information from one to another. The salient goal of leadership, given an effective approach to the movement of knowledge, shall be to ensure all stakeholders are each respective leaders within the organization. Once a degree of information ownership is received by stakeholders in a meaningful, logical manner, there is a higher likelihood

of implementation. The process also 'models' an appropriate and optimal manner to communicate, organizationally.

Movement Strategies

It is not enough to communicate the knowledge today. Sample knowledge can be, but not limited to, staff/faculty meeting content, memorandums, etc. What's the value of knowledge if it's not received and implemented? How can we be sure each stakeholder has had input in the creation and distribution of knowledge; hence, 'walking the talk'? The movement objective should be to effectively management the timing, content, presentation, and amount, etc. of knowledge.

A Scenario

An organization has spent much time in developing a core set of strategies and objectives that it will implement. Such strategies, etc. have been compiled with the input of a sample of stakeholders ranging from perhaps the Board of Directors, shareholders, CEO, Executive Cabinet, line managers, leaders, and associates. However, when delivering the knowledge, its contents have lacked the acceptance and follow-thru by some stakeholders. In such a case, what may be the reasoning behind the lack of follow-thru when leadership was involved? Could it have been due to the lack of the entire organization being represented in the decision-making/contribution phases? It only takes one person to feel 'left-out' to potentially sabotage the reception of information. How can leadership ensure members are involved in each of the phases?

The process should involve cross-sectional involvement of stakeholders. When all cannot be involved, it is advisable that elected membership coupled with the least likely to be involved, but sabotage, be included on an invitation basis. The selection/involvement process should be made public with no hidden agendas.

Measurement of Knowledge Implementation

What percent of organizational knowledge is handled by which level? Does management or associates work most with the knowledge? What level of involvement has all the different organizational stakeholders had in the birthing of knowledge? Today, it's not enough to communicate knowledge without ensuring a complete understanding and buy-in of what's being distributed.

How much value does anything have if we've not embraced it? What level of accountability can an organization expect from its stakeholders whom have not been in direct involvement with the creation and dissemination of knowledge? It becomes easier with the buy-in of knowledge, where the 'good news' just can't seem to be spread fast enough?

While not politically or perhaps organizationally correct, witnessing knowledge distributed via a meeting and/or memorandum is not enough. How can an organization involve its entire stakeholders in the creation and distribution of knowledge? The following should be considered:

1. Involve representation from each respective department.
2. Ensure representatives specifically communicate outcomes with the rest of the line staff (each and every one).
3. Be sure to promote the process and specific involvement of the creation of knowledge with all. For example, celebrate and communicate the achievements, organizationally. This process ensures that literally all are involved and most importantly, seeing the contributions of knowledge fitting the paradigm. This process would solidify to all how and where each individual's contributions of knowledge were considered or lack of (reasoning provided as much as possible).
4. Within organizations there are leaders and followers. Also, there are those that have the great potential to be leaders, given they're shown their strategic contributions of knowledge are not only valued and fitted/implemented. It's a sharing game in organizations, such as it's in a personal relationship within a household. How valued would one person feel if s/he's ideas always take a back seat and/or brushed-off? True shared decision-making strategies involving all must not only be considered, but

advertised, religiously implemented and outcomes/process assessments communicated, organizationally.

5. Lastly, ensure the knowledge is tied to organizational goals, measureable, and attainable. Ensure benchmarks are in place and devised and implemented by the stakeholders, akin the process of involving the stakeholders in the creation of knowledge.

Expected Outcomes

An involved organization holds itself (and each respective stakeholder) responsible for the creation, distribution, and metrics of organizational knowledge. It's leadership's responsibility to essentially create an inverted, triangular structure within the organization, involving each associate. The outcomes will not only be embraced by the leaders and followers, but those that are not usually classified as leaders or followers. Does your organization have associates that are not usually leading or following? These are people that find themselves doing their job, but lacking true involvement and buy-in with the transformation of knowledge. Aiming to involve such associates will show them they're being valued and each of their recommendations is considered. Involving the popular or political vote within organizational knowledge management is counterproductive.

References

- [1] Bhatt, G. D. (2002). Management strategies for individual knowledge and organizational knowledge. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 6 (1), 31
- [2] Enrique, C. C., Patrocinio, Z. S. & Pertusa, O. E. (2007). Organizational structure features supporting knowledge management processes. *Journal of knowledge management*, 11 (4), 45-57
- [3] Ionescu, L. (2008, September). Organizational behavior and knowledge management processes. *Economic Management and Financial Markets*, 3 (3), 52-56

-
- [4] Rai, R. K. (2011). Knowledge management and organizational culture: a theoretical integrative framework. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 15 (5), 779-801
- [5] Wang, K., Chiang, C., & Tung, C.M. (2012, July). Integrating human resource management and knowledge management: From the viewpoint of core employees and organizational performance. *International Journal of Organizational Innovation (Online)*, 5 (1), 109-137