Chapter 122
The New Generation of Knowledge Management for the Web 2.0 Age: KM 2.0

Imed Boughzala
TELECOM Business School, France

Moez Limayem
University of Arkansas, USA

INTRODUCTION

Today, due to spurred social (e.g. the "Millennials") and technological (e.g. Broadband Internet, Mobile Technology, GPS[1], Web 2.0), etc) changes, organizations are transformed in an economic environment that is more than ever competitive. In the context of the *Social Organization* in the Web 2.0 age, collaboration mediated by technology, social networking and virtual communities, culture of awareness and innovation have become new levers to put *Collective Intelligence* at the service of the organization. In such an organization, all employees can equally participate in creating, using and sharing information and knowledge. The "Individual"- knowledge worker, plays a central role in this case.

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-61520-611-7.ch122

Faced with these changes, strategies and management models must necessarily adapt and even sometimes be rethought. *Knowledge Management* (KM), which is range of practices, methods and techniques used in an organization to identify, analyze, organize, create, memorize, and share knowledge (Dieng et al., 1999), is in the forefront in this evolutionary organizational context as we are moving from the only information processing to human interactions management and interpersonal networking. With the advent of the Web 2.0, the concept of KM has been impacted and has evolved towards a vision based more on people participation and emergence and less on knowledge per say. This implies a new conception of KM that we propose to call "*KM 2.0*" rather than Andy McAfee (2006)'s term "*Enterprise 2.0*" which is a more technology-focused concept and is not yet well defined.

The purpose of this chapter is to introduce, define, and clarify the concept of KM 2.0 compared to the traditional KM in terms of scope, nature of knowledge, place of the individual, process, and technology. KM 2.0 opportunities and challenges will be discussed and implications to practitioners, managers and researchers will also be presented.

TRADITIONAL KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT

The interest in KM dates back to the early 90s when companies realized the strategic value of knowledge as a competitive resource and a factor of stability for their survival (Spender, 1996). There is more than one definition of KM. Mentzas (2004 p.116) defines KM as the "*discipline of enabling individuals, teams and entire organizations to collectively and systematically create, share and apply knowledge, to better achieve the business objectives*". "*KM efforts can help individuals and groups to share valuable organizational insights, to reduce redundant work, to avoid reinventing the wheel per se, to reduce training time for new employees, to retain intellectual capital as employees turnover in an organization, and to adapt to changing environments and markets"* (McAdam and McCreedy, 2000 (as sited in Wikipedia).

According to Ikyjiro Nonaka (1994), *Knowledge Creation* is a spiralling and continuous process of interactions between explicit and tacit knowledge. Explicit knowledge which is codified and transmitted as information in formal and systematic language (e.g. rules, procedures) and tacit knowledge which is personal and deeply internalized, embodied in practice and action and so hard to be formalized and communicated (e.g. talent, hand-turn) (Polanyi, 1966). Spender (1996) has qualified a part of this tacit knowledge as implicit which is the only part that could be codified. The interactions between the explicit and tacit knowledge lead to the creation of new knowledge. The combination of the two categories makes it possible to conceptualize four conversion patterns: *Socialization*, *Externalization*, *Combination* and *Internalization* (Nonaka, 1994).

The Japanese culture inspired Ikyjiro Nonaka and and Noburo Konno to introduce the concept of *ba* in 1996 to represent a shared space for emerging relationships that serves as a foundation for *Knowledge Creation* (Nonaka, 1998). This space can be physical (e.g. office, dispersed business space), mental (e.g. shared experiences, ideas and ideals) or any combination of them. This concept which is difficult to be translated in Western languages, could be defined as the pooling context in which knowledge is shared, created and used through interaction.

Since its emergence, KM focused more on knowledge as such with its space of socialization (*ba*) and individuals (knowledge workers) who are holders of knowledge in their behavior, interactions and relationships. This discipline has for long time emphasized capturing, accumulating and disseminating knowledge through *Knoweldge Management Systems* (KMS). These systems are complex and expensive to implement and maintain.

We argue that with the arrival of Web 2.0, KM has found a new youth and its study and scope should be redesigned.

KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT 2.0

According to Stowe Boyd (Gandih, 2008), one of the prominent consultants and bloggers in the Web 2.0 industry, there are three types of knowledge:

- Impersonal knowledge which consists of ideas and information made explicit in documents and files (explicit knowledge).
- Personal knowledge which is tacit and stored in the brains (tacit knowledge).