

Knowledge Management Software

Rodrigo Baroni de Carvalho
FUMEC University, Brazil

Marta Araújo Tavares Ferreira
Federal University of Minas Gerais (UFMG), Brazil

INTRODUCTION

Due to the vagueness of the concept of knowledge, the software market for knowledge management (KM) seems to be quite confusing. Technology vendors are developing different implementations of the KM concepts in their software products. Because of the variety and quantity of KM tools available on the market, a typology may be a valuable aid to organizations that are searching and evaluating KM software suitable to their needs.

The objective of this article is to present a typology that links software features to knowledge processes described in the SECI (socialization, externalization, combination, internalization) model developed by Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995). KM solutions such as intranet systems, content-management systems (CMSs), groupware, work flow, artificial intelligence- (AI) based systems, business intelligence (BI), knowledge-map systems, innovation support, competitive intelligence (CI) tools, and knowledge portals are discussed in terms of their potential contributions to the processes of socialization, externalization, internalization, and combination.

BACKGROUND

KM intends to be an area of research and practice that deepens the understanding of knowledge processes in organizations and develops procedures and instruments to support the transformation of knowledge into economic and social progress. In fact, different aspects of these issues have been studied for decades in many different disciplines as R&D (research and development) and innovation management, information systems management, information science, computer science, library studies, innovation economics, science and technology social studies, epistemology, and many others. Maybe one of the most important contributions of the KM concept is the creation of a space (in academy and in the business world) where these many groups and points of view may discuss and work together.

KM studies analyze people, organizations, processes, and technology. Although technology is not the main

component of KM, it would be naive to implement KM without considering any technological support. According to Stewart (1998), the intellectual capital of an organization has three dimensions: human capital, structural capital, and client capital. Structural capital is defined as the organizational systems and structures that store and transfer knowledge, and it includes the quality and extent of information systems, databases, patents, written procedures, and business documents. From this perspective, KM software should be considered as an important component of the structural capital of organizations.

This article assumes that IT has a supporting role, not the main role, in a KM program. According to Terra (2000), KM has seven dimensions: strategy, culture and organizational values, organizational structure, human resource skills, IT, measuring, and environmental learning. Therefore, IT is only one of the dimensions of KM, and technology alone does not transform information into knowledge. The KM ultimate challenge is to increase the chances of innovation through knowledge creation. The role of IT in this context is to extend the human capacity of knowledge creation through the speed, memory extension, and communication facilities of technology.

Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) have analyzed the knowledge-creation process of Japanese organizations and developed a framework (SECI model). This model relates the knowledge creation of firms to four knowledge conversion processes.

- **Socialization (S):** the process of sharing tacit knowledge through shared experiences. As apprentices learn the craft of their masses through observation, imitation, and practice, so do employees of a firm learn new skills through on-the-job training.
- **Externalization (E):** where tacit knowledge is articulated into explicit knowledge with the help of metaphors and analogies. Externalization is triggered by dialog and collective reflection.
- **Combination (C):** the process of converting explicit knowledge into more systematic sets of explicit knowledge.

- **Internalization (I):** where explicit knowledge is converted into tacit knowledge. This usually occurs when explicit knowledge is put into practice. It is also related to shared mental models and work practices.

These interactions build a continuous spiral from the individual to organizational level. Ponzi (2004) used bibliometric techniques to analyze 2,240 source records obtained from scientific citation indexes. His research revealed that Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) is the top most cited reference in the KM area and the most influential work. Due to this popularity, we have decided to use the SECI model to help individuals who already know this framework but need a better understanding of the KM software market.

There are some related works concerning KM software categorization: Barnes (2001), Bellaver and Lusa (2002), Davenport and Prusak (1998), Fernandez, Gonzalez, and Sabherwal (2004), Maier (2004), Malhotra (2000), Rollet (2003), Ruggles (1997), and Tiwana (2002). None of these academic works establish a direct relationship between the KM systems and the SECI model. The authors usually prefer to use their own KM framework to analyze the link between knowledge processes and KM systems. There is also another type of proposal for categorization, that is, Microsoft (2000), which has been developed by vendors and is very IT based. It is not the objective of this article to discuss the differences and the similarities among these proposals, but they have been considered in the development of the typology presented here.

MAIN FOCUS OF THE ARTICLE

The main objective of this article is to present a typology of KM solutions present on the market that comprehends 10 categories, each of which emphasizes specific KM aspects. It also intends to identify which of the knowledge-conversion processes (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995) is supported by each software category. This article concludes by presenting some trends in KM software development and suggesting some guidelines for the launching of KM programs supported by IT.

To accomplish our objective, it was necessary to explore the software market in order to classify KM tools. The major difficulty in accomplishing this task was the establishment of limits on a growing market. A sample of KM software was constructed through information collected on KM-related sites selected in Nascimento and Neves (1999), on advertisements in KM magazines (*KM World*, *KM Magazine*, and *DM Review*), and in digital libraries (<http://brint.com>). The

exploratory research resulted in a list of 26 software vendors that were contacted, from which 21 sent folders, technical briefings, and demo versions of their software. The analysis of each KM system basically consisted of an installation and feature checkup. It was tested if the features advertised by the vendor were really supported by the KM system. After the analysis of these tools, it was possible to identify some common features among them, which originated the typology's first version. This version (Carvalho, 2000) was composed of eight categories.

After this period, Collins (2003), Detlor (2004), Firestone (2003), Kim, Chaudhury, and Rao (2002), and Raol, Koong, Liu, and Yu (2002) published research related to the evaluation of KM software and the emergence of knowledge portals. Due to the development of the KM software market and influenced by the previously mentioned works, this typology was reviewed and updated in 2004. As a result, two new categories have been incorporated: competitive intelligence tools and knowledge portals. The KM systems are then discussed in terms of their contributions to the four knowledge conversion modes developed by Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995).

As a result of this research, 10 KM software categories are presented as follows:

- Intranet-based systems
- Content management systems
- Groupware
- Work flow
- Artificial intelligence-based systems
- Business intelligence
- Knowledge map systems
- Innovation support tools
- Competitive intelligence tools
- Knowledge portals

Intranet-Based Systems

An intranet is an appropriate tool to systematize and add the explicit knowledge that is dispersed through departments. Intranets are organizational assets and an important part of the structural dimension of intellectual capital, as described by Stewart (1998). The communication in intranets is usually passive because the user has to pull the information. Nevertheless, the efficient usage of intranets is closely related to a wider comprehension of information management contribution to organizational performance. An intranet, like other systems described in this article, should be understood as a part of the organizational information context, and its usefulness is influenced by culture, values, and principles concerning strategic information management.

7 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-software/16979

Related Content

FPN-Based Small Orange Fruit Detection From Farm Images With Occlusion

Francisco de Castro and Angelin Gladston (2022). *International Journal of Knowledge-Based Organizations* (pp. 1-12).

www.irma-international.org/article/fpn-based-small-orange-fruit-detection-from-farm-images-with-occlusion/296394

An Exploratory Analysis of Information and Knowledge Management Enablers in Business Contexts

Karen Nelson and Michael Middleton (2008). *Knowledge Management: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications* (pp. 2660-2669).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/exploratory-analysis-information-knowledge-management/25288

Facilitator Toolkit for Building and Sustaining Virtual Communities of Practice

Lisa Kimball and Amy Ladd (2004). *Knowledge Networks: Innovation Through Communities of Practice* (pp. 202-215).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/facilitator-toolkit-building-sustaining-virtual/25434

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

Knowledge Management in U. S. Federal Government Organizations: Can It Work?

J. Judah Buchwalter (2002). *Knowledge Mapping and Management* (pp. 88-97).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/knowledge-management-federal-government-organizations/25383