

Knowledge Producers and Consumers

Atreyi Kankanhalli

National University of Singapore, Singapore

Bernard C.Y. Tan

National University of Singapore, Singapore

Kwok-Kee Wei

City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong

INTRODUCTION

In a knowledge-based economy, organizations find it difficult to compete based upon the individual knowledge of a few organizational members. This provides the rationale for *knowledge management* wherein organizational knowledge must be shared, combined, and reused in order to enable organizations to compete more effectively. Hence, *knowledge sharing* is considered an essential process in knowledge management. Unfortunately, sharing is often unnatural for the parties involved in it, that is, knowledge contributors or producers and knowledge seekers or consumers. Hoarding knowledge and not accepting knowledge from others are natural tendencies that are difficult to change (Davenport & Prusak, 1998). *Knowledge contributors* may be inhibited from sharing their knowledge due to perceptions of loss of power, lack of time or incentives, and other barriers. *Knowledge seekers* may find it laborious to seek advice from others and desire to discover solutions for themselves. Therefore, it is vital to understand and foster the *motivations* of knowledge contributors and seekers toward participating in knowledge sharing.

With the attention to knowledge management and the knowledge-based view of the firm, research in knowledge sharing and its motivations has gained interest over the last decade and a half. The initial focus of research was on investigating what motivates knowledge contribution (e.g., Orlikowski 1993; Constant, Kiesler, & Sproull, 1994) as this appeared to be a more intractable problem than motivating knowledge seeking. Subsequently, knowledge seeking behavior also has been researched (e.g., Goodman & Darr, 1998; Jarvenpaa & Staples, 2000; Kankanhalli, Tan, & Wei, 2001), although there is still considerably more attention devoted to studying knowledge contribution behavior.

Concurrently, the role of technology (known as *knowledge management system* or KMS) in enabling knowledge sharing has received research interest. How-

ever, in spite of the advent of new technology enabled forms of knowledge sharing such as knowledge logging (the enterprise flavor of blogging), the challenges of promoting knowledge sharing persist. This is because culture and management issues appear to dominate over technological issues in ensuring knowledge sharing success. For example, Ruppel and Harrington (2001) found that employee acceptance of or resistance to Intranets as a knowledge-sharing environment was more of a management and culture problem rather than a technology hurdle. Calls have been made to address both social and technical issues together (Zack, 1999) in order to be able to reap the benefits of knowledge management that have been experienced by some organizations (Davenport & Prusak, 1998).

BACKGROUND

Knowledge sharing is typically defined in two ways depending on the perspective toward knowledge. Researchers who view knowledge as an object tend to use the term “knowledge transfer” while others who see knowledge as a process use the term “knowledge sharing” (Allee, 1997). The notions of knowledge sharing and knowledge transfer can be combined by defining knowledge sharing as voluntary activities (process) of transferring or disseminating knowledge from one person to another person or group in an organization (Hansen, Nohria, & Tierney, 1999). A number of theoretical perspectives have been used to investigate the motivation of knowledge contributors and seekers.

Public Goods Theory

One of the initial lenses employed in studying motivations in knowledge sharing has been public goods theory (e.g., Thorn & Connolly, 1987; Fulk, Flanagan, Kalman, Monge, & Ryan, 1996). Knowledge shared in an organization through means such as a knowledge repository

(referred to as a discretionary database in some previous literature) can be considered as a public good, that is, non-excludable, non-rival, and exhibiting jointness of supply. Knowledge shared is considered non-excludable because other repository users who did not contribute to its production are not prevented from access to the knowledge. The knowledge is non-rival because even if one consumer uses the knowledge, it still remains available to others, who also may apply the knowledge in their own situations. The knowledge contributed exhibits jointness of supply because it costs as much to produce for use by one person as for use by many.

Research along this perspective tends to focus on the motivational dilemma faced by knowledge contributors to such repositories. The dilemma for knowledge contributors is that collective interests bid them to share knowledge whereas self-interest may discourage them from contributing. Collective interest suggests that knowledge contributed will allow it to be combined or reused for greater benefit to the organization (Fulk et al., 1996). However, self-interest seems to dictate that contributing knowledge would reduce the unique knowledge possessed by the individual and thereby make him or her more replaceable in the organization (Kollock, 1999). In a broader sense, the dilemma for the community is that all members of the community stand to gain if everyone contributes. However, individually members are better off free-riding on the contributions of others. Therefore, research along this stream tries to understand how to promote collective action of knowledge contribution when it does not appear individually rational (Wasko & Faraj, 2000).

Expectancy Theory

Another perspective on studying motivation for knowledge contribution and seeking has attempted to apply more rational theories of motivation such as expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964) to understand the phenomenon. These studies (e.g., Kalman, 1999) suggest that individuals contribute knowledge based on their expectancy of certain benefits. Kalman's research found that organizational commitment, organizational instrumentality (the belief that sharing knowledge will produce organizational gain), and connective efficacy (the belief that the repository can be used to reach other people) positively influence individual's motivation to contribute to a repository.

Studies on knowledge seeking also have made use of expectancy theory (e.g., Nebus, 2004). Nebus' study proposed that the relationship between perceived value from knowledge seeking and knowledge seeking behavior is moderated by the perceived expectation of obtain-

ing value. The perceived value from knowledge seeking depends on contributor's expertise and credibility while the perceived expectation of value depends on trust, obligation, and contributor's willingness to help. The perceived cost of seeking depends on monetary and time costs as well as the seeking risk in terms of the distance between the contributor and seeker.

Technology Adoption Theories

Theories of technology adoption have been applied to study motivation to use technologies for knowledge sharing. Particularly, the theory of planned behavior (Ajzen, 1991), which has been applied to technology adoption, has been used for this purpose. The theory proposes that the intention to use a technology depends on the attitude toward the technology, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral controls. Studies of knowledge contribution (e.g., Bock & Kim, 2002) have sought to find the antecedents of attitude, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral controls for knowledge contributors. Bock and Kim (2002) found that anticipated reciprocal relationships affected the attitude toward knowledge contribution while autonomy, innovativeness, and fairness of the organization impacted the subjective norm to contribute knowledge. As expected, attitude and subjective norm were positively related to knowledge contribution intention and to actual knowledge contribution behavior. Anticipated extrinsic rewards were found to play a facilitating role in individual's knowledge contribution.

The theory of planned behavior in conjunction with the task-technology fit model (Goodhue & Thompson, 1995) has been used to explain knowledge seeking behavior (Kankanhalli et al., 2001). Kankanhalli and colleagues' study found that technology-related factors (perceived output quality) and organization-related factors (availability of resources) directly impact seeking behavior, while task factors (task interdependence and task tacitness) play a moderating role on the effect of incentives on knowledge seeking from repositories.

Gaps in Literature

Prior empirical studies tend to focus on the benefits (acting as motivators) rather than the costs (acting as inhibitors) of knowledge contribution. This is in spite of the fact that practitioner literature (e.g., O'Dell & Grayson, 1998) and conceptual academic literature (e.g., Ba, Stallaert, & Whinston, 2001) suggest that costs are important in determining knowledge contribution behavior. Another feature of the prior research is that most studies consider knowledge sharing for all electronic

6 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-producers-consumers/16985

Related Content

A University Knowledge Management Tool for the Evaluation of the Efficiency and Quality of Learning Resources in Distance e-Learning

Irena Atanasova (2019). *International Journal of Knowledge Management* (pp. 38-55).

www.irma-international.org/article/a-university-knowledge-management-tool-for-the-evaluation-of-the-efficiency-and-quality-of-learning-resources-in-distance-e-learning/234740

Editor Conclusions

Cesar Camison (2009). *Connectivity and Knowledge Management in Virtual Organizations: Networking and Developing Interactive Communications* (pp. 278-279).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/editor-conclusions/6957

Personal Knowledge Management by the Knowledge Citizen: The Generation Aspect of Organizational and Social Knowledge-Based Development

América Martínez Sánchez (2010). *Knowledge-Based Development for Cities and Societies: Integrated Multi-Level Approaches* (pp. 131-140).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/personal-knowledge-management-knowledge-citizen/41689

The Recognition of Collaboration

(2015). *Information Acquisitions and Sharing through Inter-Organizational Collaboration: Impacts of Business Performance in China* (pp. 43-75).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/the-recognition-of-collaboration/134157

The Role of Informal Groups in Organisational Knowledge Work: Understanding an Emerging Community of Practice

Gerlinde Koeglreiter, Ross Smithand Luba Torlina (2006). *International Journal of Knowledge Management* (pp. 6-23).

www.irma-international.org/article/role-informal-groups-organisational-knowledge/2674