


Chapter 1

A Re-Examination and Re-Specification of the Jennex Olfman Knowledge Management Success Model

Murray Eugene Jennex

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4332-1886>
San Diego State University, USA

ABSTRACT

The Jennex and Olfman KM success model was first published at HICSS in 2004 and in the International Journal of Knowledge Management in 2006. Additionally, it was independently verified by Kundapur and Rodrigues, Srivastava and Joshi, and Wang and Yang. Since then there has been many technology changes and innovations as well as further research on KM success. This chapter re-examines the Jennex Olfman model and suggests a newer model that incorporates the past 10 years of research, innovation in organizational structure, and technology innovation.

INTRODUCTION

The Jennex Olfman (2006) KM Success Model is a knowledge management explication of the widely accepted DeLone and McLean (2003) IS Success Model. DeLone and McLean (2003) was used as it was able to be modified to fit the observations and data collected in a longitudinal study of Organizational Memory, OM, and KM, it fit success factors found in the KM literature, and the resulting KM Success Model was useful in predicting success when applied to the design and implementation of

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-7998-2189-2.ch001

a KM initiative and/or a KMS. Additionally, the stated purpose of the DeLone and McLean IS Success Model (1992, 2003) is to be a generalized framework describing success dimensions that researchers can adapt and define specific contexts of success. The Jennex Olfman KM Success Model (2006) has been used to guide design of KM systems/initiatives, assess KM systems/initiatives, and to help determine readiness of an organization to do KM. Additionally, Cham, et al. (2016) and Kulkarni, et al. (2007) found support for using the DeLone and McLean (2003) model for assessing KM success while Kundapur and Rodrigues (2017), Srivastava and Joshi. (2018), and Wang and Yang (2016) validated the Jennex and Olfman (2006) model using PLS-SEM. However, while the model was validated, there were weaknesses. There has been much technological change and KM research since 2006 that caused this weaker validation. It is expected that the last 10 years have brought tremendous innovation to information technology and subsequently knowledge management. Key technical innovations include social media, the cloud, software as a service, mobile technologies, Internet 2.0 and collaborative technologies, unstructured data, big data, the Internet of Things, artificial intelligence, and improved connectivity and capacity. Additional emphasis on information management issues such as governance, risk and security management, leadership, innovation, business intelligence and analytics, and strategy have gotten organizations thinking new processes and new ways in managing, transferring, and utilizing data, information, and knowledge. To keep the Jennex Olfman KM Success Model (2006) relevant and viable as a tool for assisting researchers and practitioners in the creation and implementation of KM systems and initiatives this paper proposes and tests changes in constructs to the model.

This research is significant for two reasons. The first is the increasing importance and application of analytics in organizations. This paper incorporates analytics into organizational knowledge management. The second reason is the impact of adding KM and knowledge use as a formal part of organizational management with the publication of ISO (International Standards Organization) 9001-2015. ISO 9001 is the most widely applied quality management system, used by all sizes of organizations in all countries to demonstrate they have a management system to control the quality and consistency of products and services. Over one million ISO 9001 certificates are issued each year with each certificate usually needing to be renewed within three years. All these organizations will need a KM program. This paper updates the Jennex-Olfman KM success model so that it will be relevant for use by organizations in designing, implementing, and measuring their KM initiatives to support ISO 9001 certifications and re-certifications.

27 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/a-re-examination-and-re-specification-of-the-jennex-olfman-knowledge-management-success-model/244875

Related Content

Advanced Data Mining and Visualization Techniques with Probabilistic Principal Surfaces: Applications to Astronomy and Genetics

Antonino Staiano, Lara De Vinco, Giuseppe Longo and Roberto Tagliaferri (2008). *Mathematical Methods for Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining* (pp. 244-264). www.irma-international.org/chapter/advanced-data-mining-visualization-techniques/26144

Formation of Faden Quartz Druses in Mid-Carboniferous Sandstones of the Donetsk Basin

Oleg Krisak and Vyacheslav Bezrukov (2018). *Dynamic Knowledge Representation in Scientific Domains* (pp. 155-162). www.irma-international.org/chapter/formation-of-faden-quartz-druses-in-mid-carboniferous-sandstones-of-the-donetsk-basin/200175

Implementation of Data Mining Algorithm With R

C. Deisy and Mercelin Francis (2019). *Sentiment Analysis and Knowledge Discovery in Contemporary Business* (pp. 92-125). www.irma-international.org/chapter/implementation-of-data-mining-algorithm-with-r/210966

Re-Defining Work-Life Boundaries: Individual, Organizational, and National Policy Implications

Donna Weaver McCloskey (2020). *Optimizing Data and New Methods for Efficient Knowledge Discovery and Information Resources Management: Emerging Research and Opportunities* (pp. 32-52). www.irma-international.org/chapter/re-defining-work-life-boundaries/255750

A Comparative Study of Associative Classifiers in Mesenchymal Stem Cell Differentiation Analysis

Weiqi Wang, Yanbo J. Wang, Qin Xin, René Bañares-Alcántara, Frans Coenen and Zhanfeng Cui (2011). *Knowledge Discovery Practices and Emerging Applications of Data Mining: Trends and New Domains* (pp. 223-243).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/comparative-study-associative-classifiers-mesenchymal/46898