

Chapter 4.19

Innovation Link Between Organization Knowledge and Customer Knowledge

Helen Mitchell

Unitec, Auckland, New Zealand

INTRODUCTION

In 1959 Penrose referred to the importance of knowledge for using resources more innovatively and profitably, and in the same year Drucker indicated greater value should be placed on knowledge workers. An article by Nonaka (1991) suggested that the source of lasting competitive advantage is knowledge. Since then there has been a growing interest in knowledge, and an emerging view that the sharing of knowledge and creation of new knowledge leading to innovations is the key to providing future economic growth. In 1998, Amidon referred to the survey in 1996 produced by *The Economist* describing how rich economies will increasingly depend upon “their ability to innovate” (p. 24).

THE ORGANIZATION

At the corporate level it is important for organizations to recognize the value of knowledge. An environment accepting that knowledge sharing is the norm provides a conduit for the generation of innovations. Continuous innovation is necessary for survival in what is now a highly competitive global environment. Innovation springs from the knowledge within the organization. Corporate knowledge is accumulated through its systems and procedures, its databases and its technology, and from its employees sharing and applying their knowledge to the operational requirements of the business. The interaction of employees with external parties such as customers, suppliers, industry contacts and those residing in the wider community also provides a considerable source of knowledge for the organization.

Employees bring to an organization their individual knowledge bank gathered as a result of their education and experience of life. The longer they work in an organization, the more knowledge they accumulate about its operations, products and customers. Nonaka (1991) refers to the spiral of knowledge in the organization and says that knowledge begins with the individual. Taking this further, Inkpen (1996), when referring to the spiral of organizational knowledge creation, indicates the importance of moving knowledge from the level of the individual to group level and on upwards to organizational level.

It is perhaps worth taking cognizance of Davenport and Prusak (1998, p.108), who say, “Despite the corporate mantra that employee knowledge is a valuable resource, most firms do not make concerted efforts to cultivate the knowledge oriented activities of their personnel”. Although knowledge comes from employees, Teece (1998, p. 62) indicates it is the organization that provides “the physical, social, and resource allocation structure so that knowledge can be shaped into competences”. It is worth remembering that Drucker (1994, p. 71) said it is the knowledge workers who own the tools of production. Previously, “The industrial workers needed the capitalist infinitely more than the capitalist needed the industrial worker,” but in the knowledge society organizations “...need knowledge workers far more than knowledge workers need them”. It should be kept in mind that employees take their knowledge home with them each evening, and in some situations they may not return, thus depriving the organization of valuable knowledge. However, if it is recognized that employees have knowledge of value, then organizations need to maximize the benefit of that knowledge, and determine how to harness it to the advantage of the organization and the individual (Mitchell, 2002a).

When assessing the potential of knowledge, Carneiro (2000, p. 87) suggests organizations “...need to look for the knowledge that is able to add value. Value adding knowledge is very

different to an information-mix.” Lester (2001) also advises, “Managing knowledge is not like managing information, it involves focusing on, nurturing and winning the trust of the professional knowledge workers and the confidence of customers and suppliers” (p. 172). This means organizations need to look closely at encouraging a culture involving the development of good relationships based around trust, and in which knowledge is readily shared. Sharing knowledge increases the knowledge among those who share and adds value to the organization while at the same time making it difficult for competitors to copy.

It is, therefore, important for organizations to try to move the tacit knowledge of its employees into explicit knowledge to be embedded in the organization’s knowledge repository for all to share. Codifying tacit knowledge is not easy, and all the knowledge the employee holds will never be captured. However, knowledge that can be codified becomes available for sharing with others in the organization. Knowledge sharing and creation of new knowledge emerges as a result of working in teams where problems that arise need to be resolved. Opportunities for social interaction should be encouraged – it is not unknown for useful knowledge to be exchanged in such an environment. While sharing knowledge for the benefit of the organization involves everyone, knowledge is also shared, wittingly, or unwittingly, with those external to it. This can present a two-edged sword. While knowledge can be lost, it can also be gained. However, from the knowledge of all those involved in the knowledge sharing process, along with the knowledge held within the structure of the organization, there emerges collective knowledge. Whether it is focused within the organization, or encompassing knowledge external to it, collective knowledge provides a catalyst for the development of innovations (Mitchell, 2002b).

4 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/innovation-link-between-organization-knowledge/9530

Related Content

Physician Rating Websites and Use or Non-Use of a Physician After Reading These Reviews

Joshua Fogeland Viviane Wahba (2021). *Journal of Electronic Commerce in Organizations* (pp. 55-73).
www.irma-international.org/article/physician-rating-websites-and-use-or-non-use-of-a-physician-after-reading-these-reviews/274270

Evaluating Citizen Attitudes Towards Local E-Government and a Comparison of Engagement Methods in the UK

Andy Phippen (2007). *International Journal of Cases on Electronic Commerce* (pp. 55-71).
www.irma-international.org/article/evaluating-citizen-attitudes-towards-local/1520

B2C E-Commerce, C2C E-Commerce, and E-Recruiting

(2012). *Electronic Commerce Management for Business Activities and Global Enterprises: Competitive Advantages* (pp. 122-165).
www.irma-international.org/chapter/b2c-commerce-c2c-commerce-recruiting/67589

Clustering E-Shoppers on the Basis of Shopping Values and Web Characteristics

Sanjeev Prashar, Sai Vijay Tata, Chandan Parsad, Abhishek Banerjee, Nikhil Sahakari and Subham Chatterjee (2021). *Research Anthology on E-Commerce Adoption, Models, and Applications for Modern Business* (pp. 941-957).
www.irma-international.org/chapter/clustering-e-shoppers-on-the-basis-of-shopping-values-and-web-characteristics/281542

Effect of Influencer Marketing on Online Impulse Purchase: The Mediating Role of Consumer-Brand Engagement

Jay P. Trivedi (2021). *Journal of Electronic Commerce in Organizations* (pp. 49-64).
www.irma-international.org/article/effect-of-influencer-marketing-on-online-impulse-purchase/280079