

Minitrack Introduction - Managing Knowledge for Innovation, Agility and Collaboration

Marianne Gloet
University of Melbourne
marianne.gloet@unimelb.edu.au

Danny Samson
University of Melbourne
d.samson@unimelb.edu.au

Dragos Vieru
Télé-Université du Québec
dragos.vieru@teluq.ca

In this century of social media, big data and mobile applications this minitrack focuses on the contribution that KM makes to supporting organizational innovation, agility and collaboration. As the global economic environment continues to generate profound challenges, the role of KM is explored in the following ways: (1) the manner in which inflows and outflows of knowledge have expanded to accelerate internal innovation and expand the markets for external use of innovation, and (2) how KM is used to support organizational agility, knowledge sharing and collaboration. The focus of this minitrack supports alternative approaches to innovation and other organizational activities in an open environment involving multiple participants and stakeholders. These themes are open to exploring new methods and organizational structures for improving innovation, organizational agility, knowledge sharing and collaboration by engaging a broader base of outside knowledge holders and raise important new issues about how knowledge is created and applied to derive business value, generate new ideas, and support innovation.

The fundamental role of knowledge in acquiring and maintaining competitive advantage emphasizes the need for effective and strategic KM in organizations. When effective and reliable methods drive approaches to KM, this in turn supports the integration of value-creating activities into organizational processes and increases an organization's potential to achieve innovation, agility and competitiveness. Moreover, with the intensification of competition and the development of various forms of globally distributed and virtual modes of cross-boundary work, scholars have increasingly regarded an organization's ability to facilitate the sharing of knowledge as being critical for organizational effectiveness, innovation and creativity. Knowledge and innovation are inextricably linked. As a fundamental resource linked to achieving competitive advantage, knowledge cannot simply be reduced to an object that may be computerized. Indeed, knowledge

sharing is challenging during cross-boundary collaboration efforts to support innovation. IT-based knowledge sharing is challenging because the specialization of each functional area renders organizational knowledge situational, cultural, and contextual. Individuals do not necessarily use the same language, nor do they possess the same view of what needs to be shared and how it needs to be shared (what technology to use and how to use it). Also differences in practices may create epistemic barriers (e.g. differences in knowledge bases) among members of different communities of practice within an organization or from different organizations and assessing these differences is essential to understanding organizational knowledge sharing in relation to organizational innovation.

The first paper in the minitrack, by Ross Farrelly and Eng Chew, is of relevance to researchers in a plurality of disciplines including design science, service innovation and platform development because it applies a novel design approach in an industry platform setting and develops a novel conception of a large scale market for personal information. As mobile and wearable technology continues to evolve it is becoming easier than ever to capture an ever-increasing volume of personal information, information which is not only voluminous but also increasingly detailed and therefore of great value to organisations. However, there are currently no readily available means by which an individual can receive financial compensation for granting access to his or her personal information. This paper discusses the viability of a Primary Personal Information Market (PPIM), a market in which the primary producer of personal information sells access to that information in some form to a consumer who wishes to benefit from it. This stands in contrast to the secondary personal information market in which a secondary party gains financial benefit by selling other individuals' personal information. The authors conceptualize the integrated Service Innovation Method (iSIM) as a framework by which to design

PPIM as an industry platform for innovative personal data service delivery.

Because it is difficult and costly for firms to practice exploration and exploitation simultaneously in their new product development, managers need to know when investing in ambidexterity is beneficial for their firm's innovativeness and when it is not. To date, research has remained undecided about the performance implications of striving for the joint implementation of exploration and exploitation. To address this persistent debate, the paper by Nicolas Zacharias develops a new conceptualization that distinguishes two forms of ambidexterity, with contrasting effects on innovativeness. Drawing on dynamic capabilities theory, the author proposes that market-based ambidexterity benefits companies' innovativeness, whereas product-based ambidexterity harms it. The empirical results, obtained from longitudinal data gathered from 229 executives in multiple industries, confirm these theorized effects of the two forms of ambidexterity on product program innovativeness, which in turn increases firm performance. These findings help explain the different effects of ambidexterity in prior research and offer important managerial and decision-making implications.

Finally, the paper by Marianne Gloet and Danny Samson examined the extent to which the management of knowledge and the application of business excellence frameworks can contribute to innovation performance. As competition in business and industry continues to grow, the demand for effective KM to support innovation in knowledge-intensive industries also increases. In this context, the strong links between forms of knowledge and modes of innovation motivate organizations to manage their knowledge assets proactively to achieve IP. To this end, the manner in which organizations approach KM influences IP. Business excellence frameworks can be useful in shaping KM activities to support IP; however, this early stage research has indicated that the nature of business excellence frameworks, with their roots in quality and continuous improvement, may actually place a heavier focus on incremental rather than more radical forms of innovation. This research is preliminary in nature and it would be useful to expand the number of cases and to examine other business excellence frameworks. For instance, the U.S. Baldrige Awards contain a strong focus on KM, so this will be one thrust of future research in this area.