

Governing strategy and knowledge: tools and methodologies

Carlo Bagnoli · Hanno Roberts

© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC. 2011

Keywords Strategy · Knowledge · Governance

1 Introduction to the JMG special issue

The recent affirmation of a knowledge-based view of the firm (Nonaka 1994; Grant 1996; Spender 1996) stems from the increasing importance given to knowledge as the base resource to develop sustainable competitive advantage (Drew 1999). For example, Zack argues that a firm's competitive strategy should be built around its knowledge-based resources, and that the actions a firm takes to manage knowledge gaps or surplus (e.g., building online document repositories, recruiting for particular skills) should be guided by a Knowledge Management (KM) strategy: "*KM strategy guides and defines the processes and infrastructure (organizational and technological) for managing knowledge. KM strategy typically includes broad generic components (e.g., emphasizing tacit vs. explicit knowledge, knowledge exploration vs. exploitation, or organizational vs. technical mechanisms for knowledge exchange) as well as those that are firm specific*" (Zack 2002: 270).

It implied a revisit to the concept of Knowledge Management (KM), leading to the distinction of 1st generation and 2nd generation knowledge management initiatives. The first generation of knowledge management concerned itself with the

C. Bagnoli (✉)
Department of Management, University Ca' Foscari of Venice,
873 Cannaregio, S. Giobbe, 30123 Venice, VE, Italy
e-mail: bagnoli@unive.it

H. Roberts
Department of Accounting, Auditing and Law, Norwegian School of Business,
Nydalsveien 37, 0484 Oslo, Norway
e-mail: hanno.roberts@bi.no

capture, codification, and diffusion of information, arguing that information is the raw material of knowledge and one has to start there. It emphasized the use of information and communication technologies as main vehicle, leading to a large variety of tools, instruments and approaches, ranging from internal bulleting boards, to corporate Yellow Pages of who knows what, to archiving and storing solutions. With the arrival of the second generation of knowledge management, emphasis has shifted towards the organisational aspects of knowledge. Having (permanent) access to knowledge and knowing who knows what, will only work when the overall organisation design allows, facilitates, and incentivates the sharing and the use of knowledge among its organisational members (Turchetti and Geisler, this issue). Consequently, the emphasis shifted from technology towards the context of (knowledge) use. This is not to say that technology stopped playing an important role but rather that its role became defined as a necessary but not a sufficient condition for competing on knowledge. The second generation of knowledge management typically addresses issues around (the design of) knowledge praxis, such as creating communities for knowledge sharing and emphasizing the social and networked interactions that form the base for effective knowledge creation, sharing, and utilization (Breuning and Hydle, this issue).

With the second generation of knowledge management, typical managerial issues arrived as well. For example, can knowledge sharing be incentivated and rewarded? Can it be measured in terms of its performance impact? How can knowledge be integrated with the work organisation, job design, and team- and project work? Of what do investments in knowledge consist beyond acquiring hardware and software? Is knowledge a capital asset that needs to be valued, reported, and disclosed? What are the revenue streams that can be identified with conscious deployment of the knowledge resource? In other words, how does knowledge affect the governance package of an organisation?

Several scholars have put forward proposals that attempt to demonstrate how to incorporate knowledge and knowledge conceptualizations, such as tacit-explicit, embedded-embrained, personalized-objectified, into methodologies and tools for strategy formulation (Hofer-Alfeis 2003; Mentzas 2004). Other scholars start out from an even higher conceptual level, arguing, for example, that “*the most critical element of corporate strategy is to conceptualize a vision about what kind of knowledge should be developed and to operationalize it into a management systems for implementation.*” (Nonaka and Takeuchi Nonaka 1995: 74). The initial choice of an entry point where to start problematizing knowledge for research purposes, has consequences for the subsequent trajectory of formulating research problem statements. For example, following Nonaka and Takeuchi’s initial view, the first and foremost challenge to researchers and practitioners in knowledge management becomes to develop methodologies and tools for cognitive representation of knowledge, deliberately including the strategists’ own mental models of knowledge. Another example is provided by the managerial perspective on knowledge. It starts out conceptualizing knowledge as a competitive resource equivalent to other organizational resources, such as the financial resource and the human resource. Consequently, knowledge becomes yet another object that needs to be managed and made subject to a variety of managerial tools and instruments to render it productive

(Cuccurrullo, this issue). An example of this line of thinking and argumentation is represented by strategy maps (Kaplan and Norton 2000); visual representations of strategy that support strategy implementation and, as a useful additional benefit, might result in developing a coherent sense of (the organisation's) self (Spender 2002). But that benefit is not set up as the main purpose of strategy mapping, which is implementation.

Our choice in this special issue is to start out from corporate governance and have a broader perspective on how knowledge is either deliberately designed in or unexpectedly impacts and influences the high-level structure of organisational processes. This goes beyond knowledge management and looking at knowledge as a thing that requires management and, thus, identification, capture, measurement, and utilization. Rather, it looks at knowledge as a series of processes, some of which are above the waterline of day-to-day management and recognized in their presence and acted upon, but also a series of processes that flow throughout the organisation under the waterline of observation and action, and occasionally appear and make their presence felt in wholly unsuspected ways (Frigotto et al. this issue).

The latter has two implications: first, that knowledge is randomly considered 'a problem' and acted upon as a local, punctual, and one-off phenomenon that has to be dealt with using existing mindsets and action frames. Knowledge appearances become 'surprise acts' and challenge the existing status quo. Typically, this results in case studies (war stories?) that illustrate unexpected causalities that, typically, are of a cross-functional nature and require higher-level, simultaneous and concurrent managerial interventions across different process areas (Lionzo and Rossignoli, this issue); for example, changing organisation structure, developing alternative incentive systems, deregulating or loosening up standard operating procedures, and changing reporting flows and formats, all simultaneously and concurrently intervened upon.

The second implication of knowledge processes which suddenly and unexpected appear above the waterline, is the attempt to take a step back and move to a larger framework of interpretation and categorisation that is to act as a sort of 'standard system of elements' similar to what is used in Chemistry. Even when not all elements have been found or fully known for its characteristics and effects, the system of elements is valid as a larger framework problematizing the field, i.e., to answer the ontological issue of which (knowledge) research problem belongs where.

Our contention is that corporate governance acts as such a larger 'system of elements', allowing us to look at the various occurrences of knowledge, both deliberate and conscious and unexpected and emergent, and interpret which research problem statement goes where. For example, does it affect the structure of governance, the processes of governance, the tools and implementation of governance, does it change the type of governance structures and processes?

This special issue aims to collect contributions addressing the concrete interplay between knowledge and governance. The relationship between knowledge and governance is addressed, assessed, and articulated in quantitative and qualitative papers, each of which state their ontological assumptions (how do we conceive knowledge?) and then continue to show how knowledge impacts aspects and components of corporate governance. This does not mean that the term 'corporate

governance' is mentioned on every page of every paper. Rather, conclusions and discussions are uncovering causalities in the interplay between knowledge and corporate governance, and do so mostly in terms of managerial themes.

The papers published in this special issue follow the above line of argument. We are very happy that Robert Grant accepted our invitation to write a paper outlining the relationship between the knowledge-based view of the firm and organizational capability. Grant's paper describes the present understanding of governance of the knowledge-based firm, incorporating findings of the most recent research studies, and highlighting the role of the coordination of the knowledge resource.

Following Robert's paper, the paper by Breunig and Hydle addresses the same aspect of coordination, using a longitudinal case study of globally distributed knowledge work in a team-based, professional service firm. It complements coordination with performance measurement, indicating the short-term and long-term impacts on knowledge-based value creation, and illustrating governance in a globally distributed, full knowledge-centred firm.

In turn, the paper by Breunig and Hydle is complemented by two papers; one by Lionzo and Rossignoli and one by Frigotto, Coller and Collini. The paper by Lionzo and Rossignoli illustrates learning in a knowledge-based firm, based on a comparative case study of three family-owned SMEs, addressing the role of governance in family-owned firms. The paper by Frigotto, Coller and Collini takes a step back and looks at the broader management control systems that are related to knowledge strategies, using a contingency perspective. Illustrated by a longitudinal case study, they take up the aspect of the dynamics of the reciprocal learning fit between management control systems and strategy, and how both evolve over time driven by the organization's knowledge identity. Governance, thus, is addressed as a result of the evolutionary and dynamic interplay between strategy and control.

The paper by Cuccurrullo and Lega continues on the argument of coordination but, as compared to the paper by Frigotto, Coller and Collini, is more focused on the strategy component. Based on an ethnographic study of academic medical centers, coordination of pluralistic organisations is driven by the practices used, and its conclusion resonates strongly with the learning dynamic present in the preceding papers by Breunig and Hydle, Lionzo and Rossignoli, and Frigotto, Coller and Collini. The aspect of governance and pluralism, also present in the afore-mentioned preceding papers, has been brought to the fore and discussed explicitly.

Finally, the paper by Turchetti and Geisler harks back to the 1st generation of knowledge management perspective, and addresses how the nature of knowledge itself constitutes a requisite design criterion for the organization. As such, the paper illustrates the transpience from the first to the second generation of knowledge management, and is based on the perception of knowledge as a cognitive phenomenon. Learning, thus, takes place within technical solutions as well as in corresponding organizational solutions, resonating with the paper by Frigotto, Coller and Collini. Governance is addressed from a (deliberate) design perspective, including the managerial implications.

This special issue had a long gestation period, ever since the JMG-sponsored conference of the same name was held in Venice in 2008. The paper by Lionzo and Rossignoli is the visible remnant from that conference. Following a call-for-paper

issued after the conference, we received 25 submissions, of which 16 were desk rejections due to incompatibility with the theme of the special issue. Of the 9 papers entered into the review process, 5 papers eventually were accepted. The review process consisted for the majority of 6 papers of triple-blind reviews, involving reviewers from a very diverse set of academic disciplines, in an attempt to do full justice to the interdisciplinary nature of many of the papers.

We gratefully acknowledge the diligent work and insightful comments of the reviewers, several times amounting to very substantial developmental reviews; without the below-mentioned scholars and peers, this special issue would not have been possible – thank you!

Theodor Barth	Oslo National Academy of the Arts, Norway
Erik Bjurström	Mälardalen University, Sweden
Karl Joachim Bruenig	Norwegian School of Business
Elena Cantu	SDA Bocconi, Italy
Clara Carbone	SDA Bocconi, Italy
Angelo Ditillo	SDA Bocconi, Italy
Susanne Durst	University of Liechtenstein
Swee C. Goh	University of Ottawa, Canada
Stephane Guerard	University of Zurich, Switzerland
Debbie Harrison	Norwegian School of Business
Katja Hydle	Norwegian School of Business
Joe Lampel	Cass Business School, United Kingdom
Giuseppe Marzo	University of Ferrara, Italy
Jan Mouritsen	Copenhagen Business School, Denmark
Eugenio Anessi Pessina	Catholic University of Milan, Italy
Anna Prenestini	SDA Bocconi, Italy
Emil Røyrvik	SINTEF, Norway
Lei Chei Sian	Nanyang Technological University, Singapore
Riccardo Silvi	University of Bologna, Italy
Matti Skoog	Stockholm School of Business, Sweden
Peter Skærbæk	Copenhagen Business School, Denmark
Riccardo Viganò	Federico II University, Italy
Marco Zamarian	University of Trento, Italy
Stefano Zambon	University of Ferrara, Italy
Francesco Zirpoli	Ca' Foscari University, Italy

References

- Drew, S. (1999). Building knowledge management into strategy: Making sense of a new perspective. *Long Range Planning*, 32(1), 130–136.
- Grant, R. (1996). Toward a knowledge-based theory of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17, 109–121.
- Hofer-Alfeis, J. (2003). Effective integration of knowledge management into the business starts with a top-down knowledge strategy. *Journal of Universal Computer Science*, 9(7), 719–728.

- Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P., (2000). Having trouble with your strategy? Then map it. *Harvard Business Review*, September–October, 167–176.
- Mentzas, G. (2004). A strategic management framework for leveraging knowledge assets. *International Journal of Innovation and Learning*, 1(2), 115–142.
- Nonaka, I. (1994). A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation. *Organization Science*, 5(1), 14–37.
- Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge creating company*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Spender, J.-C. (1996). Making knowledge the basis of a dynamic theory of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17(Special Issue), 45–62.
- Spender, J.-C. (2002). Knowledge management uncertainty and an emergent theory of the firm. In C. W. Choo & N. Bontis (Eds.), *The strategic management of intellectual capital and organizational knowledge*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zack, M. H. (2002). Epilogue: Developing a knowledge strategy. In C. W. Choo & N. Bontis (Eds.), *The strategic management of intellectual capital and organizational knowledge*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Author Biographies

Carlo Bagnoli is Associate Professor of Business Administration at the University Ca' Foscari of Venice. His main research interests are in the area of strategic management and financial accounting, with a focus on business model reconfiguration and communication. He authored and co-authored several books and articles on these topics.

Hanno Roberts is professor in Management Accounting & Control at the Norwegian School of Business. His research interest is in the accounting and control of/by knowledge intensive firms on which he has published and researched widely. He is a member of several Editorial Boards of Management Accounting research journals, and teaches globally within the above areas, notably at Executive and post-graduate levels.