

Towards an Integrated Approach to Knowledge Management: 'Hard', 'Soft' and 'Abstract' Issues

Vlatka Hlupic¹, Athanasia Pouloudi² and George Rzevski¹

¹ Brunel Knowledge Management Centre, Department of Information Systems and Computing, Brunel University, United Kingdom

² Department of Management Science and Technology, Athens University of Economics and Business, Greece

**Knowledge and Process Management
The Journal of Corporate Transformation
9(0), pp.1-14, 2002**

Abstract

Companies are often unaware of the potential value of corporate information and extent of data held in their systems. It is increasingly argued that analysis of such data and information can be transformed into knowledge that in turn can be used to gain business benefits such as, a competitive advantage, minimisation of costs, improved quality, responsiveness, or improved service to customers. This paper investigates the benefits of a systematic and interdisciplinary approach to research in knowledge management, particularly in investigating technical ('hard'), organisational ('soft'), as well as philosophical ('abstract') aspects of the concept. It describes in detail the framework used in research undertaken by the Centre for Knowledge Management at Brunel University. We argue that this framework is useful to researchers and practitioners alike as it contributes to a systematic and more effective knowledge management approach.

1. Introduction

In order to survive in competitive and continuously changing business environments, organisations need to adapt to new conditions and respond to change. Various change management concepts have flourished in the business and management literature for several decades (Currie and Hlupic, 2000a). Such concepts, often presented in the management literature as panaceas (see Currie, 1999), include Total Quality Management (TQM), Just in Time (JIT), Process Innovation and Business Process Re-engineering (BPR). The latter concept, although praised in theory, has been particularly controversial in practice, with multiple instances of failed implementation (e.g., Hammer and Champy, 1993). As a result, researchers have studied both business and technological issues, focusing, in the case of the former, on the types of organisations that would benefit from BPR and, in the case of the latter, reflecting on the role of information technologies in supporting the change process. However, little research has addressed how these issues are experienced by the people involved or affected by the process (Choudrie, 2000) and more specifically how organisational (business and people) issues interact with technological factors. This is

considered as an important reason for the lack of an in-depth understanding of BPR in practice, and consequently as responsible for implementation failures.

This paper argues that there is a risk that similar issues will be raised in the uptake of the increasingly popular notion of knowledge management. Knowledge management can be considered as the latest management panacea for organisational effectiveness. In essence, knowledge management emphasises the importance of knowledge for organisations and its pivotal role in achieving competitive advantage. This is because, in turbulent business environments, one of the main sources of lasting competitive advantage is knowledge (Nonaka and Takeuchi 1995). This knowledge exists in a variety of places and formats, including databases, intranets, filing cabinets and peoples' heads.

An important reason why knowledge management is becoming increasingly popular is that the capabilities of contemporary information systems make the codification, storing, generation and exchange of information and, some would argue, knowledge (e.g., Selvin and Buckingham Shum, 2000; Costa et al., 2000) easier than ever. Technology changes at a fast pace, with ever increasing functionality, while at the same time knowledge workers become increasingly competent in its use. Similarly, the knowledge content of products and services is increasing and the availability of virtual working environments and interactive learning environments is increasingly taken for granted. Knowledge management systems are broadly defined technologies, which enhance and enable knowledge generation, codification and transfer (Ruggles, 1997). Their increasing capabilities facilitate knowledge management but are still limited. Despite their name, knowledge management systems are in essence limited to handling data rather than knowledge, since they are usually designed to deal with structured data, where 'information' is directly entered into fields or can be categorised in some manner. The difficulties of developing and validating patterns (Brash, 2000) or dealing with unstructured data (Selvin and Buckingham Shum, 2000) are reflected in the research pertaining to these systems.

At the same time, it is recognised that the effective management of knowledge involves more than simply exploiting the data held on information systems. It also requires attention to the 'softer' parts of the corporate knowledge base, as found in the human and cultural aspects of businesses, particularly the experiences and tacit knowledge of employees (Savage, 1996; Starr, 1999). It is the organisational structures and processes that harness and combine intellectual and human capital for learning, innovation and problem solving. And, it is through the impact on business processes that better knowledge management can contribute to providing better service to the customers, leveraging knowledge for innovation and empowering employees through the exchange of knowledge with others in the business environment.

Both the 'hard', technological, and the 'soft', organisational and human, aspects are important for knowledge management. Furthermore, knowledge management is based on more abstract aspects, dealing with theoretical, philosophical, epistemological and ontological aspects of this concept. Despite the multiple publications, research projects and conferences related to knowledge management, no consensus has been reached with regards to what knowledge management is. In order to exploit successfully the opportunities that a knowledge management perspective offers, it is necessary to study these aspects as well.

Importantly, we will argue, it is the *integration* of these 'hard', 'soft' and 'abstract' parts of the knowledge base that are critical to business success. These include: the technological tools

that allow for easier and more powerful forms of data access and manipulation; the organisational structures and processes that harness intellectual and human capital for learning, innovation and problem solving (Albert, 1997; Applehans *et al.*, 1998; Landaurer, 1995); but also, an understanding of the essence and theory of knowledge management.

The next section of this paper presents the latter problem in detail. In reviewing the similarities and fundamental differences in the definitions of knowledge management, the paper unveils the lack of a holistic understanding of knowledge management. Section three then argues that although both the organisational and the technical issues of knowledge management present theoretical and practical challenges, the most critical challenge is the integration of their study. This forms the basis for the presentation of an integrated framework for knowledge management research in section four. Using this framework we present some research projects that have been formulated using this framework; they provide examples of a suggested revised research agenda for knowledge management. We also argue that it is possible to draw parallels between Business Process Re-engineering (BPR) and knowledge management as change management panaceas, and illustrate how problems associated with former can also be associated with the latter, and possibly avoided with an integrated approach to research in knowledge management. The paper concludes by stressing the importance of systematic, integrated and interdisciplinary research in knowledge management.

2. What is knowledge management?

Economies driven by information represent a paradigmatic shift from competition-based strategies (reactive, imitative and unclear of consumer demands in emerging mass markets) towards “first-best strategies based on value innovation” (Kim and Mauborgne 1999). Value innovation seeks, through the application of knowledge management techniques, to “make the competition irrelevant” by redesigning buyer value to expand existing markets and create entirely new markets. This section takes a close look at this paradigmatic shift, explaining why knowledge management is seen as a vehicle to effectiveness, and focuses on the different perceptions of knowledge management in the academic and practical business literature.

Knowledge management is essentially an organising principle aimed at satisfying, and where possible, exceeding customer expectations. By providing the right information, to the right people at the right time, knowledge management techniques and software applications enable companies to design dynamic operational processes and make effective use of their human resources (Malhotra 1997). Sustainable organisational competence has been considered a factor of organisational capacity to create new knowledge through a continual learning process (Argyris 1994). At present most information systems simply support organisational structures to perform the functions of information collection and dissemination. Leveraging companies towards learning organisations requires the synergistic development of information systems with organisational structures and the application of knowledge management principles to enable “intelligent” information processing and utilisation based on user needs and organisational effectiveness (Rzevski and Prasad, 1998).

Accordingly, knowledge management would give organisations the operational ability to:

- identify, appreciate and respond to strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats,
- act, assimilate feedback and re-act in these arenas simultaneously,
- develop the capacity to operate in real-time environments, and,

- understand and create ‘real’ value as determined and perceived by the end consumers.

Although the potential benefits of knowledge management are apparent and much attention is focusing on the research in knowledge management, there is still confusion about what knowledge management really means. The normative literature has been unable to agree on a definition or even on the key concepts behind the term ‘knowledge management’. The following paragraphs discuss this in detail.

2.1 Defining knowledge management

A possible reason for the vagueness and ambiguity in defining knowledge management seems to be that the word knowledge means different things to different people. Such differences become explicit where multinational companies wish to adopt knowledge management principles (Kidd, 2000). For example, according to Malhotra (1997) organisations in eastern countries such as India understand knowledge to be intellectual property whereas western organisations refer to knowledge as something that exists in peoples’ heads. Sveiby (1999), as well as Phillips and Patrick (2000) point out another difference in the interpretation of the term ‘knowledge’: some research focuses on the individual whereas the focal point for other researchers is the organisation.

An additional factor, which creates confusion, is that there are many different types of knowledge that need to be ‘managed’ differently. The most common distinction in the literature is between explicit knowledge, where the information is easy to understand and financially tangible, and tacit knowledge, which is difficult to document or categorise and is non-financially tangible. Marshall and Brady (2000), in their critical review of the different types of knowledge that have been identified in the literature, attribute the importance of the distinction between tacit and explicit knowledge to “a preoccupation with externalisation, or the conversion of tacit into explicit knowledge” (p. 288). They also argue that such classifications of knowledge may be misleading, depicting knowledge types as mutually exclusive categories. Tacit and explicit knowledge in particular need to be seen instead as “co-existent and inter-penetrating dimensions in the process of knowing” (p. 289).

Thus, there are differences both in the understanding of the term knowledge as there are in the understanding of its dimensions. Therefore, it is not surprising that there are diverse views of what knowledge management is. As an obvious illustration for this lack of consensus, Table 1 presents some representative definitions of knowledge management.

Usually there is one common parameter in different knowledge management definitions: knowledge management is seen as the vehicle for organisational effectiveness and competitiveness. This common parameter implies an instrumental approach to knowledge management and, as Marshall and Brady (2000) put it, “emphasises a utilitarian understanding of knowledge which has little patience for reflecting on anything other than its contribution to organisational effectiveness” (p. 295). With reference to the discussion in the previous section, knowledge management is thus seen by many as the new management panacea.

Another common element of knowledge management definitions is that knowledge or information and sometimes experience or expertise are at the centre. This is hardly surprising; what is interesting though is that information and knowledge are often treated as synonyms. Also, it is rather different aspects of this information, knowledge or expertise that that some

definitions focus on: innovation that derives from the synergy of data and information processing with human innovation and creativity (1st definition), knowledge sharing (3rd definition), structures (8th definition), stores of knowledge (10th definition). This is representative of the diversity pertaining the knowledge management literature (cf. Phillips and Patrick, 2000).

Table 1 Definitions of knowledge management

Source	Definition
1. Malhotra, 1997	<i>Knowledge Management caters to the critical issues of organizational adaptation, survival and competence in face of increasingly discontinuous environmental change. Essentially, it embodies organizational processes that seek synergistic combination of data and information processing capacity of information technologies, and the creative and innovative capacity of human beings.</i>
2. APQC, 1999	<i>Knowledge Management is the broad process of locating, organizing, transferring, and using the information and expertise within an organization.</i>
3. Huysman & de Wit, 2000	<i>Knowledge Management is about the support of knowledge sharing</i>
4. Starr, 1999	<i>Knowledge Management – Information or data management with the additional practice of capturing the tacit experience of the individual to be shared, used and built upon by the organization leading to increased productivity.</i>
5. O'Brien, 1999	<i>Knowledge management is a tool of enterprise collaboration that facilitates the organization, management and sharing of the diverse forms of business information created by individuals and teams in organizations</i>
6. Newman, 1991	<i>...it is the collection of processes that govern the creation, dissemination, and utilization of knowledge</i>
7. Knowledge Praxis	<i>... knowledge management is a business activity with two primary aspects: Treating the knowledge component of business activities as an explicit concern of business reflected in strategy, policy and practice at all levels of the organization and making a direct connection between an organization's intellectual assets – both explicit (recorded) and tacit (personal know-how) – and positive business results.</i>
8. Davenport et al., 1998	<i>...attempt to do something useful with knowledge, to accomplish organizational objectives through the structuring of people, technology and knowledge content.</i>
9. Gartner Group, 2000	<i>knowledge management promotes an integrated approach to identifying, capturing, retrieving, sharing and evaluating and enterprise's information assets</i>
10. Laudon and Laudon, 1998	<i>...the process of systematically and actively managing and leveraging the stores of knowledge in organization.</i>
11. whatis.com, 1999	<i>Knowledge management is the name of a relatively new concept in which an enterprise consciously and comprehensively gathers, organizes, shares, and analyzes its knowledge to further its aims.</i>
12. Business Architects, 1999	<i>Knowledge Management is the process of identifying, capturing, organizing, leveraging, and disseminating information which contributes to profitability and competitive advantage.</i>

Furthermore, even though there are several definitions within the literature, it is increasingly evident that these do not adopt an interdisciplinary approach, despite the interdisciplinary interest in knowledge management (McAdam and McCreedy, 1999; Phillips and Patrick, 2000). Instead, a managerial perspective is often predominant, that does not necessarily accommodate the capabilities of information systems. Sveiby (1999) acknowledges this implicitly when he divides research publications in this field into two categories. The first one is where the researchers come from a background which is computer and/or information science oriented; they perceive knowledge to be an object and knowledge management to refer to 'Management of Information'. The second category consists of researchers from a philosophy, psychology, sociology or business/management background who consider knowledge to be related to processes and knowledge management to be the 'Management of People'.

These similarities and differences in the conceptualisation of knowledge management are important in "creating and refining an appropriate conceptual language for what is a difficult and highly variegated area of inquiry" (Marshall and Brady, 2000). In this paper, however, we are predominantly interested in how the differences in the definitions imply differences in the underlying assumptions that guide research in this area. Indeed, some research focuses on the technical dimension of knowledge management (i.e., on how information technologies can support it). While some research also makes reference to the organisational context within which the technology will be used (e.g., Delesie and Croes, 2000; Edwards and Gibson, 2000), there is little evidence of whether or how the organisational and technical dimensions have been integrated. Other research, however, focuses on the organisational dimension of knowledge management, emphasising in particular the importance of people (Sutton, 2000; Al-Hawamdeh and Ritter, 2000) or groups (Dijkstra and Verwijs, 2000). The reasons for these differences and the implications of the lack of integration between the technical and organisational dimensions are discussed in detail in the next sections.

It follows from this section that research in knowledge management is diverse. As knowledge management can provide several benefits, as outlined earlier in the section, there is a challenge for the research community to suggest an integrated approach to the study and practice of knowledge management. This is advocated further on in the paper.

3. Hard and soft aspects of knowledge management: separated but inseparable

It follows from the previous section that, the existing research and empirical efforts in knowledge management are currently focused on one of two broad categories: technical issues or human and organisational issues. The next paragraphs present some of the challenges in each category. It is argued, however, that the most critical challenge for effective knowledge management as well as for knowledge management research is the integration of these 'hard' and 'soft' aspects.

3.1 Technical ('Hard') Issues

Knowledge management tools, as all tools, aim to assist in the completion of a task with ease and efficiency. Ruggles (1997) suggests that knowledge management tools can be divided into three categories, which are believed to represent the primary knowledge activities of most organisations:

- *Knowledge Generation* – the creation of new ideas, recognition of new patterns, the synthesis of separate disciplines, and the development of new processes.
- *Knowledge Codification* – the auditing and categorisation of knowledge, and
- *Knowledge Transfer* – the forwarding of knowledge between individuals, departments and organisations.

Each of these stages presents technical challenges. One important issue is indexing, in other words, the appropriate structuring of data or information to facilitate or lead to knowledge discovery (Delesie and Croes, 2000). Knowledge acquisition and representation can also be difficult to address in knowledge management systems (West et al., 2000), as they are for knowledge based systems; issues that have been recorded extensively in the artificial intelligence literature. With knowledge management systems, the key issue is probably the need to move beyond simple structured data mining towards the capture, mining and manipulation of tacit or unstructured data. Practitioners and researchers alike have identified tacit data as a, if not the, corporate resource to be managed and exploited for competitive advantage in the information intensive economy.

Another key challenge for the design of knowledge management technology is the identification of patterns (Brash, 2000) that enable reuse of the technology and contributes to system flexibility (Selvin and Buckingham Shum, 2000). System flexibility, however, also presumes situated real-time capture of knowledge, which can be conflicting with the requirement for reuse (ibid.). An interesting case of knowledge management tools can be computer supported collaborative work technologies, since these can facilitate knowledge management and empower even international team members (Edwards and Gibson, 2000). Yet, the effective use of such systems is contingent on the willingness of team members to share knowledge and on effective conflict management.

In general, similar to all information systems, although knowledge management tools can be a great benefit to an organisation, they will not be effective if used in the wrong environment. Effective knowledge management enables access to the right information at the right time. The introduction and implementation of a knowledge management tool does not result in a 'knowledge environment' if other knowledge activities are not supported. For instance, it would be impossible to achieve knowledge transfer if the culture within a particular organisation was that of hoarding knowledge. As a result, cultural constructs need to be developed and nurtured, to facilitate a knowledge environment (Irani and Sharp, 1997).

It has been argued that the obstacles to computerised support for knowledge management include knowledge drift, the subjectivity of knowledge but also the reputation of knowledge based and artificial intelligence systems; that consequently knowledge management is still at an immature state (Edwards, 2000; Spiegler, 2000). It is interesting to note that it is difficult to make explicit the difference of knowledge management tools from other information systems and artificial intelligence systems in particular. However, from the discussion in this section and current research on knowledge management tools it is evident that there are several challenging technical issues that need to be resolved for knowledge management to become more effective.

These technical issues are nevertheless witnessed and can only be addressed within a particular organisational and cultural context. Whilst technology is certainly important, it cannot be considered in isolation as cultural and human aspects are at least equally important.

These ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ aspects of knowledge management are also interrelated. For example, appropriate, user-friendly tools (such as internet/intranet search and mining facilities, technology-based learning, knowledge bases and maps containing experiential learning gained by past projects or information about employees’ expertise) can contribute to creating a knowledge-sharing culture. Conversely, a knowledge sharing culture can in turn initiate a need to acquire and use knowledge management tools. The challenges and difficulties related to the human and organisational aspects of knowledge management are reviewed in detail below.

3.2 Human and Organisational (‘Soft’) Issues

Knowledge management, while supported by technology, is also influenced by human and organisational issues. In the following paragraphs we review these issues at three separate but interconnected levels, where knowledge management benefits are realised: the individual, organisational and international levels. This classification allows for a balanced discussion between the factors that facilitate and those that inhibit effective knowledge management. This discussion then leads to the realisation that the human and organisational issues both shape and are shaped by knowledge management practices.

First, at an *individual level*, knowledge management provides opportunities and tools to operate, and where possible flourish, in an environment of continuous change. Attention to the individual level signifies acceptance of idiosyncratic knowledge, recognising that personality plays a critical role in the way that people acquire, perceive, value and use knowledge as well as that the creation of knowledge is affected by the world view of the individual (Guns and Välikangas, 1998). There is, however, a potential risk for organisations to see knowledge management as management of individual learning instead of collective learning (Huysman and de Wit, 2000), missing the opportunity to capitalise on the individuals’ knowledge for the benefit of the organisational community.

Second, at an *organisational level*, knowledge management supports the streamlining of activities and facilitates improved organisational response to internal and external changes. This often places attention on the processes and presents several challenges, not least the difficulty of identifying processes (Nickols, 1998). Furthermore, Huysman and de Wit (2000) have identified several ‘traps’ that relate to knowledge management at this level:

- an opportunity trap – knowledge management will be more effective if it is problem-driven, i.e., if it responds to concerns that are relevant in the particular organisational context, rather than if it is technology-driven or attempting to imitate other businesses, as is often the case;
- a codified knowledge trap – it is difficult to record previous knowledge for others to access, especially as new knowledge keeps being created and human actors are busy making sense of the new knowledge and conditions
- a management trap – knowledge management is dominated by management initiatives, but, it is unlikely to be effective unless knowledge workers willingly take part in it
- the operational level trap – knowledge management should not be limited to the operational level, in the same way that knowledge exchange processes cannot be limited to this level.

Finally, at an *international/regional*, level it enables to competing globally against larger regional trading blocs, removing their economy of scale advantages. The problem at this level is that different cultures have different mental models of collaboration or trust (Kidd, 2000).

Two key 'soft' issues underpin knowledge management at all three levels: knowledge sharing and culture. Once an organisational culture is being established by its employees it is both difficult to measure and to change (Burrows, 1994). Organisational culture is an important factor to consider in the context of knowledge management, as its boundaries may often restrict the flow of information and knowledge amongst employees and they might resist sharing of information. It can be claimed that one of the critical success factors for effective knowledge management is that employees must be willing to both share and use expertise and knowledge available within an organisation, which, in practice is not easy to achieve. According to Gates (1999), cultural factors need to change so that people are rewarded for sharing information, rather than simply holding on to it, so it seems that one of the main challenges of knowledge management is ensuring that knowledge sharing is rewarded more than knowledge hoarding. Indeed, several knowledge management researchers argue that people in practice *share* knowledge constantly (Marshall and Brady, 2000; Huysman and de Wit, 2000); the problems in sharing knowledge are related to ineffective management. However, as has been argued in previous research in information systems, the attitudes to sharing are complex (Constant, et al., 1994) and are affected by organisational norms as well as by personal idiosyncrasies. In short, no evangelising might work within organisations in order to reap the benefits of knowledge management. Knowledge must be useful for employees, and only when everybody gains by knowledge sharing, an adequate culture for knowledge management can be developed.

If knowledge management is not to become another management 'fad' that claims to offer too much (Currie and Hlupic, 2000b) but instead, develops into an actual management philosophy for the information age, several areas need to be addressed. These include in particular organisational culture, issues of organisational learning, operational management and human resource management. Research needs to be directed towards understanding how these areas limit or enhance the competitive benefits of knowledge management theories and models; what this new way of working entails with regard to skills, organisational structures and operations.

As yet, there is no generic model of knowledge management, grounded in empirical research, which companies or industrial sectors can use as a basis for organising and managing their information resources. In doing so, such a model could allow organisations to leverage their core competencies and key skills. Already in this section it has become evident that both 'hard' and 'soft' issues of knowledge management raise significant challenges. However, it is also evident that, even though they are often separated in the literature, in a practical context they are inseparable as they inform and influence each other. We argue that research in knowledge management should reflect this synergy of organisational and technical issues. The next section presents the context and motivation for a framework within which such research can be realised.

4. Integrated Knowledge Management Research Framework

The framework advocated in this paper is based on the premise that knowledge management is an interdisciplinary subject consisting of a number of elements. These include: our

understanding of concepts related to knowledge and knowledge management and our research approach to such issues (*ontological and epistemological aspects*), research on organisational features conducive to capturing, sharing, and utilising knowledge (*organisational learning*), as well as the study of computer-based systems capable of extracting useful patterns from previously unconnected data, text, images and voice messages stored in a variety of formats throughout an organisation (*knowledge management systems*). More specifically:

Ontological and epistemological aspects of research include investigations into the distinctions between information (e.g., as useful patterns) and knowledge (e.g., as a means of learning), as well as investigations into the most effective ways of organising knowledge (e.g., into facts, concepts, principles, theories and methods) and researching knowledge management issues (e.g., case study research).

Organisational learning research includes investigations into organisational structures (e.g., networking) and cultures (e.g., participative, caring and sharing cultures) which may provide certain advantages under current dynamic economic, political and social conditions in comparison with traditional hierarchies.

Knowledge management systems research includes investigations into effective ways of knowledge discovery (e.g., extracting knowledge from information by means of pattern recognition) using appropriate technologies, including intelligent multi-agent swarms.

Table 2 summarises the main elements of an integrated approach to research in knowledge management. It also illustrates the main research areas set out by the Brunel Knowledge Management Centre. These are further exemplified in the next section.

Table 2 Elements of an integrated approach to research in knowledge management

Technical (<i>hard</i>) aspects	Human/ organisational (<i>soft</i>) aspects	Ontological and epistemological (<i>abstract</i>) aspects
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical aspects of KM tools • KM tools evaluation • KM tools selection methodology • Requirements for further development of KM tools • Multi-agent technology for knowledge discovery • Processes and tools for knowledge recognition • KM tools surveys 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organisational learning • Business intelligence • Cultural aspects of KM • Organisational structures that support KM • Best practices in KM • Human resource management in the context of KM • Project management in the context of KM • Operational management in the context of KM 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definitions of KM • Philosophical and psychological aspects of “knowledge” • Taxonomy of KM • Epistemology and ontology of KM • Appropriate methods for investigating KM phenomena

4.1 Brunel Knowledge Management Centre: Research Agenda

The Brunel Knowledge Management Centre aims to investigate how the effectiveness of knowledge management can be improved by addressing the lack of a systematic and multi-disciplinary approach in this research area. The Centre has been established to mark the research collaboration between members of the Department of Information Systems and Computing and the School of Business and Management at Brunel University. The members of the Centre include academic staff and research students who have a broad range of diverse skills from backgrounds including business, organisational and management studies, economics, information systems and engineering. We postulate that such diversity supports innovative and interdisciplinary approaches to knowledge management.

The main objective of the research carried out within the Centre is to investigate how the effectiveness of knowledge management can be improved. The members of the centre claim that this could only be achieved by taking into consideration technical, human/organisational and abstract aspects of knowledge management. The aim of the Centre, therefore, is to study the integration of the two existing key research areas in knowledge management and applying the previous framework in practice. Importantly, the Centre also intends to ground and integrate the results at a more fundamental, normative level that considers the notion of knowledge management but also the methodologies that are appropriate for its study.

The specific objectives of the Centre are to conduct research in the broad area of knowledge management and to facilitate the transfer of knowledge management methods and tools from researchers to practising managers. Some specific research areas that form the core of the Centre's research activity at the moment include: processes and tools for knowledge recognition, processes and tools for knowledge creation, knowledge management for organisational learning, business and marketing intelligence and customer relationship management.

One of the projects carried out within the Brunel Knowledge Management Centre is “Tools and Organisational Structures for More Effective Knowledge Management (TOSCA)” project. The TOSCA project aims to deliver a set of inter-related frameworks and techniques for improving the state of the art in knowledge management. The project endeavours not only to address the way businesses nurture and manage their knowledge assets internally (in terms of both ‘expertise’ and ‘hard data’), it also addresses the issue of exploitation of *external* knowledge resources – harvesting data about markets and the behaviour of competitors. The project involves theoretical and empirical research carried out by an interdisciplinary team that works closely with both knowledge management software developers and user organisations. The project draws from the framework presented in the previous section and should result in new frameworks and techniques for use across business sectors.

One of the key deliverables of the TOSCA project relates to a multimedia, internet-based showcase of ‘best practice’ in knowledge management. This framework will incorporate: (1) the findings from the case studies, reflecting insights from the human and organisational aspects (2) the tools developed for designing and implementing knowledge management systems, informed by the technical aspects and (3) theoretical and conceptual developments, representing the more abstract aspects of this research. The showcase will have a clear business focus, as well as making a distinct contribution to knowledge management more generally, as the interrelations between the three areas of the framework will be studied and developed.

Another project, currently being undertaken, relates to investigation of technical aspects of knowledge management. As part of this project, extensive evaluation of a set of KM tools is being carried out, with the aim to produce an evaluation framework for KM tools and a selection methodology for such tools. Despite the technical focus, we expect to incorporate valuable lessons from the other aspects of knowledge management, as described in the framework, so that the results can be relevant to business and theoretically grounded as well as informed by business practice. In particular, the organisational aspect will be driven by the need to evaluate tools in a relevant business context whereas the fundamental abstract aspects will be represented in answering what the users of knowledge management tools consider 'knowledge' to be and whether they perceive it as a competitive differentiator (cf. Currie and Pouloudi, 2000).

These projects will therefore demonstrate the importance of using a holistic approach to knowledge management and the need for an interdisciplinary research team, that will themselves benefit from sharing and managing knowledge. Furthermore, it is hoped that our framework will generate research interest, will inform and strengthen other knowledge management projects and will be expanded with knowledge from other research groups.

5. Conclusions

Knowledge management is arguable presented as the latest management panacea for organisational effectiveness. Consequently, there are lessons to be learnt by knowledge management researchers and practitioners from the analysis of the reasons for the failure of previous panaceas, e.g., reengineering projects. In particular, the lack of top management commitment and support through the process of the project, poor consultation, unclear role of IT, and the deficient consideration to the cultural, social and political issues (Belmonte and Murray, 1993; Moad, 1993; Grint and Willcock, 1995) are expected to be critical for the success of knowledge management projects as well. The literature provides examples of the need for an integrated and systematic approach to BPR (including "hard", "soft" and "methodological/abstract" elements) in order to increase the chance of success of BPR projects (Hlupic et al., 2000; Hlupic, 1998). In this paper we have argued that the same is needed for knowledge management research and practice, if this management concept is to make more of a difference for organisations than previous management fads.

More specifically, we have argued that knowledge management (KM) is a complex research area that brings together hard, soft and abstract aspects: technical issues related to knowledge management tools, organisational issues related to the culture, structure and context within which these tools may be used and the organisational learning that may result from their use, as well as more fundamental ontological and epistemological issues about the notion and approach to the study of knowledge management. While research in knowledge management is growing and attempts to address the challenges relating to each of these aspects, there is currently little empirical or theoretical work that provides a systematic, integrated, interdisciplinary perspective to the study of knowledge management. The Brunel Centre for Knowledge Management advocates such an approach and currently undertakes a series of projects in this area. Our aims are to bridge gaps in existing KM research and contribute to systematic and more effective knowledge management practices that are theoretically sound as well as relevant to the business community.

6. References

- Albert, S. (1997). “Managing knowledge – experts, agencies and organizations”. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.
- Al-Hawamdeh, S. and Ritter, W. (2000) Managing formal and informal knowledge within the organisations: re-defining the role of information professionals. In J.Edwards and J.Kidd (Eds.) Proceedings of the Knowledge Management Conference (KMAC 2000), 17-18 July, Birmingham, UK.
- Applehans, W., Globe, A. and Laugero, G. (1998) “*Managing Knowledge: A Practical Web-Based Approach*”, Addison-Wesley, London.
- APQC. (1999). “Knowledge Management”, URL <http://www.apqc.org/topics/topic02.cfr>
- Argyris, C. (1994). On organizational learning. Blackwell, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Belmonte, R., and Murray, R. (1993) Getting Ready for Strategic Change: Surviving Business Process Redesign. *Information Systems Management*, 10(3), pp. 23-29.
- Brash, D. (2000) Developing and validating generic knowledge: an initial experience report. In J.Edwards and J.Kidd (Eds.) Proceedings of the Knowledge Management Conference (KMAC 2000), 17-18 July, Birmingham, UK.
- Burrows B. (1994) The Power of Information Developing and Knowledge Based Organisation, *Long Range Planning*, 27(1), 142-153.
- Business Architects. (1998). “Knowledge Management”, [WWW document] URL <http://www.businessarchitects.com/knowledge%20mgmt.htm>
- Choudrie, J. (2000) *Investigating reengineering teams in the context of business process change*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Department of Information Systems and Computing, Brunel University.
- Constant, D., Kiesler, S., & Sproull, L. (1994). What's Mine Is Ours, or Is It? A Study of Attitudes about Information Sharing. *Information Systems Research*, 5 (4), 400-421.
- Costa, M., Sousa, Orlando and Neves J. (2000) Foundations for legal knowledge management. In J.Edwards and J.Kidd (Eds.) Proceedings of the Knowledge Management Conference (KMAC 2000), 17-18 July, Birmingham, UK.
- Currie, W. (1999) 'Revisiting management innovation and change programmes: strategic vision or tunnel vision'?. *OMEGA: The International Journal of Management Science* 27, 647-660.
- Currie W. and Hlupic H. (2000a): “Change Management Panaceas and the Supporting Role of Simulation Modelling”, accepted for WSC’2000, San Diego, USA, December 2000.
- Currie W. and Hlupic V. (2000b): “Business Process Re-engineering and Simulation Modelling: the Missing Link”, in “Systems Modelling for Business Process Improvement” (Ed. by Bustard D.), Mc-Graw Hill, Forthcoming.
- Currie, W.L. and Pouloudi, A. (2000), IT outsourcing: a challenge for the management of knowledge as a resource. In J.Edwards and J.Kidd (Eds.) Proceedings of the Knowledge Management Conference (KMAC 2000), 17-18 July, Birmingham, UK.
- Davenport T.H., De Long D.W. and Beers M.C. (1998): “Successful Knowledge Management Projects”, *Sloan Management Review*, 39(2).
- Delesie, L. and Croes, L. (2000) Managing the variability of medical care: fostering consensus, benchmarking and feedback. The case of drug prescription patterns among Belgian home practitioners. In J.Edwards and J.Kidd (Eds.) Proceedings of the Knowledge Management Conference (KMAC 2000), 17-18 July, Birmingham, UK.

- Dijkstra, J. and Verwijs, C. (2000) Improving the learning ability of groups in the organisation. In J.Edwards and J.Kidd (Eds.) Proceedings of the Knowledge Management Conference (KMAC 2000), 17-18 July, Birmingham, UK.
- Edwards, J. and Gibson, P.R. (2000) Knowledge management using CSCW in global strategic alliances and joint ventures via the Internet. In J.Edwards and J.Kidd (Eds.) Proceedings of the Knowledge Management Conference (KMAC 2000), 17-18 July, Birmingham, UK.
- Edwards, J.S. (2000) Artificial intelligence and knowledge management: how much difference can it really make. In J.Edwards and J.Kidd (Eds.) Proceedings of the Knowledge Management Conference (KMAC 2000), 17-18 July, Birmingham, UK.
- Garner Group – www.gartner.com
- Gates B. (1999) Knowledge Workers Without Limits: Gates Shares New Vision and New technology at Microsoft CEO Summit, press release, 19 May, Microsoft Corporation, www.microsoft.com
- Grint, K., and Willcocks, L. (1995) Business Process Reengineering in Theory and Practice: Business Paradise Regained? *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 10(2), pp. 99-109.
- Guns, W. D., & Välikangas, L. (1998). Rethinking knowledge work: creating value through idiosyncratic knowledge. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 1 (4), 287-293.
- Huysman, M and de Wit, D. (2000) Knowledge management in practice. In J.Edwards and J.Kidd (Eds.) Proceedings of the Knowledge Management Conference (KMAC 2000), 17-18 July, Birmingham, UK.
- Hlupic, V. (1998) “Business Process Re-engineering and Simulation: Bridging the Gap”, Proceedings of the *European Simulation Multiconference ESM’98*, Manchester, United Kingdom, June 1998, (Ed.by Zobel R. and Moeller D.), pp. 641-645, SCS.
- Hlupic, V. Choudrie, J. and Patel, N. (2000) “The REBUS Approach to Business Process Re-engineering”, *Cognition, Technology and Work*, 2(2),89-96.
- Irani Z and Sharp J.M. (1997). Integrating continuous improvement and innovation into a corporate culture: A case study'. *The International Journal of Technological Innovation, Entrepreneurship and Technology Management (Technovation)*, 17(4): 199-206.
- Kidd, J. (2000). Us and Them: obstructing knowledge management in MNEs. In J.Edwards and J.Kidd (Eds.) Proceedings of the Knowledge Management Conference (KMAC 2000), 17-18 July, Birmingham, UK.
- Kim, W.C. and Mauborgne, R. (1999). “Creating New Market Space”. *Harvard Business Review*, Jan-Feb.
- Knowledge Praxis – www.media-access.com
- Landaurer, T.K. (1995) *The trouble with computers: usefulness, usability and productivity*, MIT Press, Cambridge MA.
- Laudon K.C. and Laudon J.P. (1998) *Management Information Systems: New Approaches to Organisation and Technology*, Prentice-Hall, New Jersey, USA.
- Malhotra Y., (1997), *Current Business Concerns and Knowledge Management*, [WWW Document] URL <http://www.brint.com/interview/times.htm>
- Marshall, N. and Brady, T. (2000) Knowledge management, knowledge-guiding interests, and modes of action: case studies from complex products and systems. In J.Edwards and J.Kidd (Eds.) Proceedings of the Knowledge Management Conference (KMAC 2000), 17-18 July, Birmingham, UK.
- McAdam, R., and McCreedy, S. (2000) A critical review of KM models in the learning organisational, 6(3) 91-100.

- Moad, J. (1998) “In Search of Knowledge”, *PC Week*, Dec 7, 111
- Moad, J. (1993) Does Reengineering Really Work, *Datamation*, 39(15), pp. 22-28.
- Newman B. (1991) “An open discussion on knowledge management” in the “Knowledge management forum” – www.iea.com/~bonewman.
- Nickols, F. (1998) The difficult process of identifying processes. *Knowledge and Process Management*, 5(1)14-19.
- Nonaka I and Takeuchi H., (1995), *The Knowledge-Creating Company: How Japanese Companies Create the Dynamics of Innovation*, OUP, Oxford.
- O’Brien J. (1999): “Management Information Systems, Managing Information Technology in the Internetworked Enterprise, McGraw Hill, UK.
- Phillips, N and Patrick, K. (2000). Knowledge management perspectives, organisational character and cognitive style. In J.Edwards and J.Kidd (Eds.) Proceedings of the Knowledge Management Conference (KMAC 2000), 17-18 July, Birmingham, UK.
- Ruggles, R. (1997) “Knowledge Tools: Using Technology to manage Knowledge Better”, Ernst & Young Center for Business Innovation Working Paper (April 1997).
- Rzevski G. and Prasad K, (1998), The Synergy of Learning Organisations and Flexible Information Technology. *AI & Society* v12, 87-96.
- Savage, C.M. (1996) *Fifth Generation Management: Co-Creating Through Virtual Enterprising, Dynamic Teaming, and Knowledge Networking*, Butterworth Heinemann, London.
- Savage, R. and O’Leary B. (2000) Bridging the cultural functional gap as a way of optimising knowledge management and creating sustainable competitive advantage. In J.Edwards and J.Kidd (Eds.) Proceedings of the Knowledge Management Conference (KMAC 2000), 17-18 July, Birmingham, UK.
- Selvin, A.M. and Buckingham Shum, S. (2000) Rapid Knowledge Construction and Dissemination: A Case Study in Corporate Contingency Planning Using Collaborative Hypermedia. In J.Edwards and J.Kidd (Eds.) Proceedings of the Knowledge Management Conference (KMAC 2000), 17-18 July, Birmingham, UK.
- Spiegler, I. (2000) Knowledge Management: a new idea or a recycled concept? *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, 14(3) June 2000. [<http://cais.isworld.org/organisation/articles/3-14/article.htm>]
- Starr, J. (1999). “KMTTool – Ideas For Sharing Knowledge”, [WWW document]. URL <http://www.kmtool.net/vocabulary.htm>
- Sutton, D.C. (2000) What is knowledge and may it be managed? In J.Edwards and J.Kidd (Eds.) Proceedings of the Knowledge Management Conference (KMAC 2000), 17-18 July, Birmingham, UK.
- Sveiby, K. (1999). “What is Knowledge Management?” [WWW document] URL [http://www.sveiby.com.au/Knowledge Management.htm](http://www.sveiby.com.au/Knowledge%20Management.htm)
- West, G.M, Strachan, S.M, Moyes, A., McDonald, J.R., Gwyn, B. and Farrell, J. (2000) Knowledge management and decision support for electrical power utilities. In J.Edwards and J.Kidd (Eds.) Proceedings of the Knowledge Management Conference (KMAC 2000), 17-18 July, Birmingham, UK.
- WhatIs. (1998). “Knowledge Management”, [WWW document] URL <http://whatis.com/knowledm.htm>