teaching note

A House Divided Against Itself Cannot Stand: A Case Study of the Consequences of Unshared Knowledge at a Private Golf Club and Resort

By Shiva Jahani, Jeffrey Weinland, Matthew D. Munyon and Fevzi Okumus

Case Study Summary

Relatively few scholarly works have explored knowledge management practices within the private sector of the hospitality and tourism industry. Literature related to golf courses and resorts is particularly sparse. This study is one of the first to provide insight into the inner workings of a private golf resort as well as the consequences of not sharing knowledge. Effective management of organizational knowledge is a critical requirement when coordinating specialized business. Translating knowledge into something of value for theorganization is a difficult task. Of particular importance is how KM can help strategic managers and leadersto build capacity to collect, synthesize and distribute the best available knowledge to produce capable managers and in turn make the organization more productive and profitable (Vlajčić et al., 2019).

This case study provides a scenario about Mr. Max who is a 65-year-old golf enthusiast and landscape architect. Max worked as one of eight department managers in the firm. Despite DM turnover about every five years, Max served as DM for 35 years. He had difficulty sharing knowledge through on-the-job social networking in his leadership role. The case study intends to generate discussions about the knowledge management practices and knowledge sharing within the private sector of the hospitality andtourism industry to explore best practices and opportunities while working with the private sector.

The Sand Trap operated from a decentralized organizational structure that lacked GM-initiated andGM-modeled knowledge management practices. This led to unintended, deleterious effects Max has seen the consequences of not sharing knowledge as well as, through his behavior, the successes of intentionally linking knowledge among department managers and a general manager. Max recommends thefirm adopts knowledge-sharing practice. A shared knowledge model would benefit the firm, including (a) saving time, (b) saving cost in training, (c) promoting a consistent culture, and (d) leading to cross-training. The firm would benefit from a mentoring program. Senior DMs and employees could train their colleagues and coworkers through a formal program and for more than one week. Additionally, the firm would benefit from extending honorary membership to other DMs as they did for Max. The discussions surrounding this case study can put forth a greater understanding of knowledge management practices and leadership.

Target Audience

Students will be required to critically think about the intersection of technology and people and thestrategic implementation of knowledge management practices. Therefore, the case study is directed at undergraduate-level students who are seeking entry-level management positions and to expand their knowledge of knowledge management practices. Additionally, instructors can teach the case study in graduate-level management, strategy, leadership, human resource, and knowledge management type courses. The assignments can be adapted to the graduate level by focusing on the more advanced levels of the Revised Bloom's Taxonomy such as application, evaluation, and creation. For example, completing a project in which the students conceptually introduce knowledge management practices into a firm and assess potential implications and outcomes.

Explanation of Teaching Objectives

Instructors have a unique opportunity to discuss the consequences of not sharing knowledge. Translating knowledge into something of value for the organization is a challenging task. Of particular importance is how KM can help strategic managers and leaders to build capacity to collect, synthesize anddistribute the best available knowledge to produce capable managers and in turn make the organization more productive and profitable. As these recent graduates prepare to lead front-line hospitality establishments, strategies for effective management of organizational knowledge become important. Translating knowledge into something of value for the organization is a challenging task. The discussion topicsregarding different generational work values for employees promote critical thinking of management strategies for these up-and-coming leaders. Upon the completion of studying this case study, learners should be able to:

1. Define the concept of knowledge management.
2. Identify the types of knowledge management practices.
3. Explain how leadership influences the implementation of knowledge management practices.
4. Explain knowledge management practices through the framework of knowledge management theories
5. Evaluate how leaders can facilitate KM practices in resorts.
6. Offer suggestions on how technology can be used in KM in resorts.
7. Offer specific recommendations on how resorts can implement KM practices.

Teaching Approach

Each learning objective should be subdivided into a separate topic of discussion, each building onto the other. It should take around (a) 30 minutes to introduce the case study; (b) one hour to outline the theory, practice, and the learning objectives; (c) 30 minutes to discuss the case study questions; and (d) onehour to evaluate understanding. The total time for the module is three teaching hours. This timeframe allows instructors to (a) introduce the topic, (b) outline industry examples, (c) facilitate full class discussions, and (d) assess understanding.

Phase One: Introduction (30 Minutes)

Before teaching the case study, instructors will assign students homework. Students will (a) review the case study, (b) annotate while reading, (c) prepare discussion points, and (d) ask questions that arose while reading and were not answered by the case study. Each student will be required to bring their completed homework assignments to class and be prepared to participate in classroom discussions and questions and answers. In this introductory 30 minutes, instructors will ask students to present questions they have from the readings.

Phase Two: Outline (1 Hour)

Instructors will briefly review the topic of the three primary knowledge management theories: (a),which provide roadmaps through the intersection of people and technology (. Next, instructors will engage the students in discussions related to their discussion points from the case study. Instructors should allot five minutes of input per question. Following the discussion, instructors will present a detailed PowerPoint related to knowledge management and knowledge management practices as well as how these affect the tourism and hospitality industry (30 minutes). The presentation should include definitions, media related toeach topic (e.g., pictures, videos), and examples within the industry. Instructors will then outline the main point of the case study as well as the learning objectives (5 minutes).

Phase Three: Implementation (30 Minutes)

Once the students understand the objectives, the instructor will lead the class in further discussionsregarding the four main questions that the case study aims to answer. The instructor will ask each question and allow five minutes for feedback.

Phase Four: Evaluation of Understanding (1 Hour)

After briefly discussing the overall case study questions, instructors will assign students to one of multiple small groups of five or fewer members. Students will discuss how to respond to comprehension questions.

1. Why are knowledge management and knowledge sharing vital elements for a firm?
2. What are examples of perceived and actual effects of implementing knowledge management?
3. Identify and describe one knowledge management theory. Applying the theory to one or moreknowledge management practices, explain how theory helps you understand the practice(s).
4. Compare professional experiences when knowledge management practices were not implementedor were insufficient, in your opinion. As a group, select one to review. Create a set of at least threerecommendations of knowledge management practices that might improve the select experience. NOTE: Use general descriptions and fictitious names to protect companies.

Once all answers have been recorded, instructors will facilitate a final class discussion. During this discussion, instructors will address each question individually, allowing each group to present their answersto the question before moving forward to the next question. Instructors should assess answers and identifyopportunities to help steer students in the correct direction when the answer is ambiguous or misleading.

References

Adner, R. (2016). Ecosystem as structure: An actionable construct for strategy. Journal of Management, 43(1), 39-58. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316678451

Alavi, M., Kayworth, T. R., & Leidner, D. E. (2006). An Empirical Examination of the Influence of Organizational Culture on Knowledge Management Practices. Journal of Management Information Systems, 22(3), 191-224. https://doi.org/10.2753/MIS0742-1222220307

Alavi, M., & Leidner, D. (2001). Review: knowledge management and knowledge management systems: conceptual foundations and research issues. MIS Quarterly, 25(1), 107–136.

Amis, J., Barney, J., Mahoney, J. T., & Wang, H. (2020). Why We Need a Theory of Stakeholder Governance—And Why This is a Hard Problem. Academy of Management Review, 45(3), 499– 503. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2020.0181

Asher, C. C., Mahoney, J. M., & Mahoney, J. T. (2005). Towards a property rights foundation for a stakeholder theory of the firm. Journal of Management & Governance, 9(1), 5–32.

Barišić, A. F., Barišić, J. R., & Miloloža, I. (2020). Knowledge management perspective in the tourism and hospitality industry. *Proceedings of the ENTR–NOVA - ENTerprise REsearch InNOVAtion Conference (Online); ISSN 2706-4735 (Online); Volume 6; Issue 1.*

Barney, J. B. (2018). Why resource-based theory's model of profit appropriation must incorporate a stakeholder perspective. *Strategic Management Journal, 39*(13), 3305–3325.

Beckman, T. J. (1999). The current state of knowledge management. In J. Liebowitz (Ed.), *Knowledge management handbook.* Boca, Florida: CRC Press .1-1–1-22.

Bernbom, G. (2001). *Information alchemy: The art and science of knowledge management*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bridoux, F., & Stoelhorst, J. W. (2014). Microfoundations for stakeholder theory: Managing stakeholders with heterogeneous motives. *Strategic Management Journal, 35*(1), 107– 125.

Bryant, S. E. (2003). The role for transformational and transactional leadership in creating, sharing and exploiting organizational knowledge. *Journal of Leadership and Organisational Studies,* 9(4), 32- 44.

Cherns, A. (1976). Principles of socio-technical design. *Human Relations,* 2(9), 783–792.

Cherns, A. (1993). *Principles of socio-technical design*. In The social engagement of social science (Trist E & Murray H, Eds), University of Pennsylvania Press.

Chourides, P., Longbottom, D., & Murphy, W. (2003). Excellence in Knowledge Management: an empirical study to identify critical factors and performance measures. *Measuring Business Excellence, 7*(2), 29-45

Christopher, D., & Tanwar, A. (2012). Knowledge Management in Outsourcing Environment: People Empowering People. *IUP. Journal of Knowledge Management, 10*(2), 61-86.

Davenport, T. H., & Prusak, L. (1998). *Working knowledge: How organisations manage what they know.* Harvard Business School Press.

de Zubielqui, G. C., Lindsay, N., Lindsay, W., & Jones, J. (2019). Knowledge quality, innovation and firm performance: a study of knowledge transfer in SMEs. *Small Business Economics, 53(1), 145-164.*

Dessler, G. (2001). *Management: Leading people into the 21st. century.* Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Publishers.

Donate, M. J., & De Pablo, J. D. S. (2015). The role of knowledge-oriented leadership in knowledge management practices and innovation. *Journal of Business Research, 68*, 360-370.

Emery, F. E., & Trist, E. L. (1965). The Causal Texture of Organizational Environments. *Human Relations, 18*(1), 21-32.

Finnegan, D., & Willcocks. L. (2006), Knowledge sharing issues in the introduction of a new technology, *Journal of Enterprise Information Management, 19*(6), 200-221.

Hall, H. (2001). Input-friendliness: motivating knowledge sharing behaviour across intranets. *Journal of Information Science*, *27*(3), 139-46.

Hallin, C. A., & Marnburg, E. (2008). Knowledge management in the hospitality industry: A review of empirical research. *Tourism Management, 29*(2), 366–381.

Handzic, M. (2004). *Knowledge management: Through the technology glass.* Hackensack, NJ: World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd.

Handzic, M., & Zhou, A. Z. (2005). *Knowledge management: An integrative approach*. Oxford, UK: Chandos Publishing.

Hansen, M. (1999). The Search-Transfer problem: The Role of Weak ties in Sharing Knowledge Across Organizational Subunits. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *44*(1), 82-111.

Huang, Q., Davison, R., Liu, H. F., & Gu, J. B. (2008). The impact of leadership style on knowledge- sharing intentions in China. *Journal of Global Information Management, 16*, 67–91.

Huysman, M., & Wulf, V. (2006). IT to support knowledge sharing behaviour in communities, towards a social capital analysis. *Journal of Information Technology, 21*(1), 40-51

Kim, S., & Lee, H. (2006). The impact of organizational context and information technology on employee knowledge-sharing capabilities. *Public Administration Review,66*(3), 370–385.

Jones, T. M., Harrison, J. S., & Felps, W. (2018). How applying instrumental stakeholder theory can provide sustainable competitive advantage. *Academy of Management Review, 43*(3), 371– 391.

Kharabsheh, R., Magableh, I., & Sawadha, S. (2012). Knowledge management practices and its impact on organizational performance in pharmaceutical firms. *European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences, 48*, 6-15.

Kluge, B., Köhler, C., & Prassler, E. (2001). Fast and Robust Tracking of Multiple Moving Objects with a Laser Range Finder. In IEEE Int. *Conference on Robotics and Automation* ICRA'01, pp.1683- 1688, Seoul.

Malhotra, Y., & Galletta, D. F. (1999). Extending the technology acceptance model to account for social influence: theoretical bases and empirical validation. *Proceedings of the Hawaii international conference on system science (HICSS 32)*, 6-19.

Manasco, B. (1996). *Leading Firms Develop Knowledge Strategies.* Knowledge Inc.

Okumus, F., Altinay, L., Chathoth, P., & Koseoglu, M. A. (2020). *Strategic management for hospitality and tourism* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Okumus, F., Bilgihan, A., Ozturk, A. B., & Zhao, X. (2017). Identifying and overcoming barriers to deployment of information technology projects in hotels. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 30*(5), 744–766.

Pasmore W., Francis C., Haldeman J., & Shani A. (1982). Sociotechnical systems: A North American reflection on empirical studies of the seventies. *Human Relations, 35*(12),1179–1204.

Pava, C. (1986). Redesigning sociotechnical system design: concepts and methods for the 1990s. *The Journal of Applied Behavioural Science, 22*(3), 201-220.

A.F. Ragab, M., & Arisha, A. (2013). Knowledge management and measurement: a critical review. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 17*(6), 873–901.

Ritsri, U., & Meeprom, S. (2020). Does knowledge management practice produce accounting employee productivity in the tourism business in Thailand? Anatolia: *An International Journal of Tourism & Hospitality Research, 31*(1), 99–110.

Santos-Vijande, M.L., López-Sánchez, J.Á. & Rudd, J. (2016). Frontline employees' collaboration in industrial service innovation: routes of co-creation's effects on new service performance. *Journal of the Academic Market Science, 44*, 350–375.

Seeley, C. (2000). Change management: A base for knowledge-sharing: Why we need to start caring about change management. *Knowledge Management Review, 3*(4), 24-29.

Son Huang, C. C., Fan, Y. N., Chern, C. C., & Yen, P. H. (2013). Measurement of analytical knowledge- based corporate memory and its application. *Decision Support Systems, 54*(2), 846–857.

Sondergaard, S., Kerr, M., & Clegg, C. (2007), Sharing Knowledge: Contextualising Socio-technical Thinking and Practice. *The Learning Organization, 14*(5), 423-435.

Sony, M., & Naik, S. (2020). Industry 4.0 integration with socio-technical systems theory: A systematic review and proposed theoretical model. *Technology in Society, 61*, 1-11.

Velmurugan. T. & Santhanam, T. (2010). Performance Evaluation of K Means and Fuzzy C-Means Clustering Algorithms for Statistical Distributions of Input Data Points, *European Journal of Scientific Research, 46*(3), 320-330

Vlajčić, D., Caputo, A., Marzi, G., & Dabić, M. (2019). Expatriates managers' cultural intelligence as promoter of knowledge transfer in multinational companies. *Journal of Business Research, 94*, 367–377.

Von Krogh, G. (1998). Care in Knowledge Creation, *California Management Review, 40*(3), 133-153. Wong, T., French, L., &

Wickham, M. (2016). Knowledge-management issues in China's hotel industry. *Annals of Tourism Research, 57*, 257–259.

Yahya, S., & Goh, W. K. (2002). Managing Human Resources towards Achieving Knowledge Management, *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 6(5),457-468.

Yang, C., & Chen, L. C. (2007). Can organizational knowledge capabilities affect knowledge sharing behaviour? *Journal of information science*, *33*(1), 95-109.

Yang, J. T. (2007). Knowledge sharing behaviour: investigating appropriate leadership roles and collaborative culture, *Tourism Management*, *28*(2), 430-543

Zhu, Z. (2008). Knowledge, knowing, knower: What is to be managed and does it matter? *Knowledge Management Research and Practice, 6*,