

24 Page Preview

TITLE Knowledge creation and strategy formation in a public, nonprofit healthcare organization: A descriptive case study

AUTHOR Dorsett, Mary Ellen M. Stallings

DEGREE EdD

SCHOOL THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

DATE 2007

Knowledge Creation and Strategy Formation
in a Public, Nonprofit Healthcare Organization:
A Descriptive Case Study

By

Mary Ellen M. Stallings Dorsett
B.A., 1975, Florida Atlantic University
M.S., 1977, Nova University

A Dissertation Submitted to

The Faculty of

The Graduate School of Education and Human Development
of The George Washington University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education

Dissertation Chairperson: Dr. David R. Schwandt

Dissertation Committee Members:

Dr. Walter Brown and Dr. Andrea Casey

August 2006

UMI Number: 3249375

Copyright 2007 by
Dorsett, Mary Ellen M. Stallings

All rights reserved.

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform 3249375

Copyright 2007 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Knowledge Creation and Strategy Formation
in a Public, Nonprofit Healthcare Organization:
A Descriptive Case Study

Although organizational knowledge is considered the most strategically important resource and learning the most strategically important capability for organizations, many initiatives being undertaken to develop and exploit this knowledge are not explicitly linked to or framed by the organization's strategy. The study described the relationship between knowledge creation and strategy formation knowledge structures as they occurred within the boundaries and context of a public, nonprofit healthcare organization. This organization had more than 5,300 employees, a 14-member top management team, and a seven-member publicly elected board of directors. During the study, the organization experienced the departure of the chief executive officer and the return of a former chief executive officer with 22 years of previous service with the organization.

The study followed a descriptive case study format using qualitative methods. The primary method of data collection was the interviews of the top management team and the board of directors. Data were also captured through document analysis and observation. Data from the interview transcripts were analyzed and captured using computer-aided cognitive mapping. Causal maps served as a research technique to explore the knowledge structures of the organization. In addition, the interpretation of results was discussed in the

context of an organizational learning system model. The level of analysis of the study was at the organizational (collective) level.

The findings of this study did not reflect a coherent sense of direction for the organization. The knowledge structures did not encapsulate a systems perspective about the interdependencies within the system or the exploration of new possibilities. There was a heavy emphasis on obtaining and applying information with a propensity toward performance. For the organizational learning structure, this resulted in little critical inquiry and little actual organizational learning. Concerning strategy, it reinforced operations rather than vision.

Implications of organizational knowledge structures and organizational learning for practice, research, and methods are explored in the final parts of this study.

DEDICATION

This study is dedicated to my loving husband and my beautiful daughter for their encouragement and love during this *very long intellectual journey*.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Throughout this process, I was fortunate to have the support and confidence of many people. I am extremely grateful to Dr. David Schwandt for agreeing to chair my dissertation committee, but also for his patience, guidance, and friendship. Without his support, the completion of this dissertation would not have been possible.

My committee members, Dr. Walter Brown and Dr. Andrea Casey, provided encouragement, insight, and constructive feedback. I am indebted to the three members of my committee for helping me learn.

I am grateful to my friends Geri Manning and Mary Ann Jacob for their support, encouragement, and motivational energy throughout this study. A very special thanks is gratefully given to the ELP staff. Their compassion and willingness to help made a difference in my life.

My husband deserves a special thank you for his endurance and support. He gave me love, guidance, and encouragement while coping with a long illness.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| LIST OF TABLES | XI |
| LIST OF FIGURES | XIII |
| CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| Strategy Formation | 2 |
| Strategy Formation and Knowledge Structures | 3 |
| Strategy Formation and Organizational Learning | 5 |
| Nonprofit Organizations | 8 |
| Healthcare Organizations | 10 |
| Reorganization of Nonprofit Hospitals | 11 |
| Conceptual Framework | 12 |
| Statement of the Problem | 15 |
| Purpose of the Study | 17 |
| Significance of the Study | 18 |
| Research Questions | 20 |
| Study Delimitations | 21 |
| Study Limitations | 22 |
| Overview of the Research Design | 22 |
| Research Assumptions | 24 |
| Key Definitions | 26 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE..... | 28 |
| Organizational Learning..... | 28 |
| Organizational Learning and Strategy Formation..... | 33 |
| Model of Organizational Learning..... | 46 |
| Strategy Formation..... | 56 |
| Strategic Management..... | 57 |
| Prescriptive Forms of Strategy Formation..... | 59 |
| Descriptive Forms of Strategy Formation..... | 63 |
| The Learning School and Strategy Formation..... | 70 |
| Strategic Thinking..... | 76 |
| Issues in Strategic Thinking..... | 78 |
| Strategic Thinking or Strategic Planning..... | 81 |
| Strategy Formation and the Demographic Characteristics of the Top Management Team and Board of Directors..... | 85 |
| Nonprofit Governance..... | 93 |
| Summary..... | 97 |
| Knowledge Structures..... | 98 |
| Knowledge Structures and Strategy..... | 99 |
| Knowledge Structures and Information Processing..... | 99 |
| Collective Knowledge Structures..... | 103 |
| Summary..... | 109 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY | 112 |
| The Design | 112 |
| Level of Analysis..... | 116 |
| Case | 122 |
| Demographic Characteristics of Groups/Participants | 124 |
| Preliminary Mapping..... | 125 |
| Data Collection Methods..... | 127 |
| Observations | 127 |
| Interviews | 129 |
| Documentary Information | 131 |
| Case Study Database..... | 133 |
| Data Analysis..... | 139 |
| Trustworthiness of Data Analysis..... | 143 |
| Credibility..... | 143 |
| Triangulation..... | 144 |
| Generalizability | 145 |
| Confirmability..... | 145 |
| Human and Ethical Considerations..... | 146 |
| Summary | 146 |
| CHAPTER 4: RESULTS..... | 147 |
| Contextual Information..... | 149 |
| Background Information About the Healthcare System..... | 149 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Processes for Establishing the Collective Maps | 150 |
| Knowledge Structures of the Top Management Team (Research Question 1) 152 | |
| Organizational Learning: How the Organization Learns | 152 |
| Organizational Learning: How the Organization Uses Ideas and Suggestions from Employees | 155 |
| Organizational Learning: The Nature of New Information | 157 |
| Organizational Learning: How Information Is Shared Vertically and Horizontally | 160 |
| Strategy Formation: Processes | 164 |
| Strategy Formation: Innovation and Experimentation..... | 167 |
| Knowledge Structures of the Board of Directors (Research Question 1)..... | 174 |
| Organizational Learning: How an Organization Learns | 174 |
| Organizational Learning: How Knowledge Is Shared Vertically and Horizontally | 177 |
| Strategy Formation: Innovation and Experimentation..... | 182 |
| Strategy Formation: Processes Used to Evaluate Information and Data to Make Informed Decisions Regarding Organizational Strategy | 185 |
| Strategy Formation: The Role of the Board of Directors | 187 |
| Summary for Research Question 1..... | 192 |
| Comparison of Knowledge Structures Between the Top Management Team and Board of Directors (Research Question 2)..... | 194 |
| Organizational Learning | 194 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| Strategy Formation | 195 |
| Summary for Research Question 2 | 197 |
| Relationship of the Strategic Plan to Knowledge Structures (Research | |
| Question 3) | 199 |
| TMT's Organizational Learning Knowledge Structures and the | |
| Strategic Plan | 200 |
| Board of Directors' Organizational Learning Knowledge Structures and the | |
| Strategic Plan | 209 |
| TMT's Strategy Formation Knowledge Structures and the Strategic Plan... | 213 |
| Board of Directors' Strategy Formation Knowledge Structures and the | |
| Strategic Plan | 215 |
| Summary | 218 |
| Summary of Results | 219 |
| CHAPTER 5: INTERPRETATIONS, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS | 220 |
| Interpretation of Findings | 220 |
| Finding 1: An Emphasis on Information in the Knowledge Structures..... | 221 |
| Finding 2: Lack of Role Definition..... | 223 |
| Finding 3: Lack of Focus on the Strategic Plan | 225 |
| Relationship of Findings to Existing Literature | 226 |
| Knowledge Structures | 227 |
| The Learning School and Strategy Formation..... | 228 |
| Strategic Thinking..... | 228 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| Implications for Theory and Practice..... | 231 |
| Implications for Future Research..... | 233 |
| Conclusion..... | 235 |
| REFERENCES | 236 |
| APPENDIX A: INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEW GUIDE | 287 |
| APPENDIX B: DEMOGRAPHICS, BOARD OF DIRECTORS | 290 |
| APPENDIX C: DEMOGRAPHICS, TOP MANAGEMENT TEAM | 292 |
| APPENDIX D: GOVERNANCE RESPONSIBILITIES FOR THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS..... | 294 |
| APPENDIX E: BOARD OF DIRECTORS' COLLECTIVE MAP..... | 295 |
| APPENDIX F: TOP MANAGEMENT TEAM'S COLLECTIVE MAP | 296 |
| APPENDIX G: ORGANIZATION'S STRATEGIC PLAN..... | 297 |
| APPENDIX H: SOURCES USED IN TRIANGULATING DATA..... | 298 |
| APPENDIX I: IRB APPROVED CONSENT FORM | 300 |
| APPENDIX J: DEFINITION OF TERMS..... | 302 |
| BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH..... | 306 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| 1 Characteristics of For-profit vs. Nonprofit Governance | 96 |
| 2 The Benefits and Costs of Knowledge Structures..... | 102 |
| 3 Questions to Establish the Credibility of Documents..... | 133 |
| 4 Miles and Huberman: What to Store, Retrieve, and Retain | 134 |
| 5 Natural Language and Standard Vocabulary | 142 |
| 6 Top Management Team: Knowledge Structures Associated with Organizational Learning | 162 |
| 7 Top Management Team: Knowledge Structures Associated with Strategy Formation..... | 172 |
| 8 Board of Directors: Dominant Knowledge Structures Associated with Organizational Learning..... | 180 |
| 9 Board of Directions: Dominant Knowledge Structures Associated with Strategy Formation | 191 |
| 10 Top Management Team's and Board of Directors' Core Knowledge Structures and Peripheral Elements Associated with Organizational Learning | 193 |
| 11 Top Management Team's and Board of Directors' Core Knowledge Structures and Peripheral Elements Associated with Strategy Formation..... | 193 |

| | | |
|----|--|-----|
| 12 | Comparison of the Top Management Team's and Board of Directors' Core and Peripheral Knowledge Structures for Organizational Learning | 197 |
| 13 | Comparison of the Top Management Team's and Board of Directors' Core and Peripheral Knowledge Structures for Strategy Formation | 198 |
| 14 | Top Management Team's and Board of Directors' Collective Knowledge Structures Associated with the Strategic Plan | 218 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| 1 Conceptual Framework of the Study..... | 15 |
| 2 Parsons' Four Functional Prerequisites | 48 |
| 3 Learning Subsystem | 50 |
| 4 Learning System and Interchange Media | 55 |
| 5 Summary Time Line | 116 |
| 6 Top Management Team: Knowledge Structures Associated with How an Organization Learns..... | 153 |
| 7 Top Management Team: Knowledge Structures Associated with How Employees' Ideas and Suggestions Are Used | 156 |
| 8 Top Management Team: Knowledge Structures Associated with the Nature of New Information | 159 |
| 9 Top Management Team: Knowledge Structures Associated with How Information Is Shared Vertically and Horizontally | 161 |
| 10 Top Management Team: Core Knowledge Structure and Peripheral Elements for Organizational Learning..... | 164 |
| 11 Top Management Team: Knowledge Structures Associated with Strategy Formation..... | 166 |
| 12 Top Management Team: Knowledge Structures Associated with the Extent to Which Innovation and Experimentation Are Associated with the Strategy Process | 168 |

| | | |
|----|--|-----|
| 13 | Top Management Team: Core Knowledge Structure and Peripheral Elements for Strategy Formation | 174 |
| 14 | Board of Directors: Knowledge Structures Associated with How an Organization Learns | 176 |
| 15 | Board of Directors: Knowledge Structures Associated with How Information and Knowledge Are Shared Vertically and Horizontally | 178 |
| 16 | Board of Directors: Core Knowledge Structure and Peripheral Elements for Organizational Learning | 182 |
| 17 | Board of Directors: Knowledge Structures Associated with Innovation and Experimentation | 183 |
| 18 | Board of Directors: Knowledge Structures Associated with Evaluation of Information and Data to Make Informed Decisions Regarding Organizational Strategy | 185 |
| 19 | Board of Directors: Knowledge Structures Associated with Its Role | 188 |
| 20 | Board of Directors: Core Knowledge Structure and Peripheral Elements for Strategy Formation | 192 |
| 21 | Knowledge Structures Related to the Strategic Plan Mission Statement | 201 |
| 22 | Knowledge Structures Related to the Organization's Vision and Values | 202 |
| 23 | Knowledge Structures Related to the Arenas and Vehicles Elements of Strategic Planning | 204 |

| | | |
|----|---|-----|
| 24 | Knowledge Structures Related to the Differentiators Element of Strategic Planning | 206 |
| 25 | Knowledge Structures Related to the Staging and Economic Logic Elements of Strategic Planning | 208 |

CHAPTER 1:

INTRODUCTION

"Knowledge itself is power," Frances Bacon (1987) maintained, and perhaps that assertion is even more true today than when he said it 4 centuries ago. In an economy where the only certainty is uncertainty, the one sure source of lasting competitive advantage is knowledge. As markets shift, technologies proliferate, competitors multiply, and products become obsolete almost overnight, successful companies are those that consistently create new knowledge, disseminate it widely throughout the organization, and quickly embody it in new technologies and products (Johnston, 1998). These activities define knowledge-creating organizations (Nonaka, 1991, 1994).

The increased importance of knowledge in contemporary society is demonstrated in the work of Drucker (1968), a socioeconomic theorist, and the work of Toffler (1990), a futurist. They focused attention on the importance of knowledge as a management resource and as power within the organization. In recognizing knowledge as the key to business success, scholars such as Quinn, (1992), Reich (1991), Schwandt (1994b, 1997; Schwandt & Gundlach, 1992; Schwandt & Marquardt, 2000), Inkpen (1998), Von Krogh (1998), and other researchers in the fields of technology management, organizational theory, and management strategy have begun to theorize about the creation and management of knowledge. Quinn (1992) shared with Drucker and Toffler the view that the economic and producing power of some modern corporations lies

more in their intellectual and service capabilities than in their hard assets. He went a step further by maintaining that the value of most products and services depends primarily on how knowledge-based intangibles, like technological know-how, product design, understanding of the customer, personal creativity, and innovation, are developed. The realization that knowledge is the new competitive resource (Bollinger & Smith, 2001) has become an important focus for organizations and countries (Cohen, 1998; Porter, 1980, 1985, 1990).

Strategy Formation

When strategy formation arrived on the scene in the mid-1960s, corporate leaders embraced it as the one best way to devise and implement strategies that would enhance the competitiveness of each business unit. Planning systems were expected to produce the best strategies, as well as step-by-step instructions for carrying out those strategies, so that the doers, the managers of businesses, could not get them wrong (Brockmann, 1998). Mintzberg (1994b) suggested that planning has not exactly worked out that way, and "while certainly not dead, strategic planning has long since fallen from its pedestal" (Mintzberg, 1994c, p. 107). As a result of its disfavor, managers and theorists turned their attention to other processes of implementation, such as transformational leadership, teamwork, employee empowerment, and reengineering (Prahalad & Hamel, 1994; Schwandt, 1997).

This refocusing of interest has led to the reconsideration of the relationship between strategy formation and organizational action (Mintzberg,

1994b) and a call for new paradigms in the field of strategy formation (Prahalad & Hamel, 1994). When Mintzberg (1990b) categorized strategy research into 10 distinct approaches, he identified one of these as the learning school, which describes strategy formation as an emergent process. Researchers (Lindblom, 1959; Mintzberg, 1978, 1994b; Quinn, 1980; Weick, 1979b) in the learning school have helped to make major strides in showing the importance of viewing strategy as a learning process (Lahteenmaki, Tiovonen, & Mattila, 2001).

Strategy Formation and Knowledge Structures

Although organizational knowledge is considered the most strategically important resource and learning the most strategically important capability for organizations, many initiatives being undertaken to develop and exploit this knowledge are not explicitly linked to or framed by the organization's strategy (Zack, 1999a). The importance of this subject is reflected in the burgeoning of cognitive studies in journals such as *Administrative Science Quarterly* and *Academy of Management Journal* and in books and essays. One exhaustive review of relevant literature of knowledge structures (Walsh, 1995) listed no fewer than 323 studies. This review showed that an impressive number of scholars have been drawn to focus their research on cognition in organizations, and most of this research referenced a top-down information processing construct. Walsh suggested the need to begin to utilize consistent terminology. Galambos, Abelson, and Black (1986) used the term *knowledge structures* to

generally refer to the cognitive structure underlying top-down information processing.

Organizational knowledge structures or cognitive maps refer to shared understanding about the nature and importance of issues faced by the organization and relationships among the issues. Prahalad and Bettis (1986) suggested that this shared understanding can be described as a general knowledge structure that can store a shared dominant general management logic. Lyles and Schwenk (1992) argued that cognitive maps of top management closely represent core aspects of organizational knowledge structures since it is their interpretation of the importance of environmental events and their view of the knowledge structure that is communicated through speeches and statements. Knowledge structures is a term used in cognitive sciences: it is a mental template based on prior experience (Walsh, 1995), consisting of organized knowledge (Fiske & Taylor, 1991) in an information environment that enables interpretation and action. Walsh (1995, p. 281) argued the importance of knowledge structures in strategy formation and the intriguing challenge management researchers face. He stated:

This challenge has been that while knowledge structures may transform complex information environments into tractable ones, they may also blind strategy makers to important changes in their business environments, compromising their ability to make sound strategic decisions. This problem-focused appreciation of cognition has been the foundation for much of the work on managerial and organizational cognition during the past ten years. (p. 281)

Many strategic management theorists assume that firms, like individuals, learn from their past experience and can transform these experiences into useful knowledge that will make them more competitive in the future (Chandler, 1962; Hamel, 1991; Lyles & Schwenk, 1992). Learning from past experience is enhanced by the availability and analysis of feedback. As a result, organizational learning refers to the development of insights, knowledge, and associations between past actions, the effectiveness of those actions, and future actions (Fiol & Lyles, 1985). Learning, therefore, is a change in the state of knowledge (Baddeley, 1990; Shrivastava & Mitroff, 1983) within the organization. The product of this process is a change of organizational knowledge structures, which deal with goals, cause and effect, beliefs, and other cognitive elements (Lyles & Schwenk, 1992). It is important to note that organizational knowledge structures differ from individual knowledge structures because they are socially constructed, depend on negotiations, are drawn from consensus among the organizational members (Daft & Weick, 1984), remain relatively stable over time, have long-term effects, and impact the whole organization. Organizational knowledge structures can be considered to be a collective system of constructs based on experiences (Daft & Weick, 1984).

Strategy Formation and Organizational Learning

The literature on organizational learning has not reached its potential in influencing strategy formation. The literature is loosely connected, inconsistent, and based on several different definitions of organizational learning (Huber,

1991; Miner & Mezias, 1996). Strategy scholars have not been any more successful in integrating organizational learning into their research (Bierly & Hamalainen, 1995). Common to the strategy formation and organizational learning constructs are the concerns with an unpredictable external environment; the need for continuous input of information concerning present and future conditions; the formation of sound organizational actions based on valid knowledge; the integration of knowledge and action to sustain the organization as a viable entity within the external environment; and the formation and nature of knowledge structures and dominant logics (Bettis & Wong, 2003) that impact the organization's culture and capacity to both learn and perform (Schwandt, 1997).

Most of the studies on organizational learning (Argyris & Schon, 1978; Bartunek, 1984; Fiol & Lyles, 1985; Ford & Hegarty, 1984; Huff, 1982; Lam, 2000; Schwenk, 1988a; Shrivastava & Schneider, 1984), however, focus on a single concept and its definition and impact. Little effort has been devoted to the study of the more important issues of the linkages between the development of shared understanding (Ireland, Hitt, Camp, & Sexton, 2001) and organizational actions (Lyles & Schwenk, 1992). While the literature is supportive of an active dialogue concerning strategy formation and organizational learning (Hodgkinson & Thomas, 1997), their dynamic social linkages are not well delineated.

Current strategy formation and organizational learning constructs attempt to explain the survival behaviors (adaptive and proactive) of collective social

systems (organizations). Each construct considers external environments vital to the construct, but neither construct addresses collective behavior (strategic actions) and cognitive patterns (knowledge structures) as nonlinear manifestations of the same social system of actions that simultaneously incorporates acts of both performance and learning (Schwandt, 1997; Green, 1988). The collective (organization) is an amalgamation of actors, objects, and norms and is characterized by social phenomena that are more than just the sum of the individual behaviors and attitudes of the individual actors (Schwandt, 1994a).

An organization's ability to respond to ongoing environmental changes reflects its capability to continually process, interpret, and act on new information to create the new knowledge upon which it formulates its strategies and actions (L. Kim, 1998). This form of action, the creation of new knowledge, reflects the focus of the field of organizational learning (Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1998). Earlier, the need for additional research on the linkages between organizational learning and strategy formation was identified. This gap in the literature is extended to include the nonprofit sector, as Young (1993) has argued that nonprofit research and theory have been slow to develop, and Merget (1993) advised that models are needed to overcome obstacles to evaluation and organizational research in nonprofits. Although the concept of organizational learning appears occasionally in the literature on nonprofits (Crosswell, 1996), its meaning continues to be