

■ 研究論文

ネットワーク組織のブリッジビルダー

－ 相互信頼関係に関する考査 －

Bridge-builders in Network Organization
- A Survey on Relationship of Mutual Trust-

神奈川大学大学院 経営学研究科
国際経営専攻 博士前期課程

王 丹

Wang Dan

■ キーワード

Bridge-builders, network organization, mutual trust, communication, culture

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to raise a discussion about linkages built on mutual trust, in which the bridge-builders play a key role in the long-term existence of network organization. Raising the problem of network organization is to dig out the truth that the most important foundational factor the mutual trust directly affects the existence of organization; and to increase the integrative role of the bridge-builders within their customers' communication processes.

Through observing and analyzing the successful and failed bridge-builders as social entrepreneurs, we find out a truth that the values held by bridge-builders affect their behavior directly. Moreover according to the experience of successful bridge-builders, we reach a conclusion that their work is to assistant to the inter-understanding of their customers rather than indicate their customers

how to communicate. Our findings regarding this connecting behavior shows that the bridge-builders create the network structure via creating mutual trust among all the peoples, companies, and organs decentralized in the organization.

Further, learning from the failed examples, we know that for building a real relationship of mutual trust, bridge-builders are required to have at least two qualities; one is the comprehensive view on influence that will be taken into the whole society through the service or products supplied by bridge-builders themselves; the other is a broad mind for tolerating the deferent cultures.

Introduction

During the 21th century, the network organization (Lee Douglas Sailer, 1978) with its highly flexibility and dynamics (Gabarro, John J, 1987) is widely used by managers. Network organization moves more quickly, manages

more economically, and responds more socially than the traditional hierarchical organization. It is recognized as an advanced structure which is more suitable for the changing environment. However, it has inherent shortcomings such as time-consuming (Thomas W. Malone, 2004), loyalty problem and trust problem.

To resolve the management problems, experienced managers adopt the advantages of both network structure and hierarchical structure to resolve different management problems. The most famous approaches are hybrid enterprises approach and power shift approach; both of them are widely used in management. Whatever the approach is, the aim is for the organization's life extension. There are many books about strategy, leadership, change, guiding on how to make wise management decisions to get organization goals. However, there is no perfect method can make everyone to achieve success, and on account of the complexity of reality, sometimes one method seems to contradict another.

With analyzing the fundamental reason for long-term existence that organization really needs to pursue, we can reach a conclusion that it is the mutual trust inside and outside the organization that play a key role for existence. It's not easy to create the relationship of mutual trust because in the organization, peoples, teams, organs, groups which are called the points here, are decentralized by the different culture, custom, or interest. This is why we need bridge-builders to create the linkage of mutual trust. After these connections have been created among the decentralized points, network structure can emerge. These will be discussed in the first section of this paper.

And in the second section, we will discuss specifically what bridge-builders are, what they are doing, how they create relationship of mutual trust, and most of all, how they played a key role in

network organization. Certainly, not all the bridge-builders do their work well. Indeed some suffered great failures. What happened in their work processes and what results their failures, will be analyzed based on the interdependent theory.

Finally, learn from the experience, we will have a depth discussion with the essential qualities that bridge-builders have to be provided with.

Why do we need bridge-builders in network organization

Characteristics and operations of network organization

First of all, let's give a definition on what a bridge-builder is. It's an organization or a person which creates linkages between other peoples or organizations that decentralized in the world. With these linkages, the other peoples or organizations will be connected with each other and a network structure will be set up.

Before the embedded discussion on this connecting work, it is necessary to figure out what network organization is and how it works. It seems that initial sociological interest in network organization was motivated in part by a critique of economic views of organization. Sociologists sought to highlight the prevalence and functionality of organizational structures that could not be classified as markets or hierarchies. But through the success of internet companies such as Facebook, Twitter, etc., it's unquestionably that network organization fosters learning, represents an organization for the attainment of legitimacy, provides a variety of economic benefits, facilitates the management of resource dependencies, and provides considerable autonomy for employees (David Levinson, 2006).

Unlike other organizational structures, the network approach provides advantages

in enthusiasm of motivating every point in organization. This vitality comes from "decentralization", the keyword as Thomas W. Malone the professor of Management mentioned in his book "The Future of Work" (Thomas W. Malone, 2004). It is reflected at the decision-making which is made in most cases by its members but not by the leader or manager. It seems that the less proportion of hierarchical management is used, the more motivation will be created. These deriving authorities occur from expertise more than from rank, because the needs which stems from the points of network demand a high degree of intangible, local, or specialized know-how.

The other important characteristic of network organization is "sharing". It is no longer unfamiliar to everyone in the world. We can share any of our information on the network if we'd like to. There is a strategic view of the networks which is considered "long term purposeful arrangements among distinct but related for-profit organizations that allow those firms in them to gain or sustain competitive advantage" (Jarillo, J.C, 1988). It is the same as network organization. Network organization maintains permeable boundaries either internally among business units or externally with other firms (Marshall Van Alstyne, 1997), this means in other words, the open information whether inside or outside the network organization can be shared.

The third characteristic of network organization is flexibility and dynamic. The network organization stresses the evolving nature of exchange relationships which allows for greater insights into the sources of stability and flexibility in collective activities (Gabarro, John J, 1987). The most probable reason is the direct communication. The communication in the network organization is point-to-point rather than

"through channels" (Lawrence, P.R, J.w. Lorsch, 1967) while knowledge of emerging problems and opportunities may arrive via multiple loose associations or weak ties (Marshall Van Alstyne, 1997). In most cases, the members in the network organization communicate via BBS (Bulletin Board Systems), e-mail, or any other contact ways set in the network organization. As a result, the network organization shapes itself automatically and flexibly for adapting to the unpredictable environment.

For those characteristics, the business activities in network organization are carried out voluntarily. In most case, business will be started by sponsors, ventures, and volunteers. Sponsors, who are the members or teams in network organization, bring tasks forward. Sometimes the task will include purpose, plan, essential resource list and risk prediction, or sometimes it will be just one term. Sponsors put the information of task on BBS for example, to notice others, and gather volunteers, and ventures who are interested in it. Without formalities, a new team will be born. Then the members determine the leader who is the one responsible through the task. After the task finished, they disband and return to former position, or maintain the very team waiting for next task.

Shortcomings and approaches of network organization

Like all the other existing organizational structure, the network organization is not perfect. Though network organization locates the partitioning of work activities in the self-direction of individuals and work groups, rather than in the hierarchy, it's born with strengths and weaknesses. The most compelling arguments on the inherent shortcomings of network organization focus on issues of time-consuming (Thomas W. Malone, 2004), loyalty problem, and trust

problem. For network organization, a decision making will spend a lot of time to let every point in network organization for recognizing because of the process on point-to-point communication. Also, there is no ultimate responsibility for appearing problems without stable controller. In contrast, these problems can be avoided by hierarchies with trust and risk due to hold-up the opportunism by vertically integrating assets they require (Marshall Van Alstyne, 1997) .

There are many approaches for avoiding the problems of network organization. The most famous approaches are hybrid enterprises approach and power shift approach. Many enterprises are hybrids of hierarchical bureaucracies, hierarchic work groups distributed across organizational, spatial boundaries, and responsibly autonomous individuals where competition and cooperation coexist. Enterprises which have complex hybrid structures consisting of hierarchies and networks are more like organic eco-systems than machines (Tom Burns, George Macpherson Stalker, 1994) . The latter are likely to be exploitative and bureaucratic while the former can be networked and innovative. It is quite a natural state of affairs that organizations can be part mechanistic and part organic with continual transformations among these forms. The network organization enacts governance systems that manage these ongoing transformations (Abrams, Robert S, 2009) .

Power shift approach are used while traditional organizations that favor a rigid hierarchical structure and ego-centric methods still employ the outmoded concept where the decision-making authority lies solely in the domain of its corporate headquarters. As Alain De Vulpian, “we are in the process of moving from a pyramidal, hierarchical society to a single-story society where hierarchical relationships dominate” (Alain De

Vulpian, 2005) . There is a concept of knowledge work where workers have control over their own activities through knowledge acquired in the course of both training and experience. As Verna Allee, "decisions are allowed to move out of the corporate headquarters to individual business units, business units will in turn distribute power and decision-making to self-managed teams and profit centers ” (Allee, V, 2003) .

The management literature has paid much attention to the topic of cooperation, delegation of authority, and change. Unfortunately, these theories cannot lead organizations to succeed as they claimed; eBay.com failed to enter the Chinese market even it cooperated with eachnet.com which is one of the most famous online shopping operators in China; many companies disappeared even they changed while numbers of Japanese entrepreneurs are more than one hundred years old because they don’ t change. Over the cooperation, delegation of authority, change or any hot theory of management, there is a relationship between each other in organization; we can’ t see it but can feel it in our subconscious. It is mutual trust that is the most important reason for long-term existence of organization.

Mutual trust and the role of bridge-builders

In network organization, where intangibles and rapidly applied expertise provide key sources of value, trust becomes essential. It’ s not easy to establish mutual trust among the two points in the network organization. Even if there are much of approaches for solving the problems, the interdependency is still a difficult subject. The same subject is relating to relationships in the world. For example, to a democratic government, trust from the citizens is the foundation of democracy; to a salesman, trust from custom is the key of profit; and to a couple, trust is the gate to

happiness.

It can be said that every communication is searching for mutual trust. This is why interdependence theory as a part of a larger scale of social exchange theories is so important. It was first introduced by Harold Kelley and John Thibaut in 1959 (Harold Kelley, John Thibaut, 1986) , and completely formulized in 1978 (Harold Kelley, John Thibaut, 1986) , from the idea that closeness is the key to all relationships. The theory stipulates that an ideal relationship is characterized with high levels of rewards and low levels of costs. Moreover there are different types of rewards and costs discussed in this theory. They are emotional, social, instrumental and opportunity (Guerrero, L.K, Anderson, P.A, Afifi, W.A, 2007) .

From this theory, emotional rewards and costs are the positive and negative feelings experienced in a relationship respectively. Social rewards and costs are those related with a person' s social appearance and the ability to interact in social environments. With every relationship there is an outcome. The outcome is determined to be positive when the rewards outweigh the costs in a relationship. Conversely, the outcome is negative when the costs outweigh the rewards.

For the psychologist, the interdependence theory identifies the most important characteristics of interpersonal situations via a comprehensive analysis of situation structure and describes the implications of structure for understanding intrapersonal and interpersonal processes (Caryl E. Rusbult, Paul A. M. Van Lange, 2008) . The interdependency behavior involves intrapersonal processes and interpersonal processes. These processes explain how self-interest is expanded to joint interest and how new goals and motives are created in cooperative and competitive situations.

The mutual trust is deeply related to a human' s thinking patterns and feelings. And this two

are base of the human value and have a direct relationship with culture. It' s interesting while a Chinese and Japanese are talking, especially about the political and social problem. The conversations often end up with unpleasant if they don' t understand the culture and habits with each other. Unfortunately, not everyone will take the initiative to understand others' culture or habits. This is where the role of bridge-builders can play a role. What can bridge-builders do in network organization ? An appropriate answer is establishing and maintaining the relationship of mutual trust between two or more decentralized points in organization. Perhaps it can be said that, in other words, there is no network organization without bridge-builder.

How do bridge-builders work in network organization

Bridge-builders as social entrepreneur

Consider the network as a pattern of social relations over a set of persons, groups, or organizations (Lee Douglas Sailer, 1978) . Social entrepreneurs are bridge-builders. Through building linkages between these in social, the social entrepreneurs set up new network organization for society.

While business entrepreneurs typically measure performance in profit and return, social entrepreneurs who recognize social problems, focus on creating social capital. They use entrepreneurial principles to organize, create and manage a venture to achieve social change which is typically said as social venture. They are most commonly associated with the voluntary and not-for-profit sectors (John L. Thompson, 2002) , but it need not preclude making a profit. The idea of social entrepreneur was first used in the literature on social change in the 1970s, and came

into widespread use in the 1980s. The language of social entrepreneurship may be new, but the phenomenon is not, it can be found throughout history. As we know, Florence Nightingale, the founder of the first nursing school and developer of modern nursing practices, Vinoba Bhave, the founder of India's Land Gift Movement, and Robert Owen, the founder of the cooperative movement are pioneers of social entrepreneur.

With combining the passion of a social mission with an image of business-like discipline, innovation, and determination, the social entrepreneurship has struck a responsive chord. From the success of social entrepreneurs straddled the governmental and business worlds during the 19th and 20th centuries, the ideas that taken up by mainstream public services in welfare, schools, and health care were promoted.

The winner of Nobel Peace Prize in 2006, Muhammad Yunus, founder and manager of Grameen Bank and its growing family of social venture businesses, is one well-known contemporary social entrepreneur (Mhammad Yunus, 2009) . He has developed micro-credit into an ever more important instrument in the struggle against poverty through Grameen Bank from modest beginnings three decades ago. Loans to poor people without any financial security, Muhammad Yunus has managed to translate visions into practical action for the benefit of millions of people, not only in Bangladesh but also in many other countries.

Grameen Bank, which builds linkages of mutual trust with poor peoples, is more like a facilitator rather than instructor. And the work of Muhammad Yunus, emphasizing the unity of economic benefits and social contribution, echoes a theme among modern day social entrepreneurs. While nonprofits, non-governmental organizations are exerting themselves for social contribution,

foundations, governments, and individuals also play a role to promote, fund, and advise social entrepreneurs around the planet.

The similar work seems not going well for the for-profit enterprise. A typical example is Vikram Akula, the founder and former chairperson of SKS Microfinance which is an organization that offers microloans and insurance to poor women in impoverished areas of India (Vikram Akula, 2010) . Although this venture is for profit, it has initiated a sharp social change amongst poor women from villages.

However, micro lenders in India have been struggling after their business models and practices caused a backlash. These micro lenders were accused of charging high interest rates and having aggressive means of collections that allegedly sparked a string of suicides in borrowers. The companies have denied these charges. But the government of Andra Pradesh passed a law to come down on abuses of the system (BBC News, 2011.11.24) .

There are continuing arguments over the one who counts as social entrepreneur. Some assert restricting the title to founders of organizations relying on income. Others spread the title of social entrepreneur to the contracted work for public authorities, grants and donations. The arguments are born depending on how people understand. A point of view on the social entrepreneur obviously affects how social entrepreneurs perceive and assess opportunities. However, for most of the people, social entrepreneurs exist for the social mission. So that, mission-related impact becomes the central criterion, not wealth creation (J. Gregory Dees, 2010) .

As bridge-builders in social, building a dummy mutual trust for excessive self-interest will corrupt the linkage of network organization in the end. As referred in the previous chapter, the mutual

trust which is deeply related to the human's thinking pattern and feeling, and often reflects in rewords and cost. Reviewing the example of SKS Microfinance, the status of getting and paying are extremely inequality for the borrowers. It is not unexpected that the relationship of trust between the borrowers and micro lenders was ruptured from the root in the end. This is what we can learn from Vikram Akula.

Bridge-builders on the internet

Despite the failure of SKS Microfinance, many social entrepreneurs succeed via the internet. The internet allows ideas to be shared by anyone in the world, help the entrepreneurs and investors to develop globally, and achieve their goals with little or no start-up capital. It has been pivotal resources for the social entrepreneurs who play a role as bridge-builders in the virtual world.

An example is Roozt.com, a new e-commerce site in the United States. Roozt.com (which is called Roozt in the following) , owned by Roozt Inc. is headquartered in Los Angeles with Satellite Offices in San Francisco and New Orleans. It has added a new give back feature embedded in its commerce platform that leverages every purchase to directly benefit specific humanitarian or environmental causes. Simultaneously, it supplies a characterized service called the "Roozt Cause" program. The "Roozt Cause" program marks the beginning of a larger Roozt campaign to harness the power of everyday e-commerce, daily deals, and online shopping to make a difference in the world. New "Roozt Cause" program is featured each month, such as water, education, or environment that will be the direct beneficiary of customer purchase donations. These programs provide Roozt's customers with an avenue to shop and give back at the same time. In only its first month the Roozt Cause program has provided over 4,000 days of

clean drinking water to school children in rural India (PRweb news center, 2012.1.17) .

Roozt is succeeding by connecting online shoppers with socially responsible, social entrepreneur vendors. It's an excellent bridge-builder in the virtual world. Peoples who are decentralized in the world can be centralized via the website; and it will become a force to be reckoned with centralizing everyone's little power. It's so exciting that we can image its future development.

Not only for shopping, as we know, the internet plays an important role between teachers and students for learning, educator professional development, and content sharing. The National School Boards Association reports that almost 60 percent of students who use social networking talk about education topics online, and more than 50 percent talk specifically about schoolwork (Vockley Lang, 2007)

TeachStreet.com (which is called TeachStreet in the following) is the typical social network website which is being built to foster relationships that include educational blogs, portfolios, as well as communication such as chats, discussion threads, and synchronous forums. It is a dynamic online community that brings motivated learners and talented teachers together, and at the same time a place where people can find class right for them while offering a public forum that helps teachers and experts share information they know via simple online tools. Teachers and experts can grow their businesses and promote their classes, workshops and special events. TeachStreet is privately-funded and located in downtown Seattle and its customers have listed classes in more than 500 cities across the country. The entrepreneur Dave Schappell has a hope that by making TeachStreet, learners and top-notch local teachers will connect each other more easily and stronger

communities and contribute will be built among more interesting humans out there in the world (TeachStreet, 2008.7) .

Perhaps it will be considered that the mutual trust is built easily and spread faster on internet rather than the real world. In fact, fraud in the internet is far more than the real world. Remember the operator of the popular website Tabelog.com, which carries reviews and ratings of restaurants and bars and be trusted and commonly used by network customers, recognized some posters had been paid by restaurants to write favorable reviews in order to move up higher in the rankings (JapanToday, 2012.1.6) . Once the mutual trust is broken, it is very difficult to recover.

Essential qualities of bridge-builders

The bridge-builders face various choices in their daily work. There is a dilemma between profit and reputation. Like the SKS Microfinance, if the bridge-builders set their aim on profit, but count themselves as social contributors, they will lose both profit and reputation. Certainly, it' s not the reputation that the most social entrepreneurs are working for. What choice will be selected is depended on the goals of bridge-builders. It will be so different between the goals of interest objectives and the goals of social contributions. However, such an extreme distinction does not mean there are only two types of organizations' goals in the world. In fact, a lot of companies and organizations are earning profit while contributing to the world. The different is the amount they take and give . Some are earning more than contributing, and some are on the opposite. The difference is depended on the value of bridge-builders which is related to the culture, the interest and custom of the bridge-builders. However, whatever the goal is, social responsibility can' t be forgotten

by anyone in anytime. Without the view of social responsibility, the culture and healthy development of human civilization will be corrupted.

To bridge-builders, there are two important qualities they need to have. One is a comprehensive view of the work process they are focusing on. Comprehensive view means a view on the whole process including influence that will be taken into the whole society through the service or products supplied by bridge-builders themselves. Moreover it requires a forecast ability of risk and skill on problem solving, for leading bridge-builders to know what improvements can be made before the problems occur if there are potential problems exist, and what can be done to resolve problems or reduce losses if unforeseen problems arise. If these abilities are too hard for a human being, at least, with the fear of influence on others, bridge-builders should remind themselves do not bring damage to the organization for any immediate interest.

The other quality that bridge-builders need to have is cultural comprehension. People, companies, teams, or any points in organization, will be connected automatically if they hold the same values or know the needs and feelings with each other. Unfortunately, they do not understand but conjecture each other on their own standpoint. It is the most probably because of the culture barriers (David W De Long, Liam Fahey, 2000) . Thanks to the culture barriers give meaning of existence to bridge-builders. We discussed bridge-builders' work, in the previous chapter, is giving assistance to their customers for understanding rather than instructing how to understanding. This means it' s necessary for bridge-builders to comprehend the culture of their customers, so that they can understand what the customers need and feel. In other words, their work is to help their customers to cross the sense of conflict. Of

course, it' s impossible for the bridge-builders to comprehend each culture; sometimes the bridge-builders themselves feel the conflict with their customers. To overcome the negative thoughts, it' s necessary to keep a broad mind to tolerate difference cultures.

Discussions

There is no independent existence in this world. Even we are separated as decentralized individuality by difference of values, worldviews, or outlook on life; we have various relationship seen or unseen with each other. Our differences are related to the culture, and this sense of conflict which is well-known as the culture barriers (David W De Long, Liam Fahey, 2000)

Culture exists not only in a country but also companies, families, schools and any organization and individual. It' s necessary to cross the conflicts of different cultures and communicate with each other in day-by-day works. While crossing the conflicts, the real mutual trust between different cultures can be created easily. With this connecting work, an organization becomes network organization.

Bridge-builder is required to be wise and broad-minded. Unfortunately, we are imperfect and fair of failure. But it is the failure that we can learn from. Creating firm linkage is not an easy work and usually developing not well at first; but if the failed bridge-builders can, learn from experience, get up from failure, try other ways; and if one who couldn' t communicate well with others can take the first step to practice their communicating method, these are the best wishes of this paper.

Reference

- 1 David Levinson, Bhanu Yerra, Self-Organization of Surface Transportation Networks, *Transportation science*, 2006.5: pp.179-188.
- 2 Thomas W. Malone, *The Future of Work: How the New Order of Business Will Shape Your Organization, Your Management Style and Your Life*, Harvard Business Review Press, 2004.
- 3 Lee Douglas Sailer, *Structural Equivalence: Meaning and Definition, Computation and Application*, *Social Networks*, 1978. 1 (1) : p. 73-90.
- 4 Marshall Van Alstyne, *the state of network organization: A survey in three frameworks*, Forthcoming in *Journal of Organizational Computing*, 1997.
- 5 Gabarro, John J, *The dynamics of taking charge*, Harvard Business School Press, 1987.
- 6 Jarillo, J.C, *On Strategic Networks*, *Strategic Management Journal*, 1988. 9:pp. 31-41.
- 7 Lawrence, P.R, J.w. Lorsch, *Organization and Environment*. 1967, Boston: Harvard University Press.
- 8 Larry E. Penley, Sam Gould, *Etzioni's model of organizational involvement: A perspective for understanding commitment to organizations*. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 1988.1. 9 (1) :pp. 43-59.
- 9 Tom Burns, George Macpherson Stalker, *The Management of Innovation*, Oxford University Press, 1994.10.
- 10 Abrams, Robert S, *Uncovering the Network-Centric Organization*, University of California, Irvine, 2009.
- 11 Alain De Vulpian, *Listening to Ordinary People*, Sol International Forum in Vienna, 2005.9.
- 12 Allee, V, *The Future of Knowledge: Increasing Prosperity through Value Networks*, Butterworth-Heinemann, 2003.

- 13 Bas Hillebrand, Wim G. Biemans, Links between Internal and External Cooperation in Product Development: An Exploratory Study, *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 2004.3.21 (2) : pp. 110-122.
- 14 Harold Kelley, John Thibaut, *The Social Psychology of Groups*, Transaction Publishers, 1986.4.
- 15 Harold Kelley, John Thibaut, *Interpersonal Relations: A Theory of Interdependence*, John Wiley & Sons Inc., 1978.10.
- 16 Guerrero, L.K, Anderson, P.A, Afifi, W.A, *Close encounters: Communication in relationships*, Sage Publications, Inc. 2nd edition, 2007.7.
- 17 Caryl E. Rusbult, Paul A. M. Van Lange, *Why We Need Interdependence Theory*, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, 2008.9.
- 18 John L. Thompson, “The World of the Social Entrepreneur” , *The International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 2002.15 (5) : pp.412-431.
- 19 Mhammad Yunus, *Creating a World Without Poverty: Social Business and the Future of Capitalism*, Public Affairs, 2009.1.
- 20 Vikram Akula, *A Fistful of Rice: My Unexpected Quest to End Poverty Through Profitability*, Harvard Business Review Press, 2010.9.
- 21 BBC News, *Boss of Indian microfinance firm SKS steps down*, 2011.11.24.
- 22 J. Gregory Dees, *The Meaning of “Social Entrepreneurship”* , *Case Studies in Social Entrepreneurship and Sustainability*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.3.
- 23 PRweb news center, *Roozt.com Completes Seed Funding, Adds Cause-Directed Investment to E-Commerce Platform*, 2012.1.17.
- 24 Vockley Lang, *CREATING & CONNECTING Research and Guidelines on Online Social and Educational-Networking*, National School Boards Association, 2007.
- 25 TeachStreet, *Find-A-Local-Teacher Site, Gears Up for Market*, *The Local Onliner*, 2008. 7.
- 26 JapanToday, *Operator of restaurant rating website Tabelog says paid posters manipulated rankings*, *Japan news*, 2012.1.6.
- 27 David W De Long, Liam Fahey, *Diagnosing cultural barriers to knowledge management*, *Academy of Management Executive*, *Academy of Management*, 2000: pp.113-127.