

Available online at www.sciencedirect.com





Procedia Manufacturing 3 (2015) 723 - 730

6th International Conference on Applied Human Factors and Ergonomics (AHFE 2015) and the Affiliated Conferences, AHFE 2015

Knowledge creation and learning within the building project orientation of organizations

Stefan Marsina^a, Anna Hamranova^a, Frantisek Okruhlica^b, Vladimir Bolek^{a,*}

^aUniversity of Economics in Bratislava, Dolnozemska 1/b, 852 35 Bratislava, Slovakia ^bPan-European University, Tomasikova 20, 821 02 Bratislava, Slovakia

Abstract

Project-oriented organization is characterized by technological and organizational innovations, as well as by generating a new managerial culture in organization when designing and implementing projects. Preferentially, the project orientation has to be fully supported by top management of the enterprise. The strategic thinking of executives must be a basic presumption. Building of project-oriented organization is a complex process, which should be conducted in several areas of activities of an organization. A model of developing current organization to mature one consists of five areas and five levels. This paper contains results from research of small, medium sized and large enterprises in terms of application building of project orientation. Levels of project orientation were examined on the ground of above mentioned model.

© 2015 The Authors. Published by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/). Peer-review under responsibility of AHFE Conference

Keywords: Knowledge creation; Team work; Knowledge sharing; Learning; Project-orieted organization; Project management office; Evolution level; Information and communication technology

1. Introduction

Sustainable development of society brings harmony between both economic progress and protection (preservation) of living environment. In the area of business management this is expressed by effective activities of business organizations generating profit concurrently with being regardful to nature around (environmental behavior

^{*} Corresponding author. Tel.: +421-2-6729-5614. *E-mail address:* vladimir.bolek@gmail.com

of organizations). One of the means to ensure effective activities in business organizations is the application of project management and gradual building of a project-oriented organization. Majority of projects designed and implemented within businesses, especially focused on manufacturing, respect environmental issues and pay attention to living environment.

Modern concepts of management emphasize project management, which is carried out by high quality of information. Project is not only a tool for technological or organizational change, but also a tool for generation of new knowledge within the organization [1]. The most important information needed for managing projects (from which the corporate knowledge arises) is located in the memory and experiences of employees (tacit information, tacit knowledge). A good project-oriented organization strives to use modern information technologies for formalization of tacit knowledge as much as possible in order to be downloaded into the information system [2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8]. Thereby it can be used as a basis for gaining new information by using advanced techniques (data mining, knowledge extraction, knowledge discovery). This new information can facilitate competitiveness or predict further development of an enterprise.

Developing only project management within the organization would lead to situation when certified project managers have no partners in preparation and implementation of any project. That is why next areas of overall activities (no functional processes as marketing, accounting, production, etc.), which support the project management development should be developed. [9]

Development of project management and supporting areas of activities of an organization is introduced in an integrated model of the transformation process leading to the project-oriented organization, which shows five developing areas of an organization from current through mature in five levels. (Fig. 1)

The model examines following areas: Communications, Knowledge development, Project management development, Training and development of employees, and Organizational standards & norms [10,3]. Communications is fundamental for effective management, especially when modern applications of Business Intelligence and Collective Intelligence are employed. [11] Shared tacit knowledge within the project team-work gives a chance to enhance the overall organizational culture. [12]

Project Management development is a backbone of the building process. Training and development provided meaningfully as a program supports the enhancement of qualifications. [13] The development of standards and norms formalizes all achievements into formal documents serving especially for controlling.

Application of the model is useful for organizations not only because of finding the actual evolution level on which they are within the particular area, but also because the model offers what activities should be done to reach the next level. Higher level of project orientation means more effective operation of the organization as a whole in profit creation, saving sources and more responsibility in terms of living environment.

Partial research activities within our research project are focused on finding the real state of using project management in business organizations and level of their project orientation. The means of gaining data is a questionnaire, where methods of statistical apparatus are applied. The questionnaire consists of two main parts. The first part gains information about organization structure of respondent and its utilization of projects and project management in domestic and international context. The second part is specifically focused on "An integrated model of the transformation process leading to the project-oriented organization". The interviewed organization reveals levels where they are situated in individual area of activity.

2. Research framework and methodology

The research framework includes the creation of a model of measured indicators, questionnaire survey, and evaluation of received data, comparison and formulation of results. The research process model is shown in Fig. 2.

The reached maturity level of enterprises in project orientation has been tested by means of developed model and questionnaire. The questionnaire was focused on typical characteristics of above mentioned areas according to "Integrated model of transformation process leading to the project-oriented organization". During the assessment a model of calculation was applied, on the basis of which, consequently, it was possible to align enterprises to individual levels of maturity model.

| Initial state | Developed area | 1 st level | 2 nd level | 3rd level | 4th level | 5th level | Desired state |
|----------------------|---|--|---|---|--|--|--------------------------------------|
| state | Communications | Communicat ion gaps between professional areas and managerial levels | Identification of activities to be supported by IS/ICT | Increased horizontal and vertical cooperation, start of implementing BI applications | Development of communicatio n within the project teams; optional use of Business Intelligence applications | Communicati on of project professionals organized by PMO | |
| | Knowledge Development | Knowledge related to profession and position in the organization | Knowledge related not only to profession in the organization | Creating environment for interchanging of tacit knowledge | Multidisciplin ary knowledge acquired on the project | Shared knowledge of PM professionals (PMP**) within the projects or PMO (+ Journal) | nization |
| Current organization | Project management development | Projects, if any, designed and implemented by external experts | Projects are designed and implemented prevailingly by external experts | Projects are designed and implemented prevailingly by internal experts | Internal experts are gradually certified as PM professionals and Project managers | PMO administers design and implementati on of projects including pool of PM experts | Mature project-oriented organization |
| | Training and development of employees | T&D only in the profession given by external trainers | T&D only in profession given prevailingly by external trainers | T & D of mixed expertise given prevailingly by external trainers | T & D of mixed expertise given prevailingly by internal trainers or is given within the project | T & D of mixed expertise given prevailingly by internal trainers lead to PMP certification | Mature pr |
| | Organizational standards & norms | Standards & norms for routine processes | In general, organizational norms support operation of ICT and T&D of employees | Organizational norms include the project administration | Organizational norms specified for PM include utilization of Business Intelligence apps and outsourcing of selected ICT | Specific norms developed for the Project management office (PMO*) | |

Fig. 1. Integrated model of transformation process leading to the project-oriented organization.

Criteria, which were used for recognition of the project orientation maturity level within individual areas, were assigned as follows:

• In the area of communication development we examined the existence of communication gaps between functional units, ICT development, improvement of vertical and also horizontal communication, development of communication by means of project teams, and enhancement of communication that is supported by Project Management Office (indicators A1 through A5).



Fig. 2. Research process model.

- In the knowledge management development area we examined, whether the employees' knowledge involves only
 their profession and position in the organization, whether knowledge development overlaps with the frame of
 profession in the organization, whether environment for sharing tacit knowledge within the organization is
 created, whether multidisciplinary knowledge is acquired in the project team, and eventually, whether sharing
 knowledge of project professionals is carried out within projects or the Project Management Office PMO
 (indicators B1 through B5).
- In the area of project management development we examined, whether projects within the organization are designed and implemented by external or internal experts, whether internal experts are gradually certified as project management professionals (PMPs) or project managers, or, whether PMO mediates preparation and realization of projects including own certified PMPs (indicators C1 through C5).
- In the area of career development of employees we examined whether T&D is carried out regularly or irregularly on request of individual managers, whether T&D is carried out by external or internal trainers, whether T&D is focused on individual or mixed professions, and, whether PMO participates in T&D (indicators D1 through D5).
- In the area of organizational standards and norms we focused on these facts: whether organization issues standards and norms only for securing routine operations, whether organization standards and norms support T&D of employees, whether they include also administration of project teams, whether selected organization standards and norms are oriented to project management, and whether selected organization standards and norms deal with effective operation of PMO (indicators E1 through E5).

2.1. Research instrument

A questionnaire was developed by building on previous theoretical bases to ensure content validity. The research was conducted between February and April 2015. Empirical data were collected through a survey in Slovak small, medium-sized and large organizations. The respondents were Slovak managers of the enterprises.

Respondents had a choice to decide about each indicator by means of 7 ordered Likert scale, which consisted of these levels: (1 - strongly disagree, 2 - disagree, 3 - partially disagree, 4 - neither agree nor disagree, 5 – partially agree, 6 - agree, 7 - strongly agree).

2.2. Measures

Measurement model is shown in Table 1.

| Indicator | Meaning |
|-----------|---|
| A1 | Communication gaps between professional areas and managerial levels |
| A2 | Identification of activities to be supported by IS/ICT |
| A3 | Increased horizontal and vertical cooperation, start of implementing BI applications |
| A4 | Development of communication within the project teams; optional use of Business Intelligence applications |
| A5 | Communication of project professionals organized by PMO |
| B1 | Knowledge related to profession and position in the organization |
| B2 | Knowledge related not only to profession in the organization |
| B3 | Creating environment for interchanging of tacit knowledge |
| B4 | Multidisciplinary knowledge acquired on the project |
| B5 | Shared knowledge of PM professionals (PMP**) within the projects or PMO (+ Journal) |
| C1 | Projects, if any, designed and implemented by external experts |
| C2 | Projects are designed and implemented prevailingly by external experts |
| C3 | Projects are designed and implemented prevailingly by internal experts |
| C4 | Internal experts are gradually certified as PM professionals and Project managers |
| C5 | PMO administers design and implementation of projects including pool of PM experts |
| D1 | T&D only in the profession given by external trainers |
| D2 | T&D only in profession given prevailingly by external trainers |
| D3 | T & D of mixed expertise given prevailingly by internal trainers |
| D4 | T & D of mixed expertise given prevailingly by internal trainers or is given within the project |
| D5 | T & D of mixed expertise given prevailingly by internal trainers lead to PMP certification |
| E1 | Standards & norms for routine processes |
| E2 | Organizational norms support operation of ICT and T&D of employees (in general) |
| E3 | Organizational norms include the project administration |
| E4 | Organizational norms specified for PM include utilization of Business Intelligence apps and outsourcing of selected ICT |
| E5 | Specific norms developed for the Project management office (PMO*) |

Table 1. Model of measurement indicators

2.3. Data collection

Data was collected from randomly selected companies operating in Slovakia. The selection of companies was not influenced by any particular factor. The managers of these companies were requested to complete a structured questionnaire. The questionnaire consisted of open questions as well as assessment statements according to a given rating scale (these are shown in Table 2 and Table 3). The sample was characterized by company size (measured by the number of employees and domestic/vs. foreign ownership (Table 2).

| Company Size | % of |
|--------------------------|-----------|
| Company Size | companies |
| Small (S) | 40.74 |
| Medium (M) | 37.04 |
| Large (L) | 22.22 |
| Ownership | % of |
| Ownership | companies |
| 100 % foreign ownership | 27.78 |
| Major foreign ownership | 4.63 |
| 100 % domestic ownership | 52.78 |
| Major domestic ownership | 11.11 |
| Public Ownership | 3.70 |

Table 2. Sample Characteristics.

| | Ν | Range | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation | Variance |
|--------------------|-----|-------|---------|---------|------|----------------|----------|
| Company size | 109 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1.82 | .772 | .596 |
| Ownership | 109 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 2.89 | 1.945 | 3.784 |
| B1 | 109 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 4.22 | 1.802 | 3.247 |
| B2 | 109 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 4.03 | 1.702 | 2.897 |
| B3 | 109 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 3.86 | 1.823 | 3.323 |
| B4 | 109 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 3.55 | 1.766 | 3.120 |
| B5 | 109 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 3.36 | 2.035 | 4.139 |
| C1 | 109 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 2.31 | 1.698 | 2.883 |
| C2 | 109 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 2.23 | 1.567 | 2.456 |
| C3 | 109 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 5.32 | 1.660 | 2.757 |
| C4 | 109 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 3.68 | 1.905 | 3.627 |
| C5 | 109 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 3.32 | 1.971 | 3.887 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 109 | | | | | | |

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics (only areas Knowledge development and training and development of employees.

2.4. Results

When evaluating certain level of maturity we selected only accordant answers (strongly agree, agree) because others, mostly uncertain, were not relevant for stating appropriate levels of maturity. The evaluation was realized by means of statistical apparatus using tools of descriptive statistics and frequency tables. The processed results are in the Table 4.

Note: The Table 4. shows the percentage share of enterprises on individual levels of the maturity model. Among "not included" there belong those enterprises, which did not express explicit consent with any indicator, or enterprises which expressed accordant attitude with more than one level.

| Developed area | 1st level | 2nd level | 3rd level | 4th level | 5th level | Not included | Agree with more levels |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Communication | 23.46 | 9.88 | 25.93 | 19.75 | 14.81 | 6.17 | 0 |
| Knowledge Development | 31.20 | 23.90 | 24.70 | 11.90 | 22.00 | 0 | 13.70 |
| Project management development | 9.20 | 6.40 | 52,30 | 14.70 | 14.70 | 2.70 | 0 |
| Training and development of employees | 28.40 | 14.70 | 24.80 | 24.70 | 15.60 | 0 | 8.20 |
| Organizational standards & norms | 23.00 | 32.10 | 16.50 | 12.90 | 11.90 | 3.60 | 0 |

Table 4. Results.

The goal of our research was to find out the level of project orientation on the sample of Slovak small, mediumsized and large enterprises. The share of enterprises on individual levels of the maturity model in percentage is shown in Table 4. The evaluation is focused on two areas of the model – Knowledge development and Training and development of employees.

In the area of Knowledge development 31.2 % of enterprises declared, that the knowledge is shared only within profession and position in the organization. In 23.9% of enterprises the knowledge is shared not only within the profession. The environment for sharing tacit knowledge is created in 24.7% of enterprises and 11.9% of enterprises

stated that the multidisciplinary knowledge is acquired on the project. The knowledge of PM professionals within the project or PMO is shared in 22% of enterprises.

However, these numbers are partially biased by the fact that 13.7% of enterprises expressed consent with more than one level of maturity model. There can be various reasons for that – from volatile filling in of the questionnaire to misunderstanding differences between individual levels of maturity.

This fact confirms that these enterprises do not comprehend the project management and/or the creation and sharing of knowledge. Particularly for these enterprises the project orientation would be a good potential solution.

In the area of Training and development of employees 28.4% of enterprises stated, that the T&D is provided only within the profession and given by external trainers, 14.7% of enterprises declared that the T&D is provided within profession and given prevailingly by external trainers, 24.8% of enterprises stated that the T&D of mixed expertise is given prevailingly by external trainers, the 24.7% of enterprises declare that the T &D of mixed expertise is given prevailingly by internal trainers or is given within the project, and 15.60% of enterprises reach the highest level in this area, i.e. T &D of mixed expertise is given prevailingly by internal trainers.

In the case of Training and development of employees similarly as it is in the area of Knowledge development 8.2% of enterprises stated their positions on more than one maturity model level.

3. Conclusion

Our research revealed that the Slovak enterprises are not effective enough in utilization of projects for their business activities. Only lower number of enterprises can declare (Table 4.) that they operate on 5th level of the maturity model. There are 14.81% in the area of Communication, 22% in the area of Knowledge development, 14.70% in the area of Project management development, 15.60% in the area of Training and development of employees, and 11.90% in the area of Organizational standards & norms. Only those enterprises, which were identified on the 4th level of the maturity model, can be considered satisfactory. Majority of enterprises are located on lower levels, which means that they are in need of making their business activities more effective, and project orientation with its principles can be significantly helpful in that effort.

Very interesting seems to be 52.30% of enterprises on 3rd level of the project management development area. This figure presents the fact, that high percentage of Slovak enterprises assesses their approach to project management on the average.

Another interesting group of enterprises from the aspect of project orientation are those enterprises which did not align themselves to any level (6.17% in the area of Communication, 2.70% in the area of Project management development, and 3.60% in the area of Organizational standards & norms), or enterprises, which aligned themselves into more than one level (13.70% in the area of Knowledge development and 8.20% in the area of Training and development of employees). These enterprises declared their neutral attitude to utilization of the area of project management. Along with enterprises situated on lower levels they represent a potential for training and development and consultations in this area. Concurrently, their identification creates an opportunity for further testing and research.

References

- [1] Marsina, S., Project management as a tool for building of knowledge-based enterprise, In Európska konferencia produktivity EPC 2007 a 10. národné fórum produktivity : zborník prednášok, Žilina 23. - 25. októbra 2007. - Žilina : Slovenské centrum produktivity, 2007. ISBN 978-80-969391-7-6, pp. 349-351.
- [2] Lacko, B., Strategic goals of project management. In: International conference "Strategic Management and its Support by Information Systems", Ostrava: Technical University of Ostrava 2001, ISBN 80-7078-923-1.
- [3] Rosenau, M. D., Githens, G. D., Successful Project Management A Step-by-Step Approach with Practical Examples. 4th ed., Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2005, p. 22.
- [4] Marsina, S., Analýza pôvodu projektu v podnikovom prostredí. In: The International Scientific Conference FPM EU in Bratislava. Bratislava: Faculty of Business Management, 2003, pp. 364-368. ISBN 80-225-1759-3.
- [5] Kerzner, H., Project Management. A Systems Approach to Planning, Scheduling, and Controlling. 9th ed., Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 2006.

- [6] Fernandez, Daniel J. J., Agile Project Management -- Agilism Versus Traditional Approaches, Journal of Computer Information Systems, 49 (2), 2008, pp.10-17.
- [7] Schmid, B., Motivation in project management: the project manager's perspective.(PAPERS)(Author abstract) Project management journal [8756-9728], 39 (2), 2008, p. 60.
- [8] Watkins, S., How Project-Management Software Affects Project Control. Buildings [0007-3725], 102 (3), p. 26, 2008.
- [9] Marsina, S., Project management helps to develop knowledge-based small and middle sized firms. In Ekonomika, financie a manažment podniku - rok 2009 : medzinárodná vedecká konferencia Fakulty podnikového manažmentu EU v Bratislave pod záštitou rektora Ekonomickej univerzity v Bratislave Dr. h. c. prof. Ing. Rudolfa Siváka, PhD. [elektronický zdroj]. - Bratislava : Fakulta podnikového manažmentu EU, 2009. ISBN 978-80-225-2808-5.
- [10] Marsina, S., Development of Information and Communication Systems within The Building of Project-oriented Organization. In: Economy, Finance and management of Companies – Year 2013. Bratislava, University of Economics in Bratislava, 2013. [CD/ROM].
- [11] Hamranova, A., Marsina, S., Molnar, P., & Okruhlica, F., Development of Information and Communication Systems within the Building of Project-Oriented Manufacturing Organization. In Advances in Production Management Systems, Innovative and Knowledge-Based Production Management in a Global-Local World, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2014, pp. 241-248.
- [12] Kantola, J., Vanharanta, H., Paajanen, P., Piirto, A., Showing asymmetries in knowledge creation and learning through proactive vision. Theoretical Issues in Ergonomics Science, 13(5), 2012, pp. 570-585.
- [13] Sirota, M., Juanchich, M., Kostopoulou, O., Hanak, R., Decisive Evidence on a Smaller-Than-You-Think Phenomenon Revisiting the "1-in-X" Effect on Subjective Medical Probabilities. Medical Decision Making, 0272989X13514776, 2013.