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Chapter-1 Introduction

In this chapter a brief background is provided which is followed by problem discussion and research purpose and research questions is presented.

1.1 Background

Globalization was the turning point when many large corporations started to begin their operations in foreign countries which provided them with new markets to sell their products as well as new manufacturing facilities. While this trend of internationalization was not new but what was interesting was the speed at which this happened with globalization. The large enterprises were the first to internationalize but later this trend was growing where SME’s have also diversified their operations in foreign countries because of new opportunities available, low cost of labor, and limited growth opportunities in their home countries (Vachini, 2005). While this expansion opens new doors, there are lot of challenges that could firm could face in the host country (Vachani, 1998).

The world economy at present is moving rapidly towards a knowledge-based economy. According to OECD (1996) the term knowledge based economy is the total recognition of the role of knowledge and technology in economic growth. Knowledge is being widely accepted as the most important resource which is an intangible resource, hard to imitate and these makes it a source of competitive advantage for organizations. But, merely recognizing the importance of knowledge is not sufficient to have competitive advantage, Organizations must understand how to best manage this precious resource and it requires great effort in terms of how to create, share and utilize knowledge. If this knowledge is not managed properly it could affect growth, operational efficiency and innovation capacity (De Long & Davenport, 2003).

The role of knowledge for competitive advantage in present day firms is more important than before. It’s a very critical part of an organization and managing that knowledge is paramount if firms wants to be successful. While in the past knowledge was treated as information which has been changed lately and it is now widely recognized as tacit knowledge which is inside the brain and body of an individual and explicit knowledge which occurs in the forms of routines, which can be written down and understandable by everyone. If organizations have to benefit from the knowledge they possess, they have to understand how to manage it, that is they have to put a great emphasis on knowledge creation, sharing and utilization activities. The difficulty of yielding competitive advantage from knowledge depends on its social and dynamic nature.
McAdam and Reid (2001) discussed that though knowledge management practices were developed for the large corporations. Later, they would be eventually applied to Small and Medium Enterprises (SME’s) also. However, in case of SME’s where often there are many constraints like resources, wise use of these available resources is very important as unthoughtful decision taken could lead to a bigger loss compared to large corporations. Moreover, the organizational structure also varies in SME’s where the owner/manager holds the main position and play a critical role in the organization and is often the one person who takes most of the decisions regarding the business planning and development.

1.2 Problem Discussion

SMEs are industrial wheels for a country. The everyday functioning of SME’s must be tracked carefully and since most of the decisions are taken by owner/manager and few other key people in the firm. SME’s also lack financial resources and expertise and thus most of the knowledge resides in the mind of the owner and a few keys people in the firm instead of being captured and stored in respective systems and routines (Durst & Edvardsson, 2012). Therefore, the sharing and utilization of knowledge in SME’s differs considerably. This challenges has been intensified by the fact that new organizational models where in many people spend a significant part of their working time outside the physical boundaries of the firms like subsidiaries, in other countries which disperses the knowledge of the firm (Corso et al., 2006). This reduces or almost eliminates physical meeting or social interactions between owner/manager and other key people in the firm due to physical distance between the parent and the subsidiary. The sharing of knowledge within a firm with offices in different countries (in this particular case Sweden and India) has not been studied at least until this thesis work was being carried out. Hence, there exists a gap to study this and help the authors get a better understanding about the topic.

More and more firms having realized the benefits of knowledge sharing that can maximize the business gain by being competitive have invested a considerable amount or resources in managing knowledge in the organizations (Cyril Eze et al., 2013). While the organizations have realized the importance of knowledge management they are not very great in managing this valuable resource. This could be due to SME’s does not fully understand or overestimate the importance of knowledge sharing and fail to realize what are the challenges and barriers that hampers or fosters the knowledge sharing process. Although many factors like culture of collaboration (organizational and societal), skill of individual, trust formalization, knowledge technology, empowering leadership, reward system, motivation etc., effect the sharing and utilization of knowledge. The challenges and barriers faced by large corporations and SME’s are not similar in nature (Vachani, 2005). Also, most of the knowledge generated in SME’s is not explicit but tacit in nature.
Moreover, it is very important for SMEs to set themselves free from the small boundary and start taking the challenge in the new era of innovation. To do so, SMEs can not depend on certain individuals and they have to start thinking of knowledge creation, sharing and utilization.

1.3 Purpose and Research question(s):

The arguments that were presented in the previous section shows that there is a gap in the literature to study how knowledge is shared in SME’s and what are the challenges that the firm or an individual is subjected and how that can be overcome.

To investigate how employees in a SME firm working in different locations (countries) share the knowledge that they acquired thorough their professional and personnel experience with their colleagues and how this knowledge can be utilized by the firm.

In order to have a better understanding and to give a clarity to the reader the research purpose is divided into three research questions. Most of the existing literature is based on the surveys done by the researchers (Cyril Eze et.al.,2013; Tohidinia & Mosakhani, 2010; Lin, 2007; Lin & Lee, 2004) and qualitative method was not commonly used. The first step is to understand how knowledge is shared in SME’s and this leads to the first research question:

**Research Question-1**: To explore how knowledge is shared and utilized in SME’s with subsidiaries located in different countries.

That’s a crucial part of our study. We experienced some critical factors which need deeper concern. We often see SMEs are sharing and utilizing the knowledge within a certain boundary. But, it become way more complicated when we think to manage both knowledge sharing and utilizing activities in a bigger context. For MNCs managing knowledge in different parts of the world might be feasible but for SMEs its not. Therefore, our study aims to figure out both opportunities and shortcoming of knowledge sharing and utilizing in SMEs which have subsidiaries in other countries. We also encounter one interesting part while we were trying to develop our understanding from the literature. We want to explore the direction of the flow of the shared knowledge. We want to see whether the knowledge is following one direction i.e. the knowledge is shared from head office only or it goes back and forth.

After the answer to the first question is found, the next step is to find what are the challenges that helps and disrupt the knowledge sharing in the SME’s and this leads to the
second research question. By having a deep knowledge of the barriers the authors will be in a better position to find solutions for these problems.

**Research Question-2**: What are the factors that foster/hamper the sharing of knowledge between these offices and how can those problems be solved?

When the challenges to knowledge sharing are identified, next step will be to analyze the role of manager/CEO and the HR manager in motivating the employees to share knowledge. This is important to study as senior manager’s attitudes and behavior in large corporations is found to have an positive effect on knowledge sharing intentions (Lin & Lee, 2004). This leads to the third research question:

**Research Question-3**: What is the role of owner/manager and human resource (HR) to encourage employees to share knowledge in the firm?

As we already mention in SMEs the decision making body is usually the CEO or Chairperson of the company, so, we wanted to see what role he/she plays in knowledge creation, sharing and utilization activities. We also planned to focus on the HR personnel whether he/she has significant impact in such activities.

---

**Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework**

*In this chapter we emphasized on knowledge, types of knowledge, knowledge management of knowledge in SMEs and how SMEs share and utilize their knowledge followed by the factors that influence knowledge sharing activities*
Theoretical framework shows relevant theories for knowledge sharing and utilization. This part reflects different aspects of knowledge sharing and utilization which we have gathered through literature and other sources of knowledge relevant to the theories and practice.

2.1 Knowledge

The term knowledge often used as synonyms in management and organization theory until few decades ago (Nonaka, von Krogh & Voelpel, 2006). Knowledge could be defined as a process of individual’s ability to generate knowledge and distribute this knowledge with colleague as well as organizational knowledge system (Nonaka, von Krogh & Voelpel, 2006). The knowledge generated could be tacit which refers to knowledge which an individual acquires through his/her experience, learning or the ability to observe surroundings. It is a knowledge that can’t be spoken or expressed in words which is hard to imitate while on the other hand explicit knowledge is the opposite which means it can be can be expressed and noted down in words or drawings and the interaction between these two forms of knowledge along a continuum is explained by knowledge conversion (Nonaka, von Krogh & Voelpel, 2006).

Knowledge is created through a dynamic process and it is important for firms to have organizational structures and models to be able to combine this knowledge to its exploration and exploitation capabilities. Knowledge is very important in innovation activities as a knowledge-rich environment can strengthen a firm’s ability to innovate even if the firm does not adjust its search strategies (Garriga, von Krogh, Spaeth, 2010). William & Von Krogh (2010) emphasized, "innovation has knowledge at its very core—innovation cannot occur without knowledge".

Knowledge can be perceived in different ways from different perspective. For instance, users might consider a knowledge useful when it helps them to solve a practical problem, whereas a company judges a knowledge as useful when the products or services on which it is based generate a positive cash flow (Wallin & Von Krogh, 2010).

Since, 1962 knowledge has got a new dimension and treated as a product. Machlup (1980) said, perhaps the most spectacular discovery of the 1962 volume was that the ‘knowledge industry’ that part of economic activity which had knowledge as a direct or final product was at least 30% of the economic activity of the United States, and probably more than that. Machlup (1980), quite wisely sheers away from the neuro- sciences and the relation of knowledge to the human brain—something about which we still know very little, in spite of some important recent advances. Nevertheless, we cannot quite escape the proposition that knowledge is a structure in brains which, in some way we do not now understand, ‘maps’ the real world of what is known. The distinction between knowledge as a stock
and information as a flow, which Machlup again rightly emphasizes, implies that an increase in knowledge, which is presumably what is meant by ‘producing’ it, is a certain kind of change in this internal map or image inside the head, though what kind is hard to say and very hard to measure. Knowledge was one of the assets that were instrumental in the competition faced by an organization. Knowledge was one form of intangible assets which was no less valuable than the other intangible assets even an element of the most valuable intangible assets (Putri & Kurnia, 2016).

2.2 Types of knowledge

Whatever the type of knowledge we talk about, three characteristics distinguish it from information. First, knowledge is a function of a particular cognitive pattern, and hence, is a product of individuals’ beliefs and commitment. Second, knowledge has always some end, so that it is related to action. Third, it is context specific and relational (Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1995). (Lowendahl, Revang & Fosstenlokken, 2001) said, knowledge is a term with many and partly conflicting definitions. A number of dimension have been proposed, such as explicit versus tacit knowledge (Polanyi, 1958, 1966), embodied versus embedded knowledge (Granovetter, 1985) and knowledge as intrinsically versus instrumentally valuable (Degenhardt, 1982). All these types are classified in two broad categories which are namely organizational and individual knowledge. We view knowledge as a very broad term and include both tacit and explicit knowledge, and both knowledge at the individual and organizational level (Lowendahl, Revang & Fosstenlokken, 2001).

Spender (1996) explained, this classification by a matrix, whose dimensions were tacit-explicit and individual-social, leading to four types of knowledge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Social or Organizational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Conscious Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e.g. knowing facts or syntax of a programming language)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Objectified Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e.g. a firm’s operating manuals and formal rules and policies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td>Automatic Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e.g. riding a bicycle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collective Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e.g. organizational culture)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.1 Organizational Knowledge:
Organizational knowledge defines organizational cultures. It can be viewed as a combination of skills, routines, norms and values developed and shared by at least two employees working together, each employee’s individual knowledge, and the information available to them (Lowendahl, Revang & Fosstenlokken, 2001). Given that knowledge is viewed as a key resource, companies invest considerable time and money ensuring they make the most of the potential competitive advantage. There are several other reasons behind implementing knowledge management strategies in organizations, the main being to gain core competencies. These competencies are dependent upon the expertise and skills of the employees working for the organization. To maintain and build upon core competencies it is necessary for organizations to develop systems whereby knowledge can be preserved.

Organizational knowledge base is strongly influenced by the cultural system through which people achieve their knowing (Blackler, 1995). Lowendahl, Revang & Fosstenlokken (2001) also mentioned, organizational knowledge includes an organization’s formal reporting structure and its formal and informal planning, controlling and coordinating system. Organizational knowledge contains the following characteristics (Smith, 2001):

a) Inimitable: meaning that the organization’s knowledge is unique.
b) Rare: due to its dependence on experience and knowledge of current and past employees.
c) Valuable: due to the ability to add value in products and gaining strategic advantage.
d) Non-substitutable: due to the synergy of employees which cannot be replicated.

2.2.2 Individual Knowledge
The individual knowledge is one source of organizational knowledge. Lowendahl, Revang & Fosstenlokken (2001) suggest, at the individual level, three types of knowledge seem important to create:

- Information-based, objective, task-related knowledge, so called ‘know-what’.
- Experience-based, tacit, subjective knowledge, so called, ‘know-how’, including skills as well as deeper understanding: e.g. the skills of reflective practitioners.
- Personal knowledge, including talent, aptitudes, artistic abilities, creativity, intuition, etc. This type of knowledge has also been described as ‘dispositional knowledge’.
For an organization to maximize the benefit of its knowledge asset it is reliant on knowledge being shared between employees. Individuals are a part of organizations and the knowledge held by individuals represents an important source of knowledge for organizational knowledge.

2.3 Knowledge Management in SME

Knowledge is the core of the business. Knowledge has become the most important strategic factor in corporate operations (Spender, 1996), as it is associated with firms’ capabilities to achieve a competitive advantage (Teece, 2001). Many smaller firms face resource constraints (Jarillo, 1989), and existing resources must consequently be used with care, as erroneous decisions will have more serious complications than would be the case in large businesses. In that regards, managing knowledge is very important whether it is in tacit or explicit form. In the last few decades, innovation has got new dimension as people are advancing in technology in every sphere of life. Large companies have adapted new ways to foster innovation in an effective way and they developed certain models to use both tacit and explicit knowledge. The way the models are designed is more compatible for large companies in sharing and utilizing knowledge. A significant number of small and medium enterprises also came into the play and they have got enormous success. However, there are many things, which are still needed to be upgraded for sharing and utilizing knowledge in SME. Eleven years ago, McAdam and Reid (2001) wrote that knowledge management (KM), like other management practices, was invented and developed in large organizations to be applied later on in small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs).

Durst and Edvardsson (2012) urged, reviewing the literature related to small businesses suggests that scholars tend to apply approaches originally developed for larger firms rather than SMEs. This procedure involves the risk that smaller firms may lose their distinct characteristics and thus their capability to act.

Egbu, Suresh & Renukappa (2005) said, organization sustainability is an issue because 36 per cent of the SMEs perish after three years. Therefore, SMEs are more likely to adapt knowledge management techniques. Developments in KM in smaller businesses have to stem more from a fundamental conceptual grasp of the role of knowledge in business and the basic principles of KM (Egbu, Suresh & Renukappa,2005). An empirical study by McAdam and Reid (2001) revealed that the SME sector was less advanced, with a mechanistic approach and a lack of investment in KM. Smith (2001) said, people possess slightly different types of tacit and explicit knowledge and apply their knowledge in unique ways. Individuals use different perspectives to think about problems and devise solutions. As we mention earlier that, SMEs usually have a flat organizational structure.
which creates certain gaps in transferring knowledge, more precisely tacit knowledge. Smaller firms tend to prevent the outflow of knowledge from the company and thereby block knowledge sharing (Beijerse, 2000; Matlay, 2000; McAdam and Reid, 2001; Corso et al., 2003; Bozbura, 2007; Hutchinson and Quintas, 2008).

In SMEs, the attempts made to transform tacit knowledge into explicit knowledge have, in the main, been unsuccessful (Egbu, Suresh & Renukappa, 2005). However, it has been a profound interest for many researchers to practically implement KM in SMEs (Chan and Chao, 2008) since they are the industrial wheels of almost all countries worldwide. Durst and Edvardsson (2012) said it is not uncommon that the processes of business planning and decision-making are limited to only one person in SME. But, it is always very difficult for 1 or 2 persons to perceive the need of the organization from all aspect. More importantly, it is very challenging for a decision-making individual to choose the exact knowledge from the abundance of knowledge. Therefore, there is certain gap in planning and implementing a model for sharing and utilizing knowledge in SME.

2.3.1 Knowledge management in SME with subsidiaries:
As SMEs invest abroad, some encounter severe problems (Vachani, 1998). Vachani (1998) also mentioned, the challenges faced by subsidiaries of small and large companies are not always similar since SMEs differ from large companies in important ways, such as experience with foreign environments, ability to withstand demands of host governments, and level of resources available to manage foreign operations. North (1990) points out a major difference in developed- and developing-country markets that helps explain why firms from developed countries that are not used to operating in the developing-country environment can find it challenging. It's very crucial to decide the way for transferring tacit knowledge for an individual sitting in the developed country. Furthermore, in small organizations, most knowledge identification is done through informal networks, but as organizations grow these networks cannot possibly be aware of the entire knowledge. A few experts within the organization may be called or contacted repeatedly, never having time to fully respond to their duties (Egbu, Suresh & Renukappa, 2005).

Tacit knowledge, a key component of socially constructed knowledge (Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1995), is mainly captured through informal discussions. Therefore, it's always very challenging for SMEs to document the tacit knowledge which has been devolved through informal discussions and it is even harder when SMEs have subsidiaries abroad. Vachani (1998) urged that, while institutional distance can pose challenges for both large and small companies, SMEs are more likely to face problems stemming from
it as they are less likely to have accumulated experience in dealing with diverse international environments and have fewer resources to tackle challenges relating to transfer of organizational practices. The level of subsidiaries’ problems is expected to depend on the historical relations between the host and home countries (Vachani, 1998).

2.4 Knowledge sharing and utilization in SME

As more firms seek to gain competitive advantage by maximizing their knowledge assets, an increasing number of enterprises have begun implementing or incorporating knowledge management (KM) as part of their strategy to realize improved business performance. A typical SME often has a very flat structure and free floating management style. It is useful in one perspective but on the other hand it works like a wall in sharing knowledge. Knowledge sharing in SMEs may happen in corridor conversations (Wong and Aspinwall, 2004) or at organization members’ birthday parties (Durst and Wilhelm, 2012). It is easier to transform explicit knowledge into tacit knowledge when people cooperate, trust each other and willingly contribute their own valuable knowledge resources (Smith, 2001). But, this very often results in situations where insufficient time is available for strategic issues. Nonaka (1994) explored the process of knowledge sharing in organizations and have created a model that present how different knowledge sharing phases transform the knowledge between explicit and tacit; the authors named it the knowledge sharing spiral. The concepts of the different phases are widely used in research regarding knowledge sharing. The knowledge sharing spiral is initiated by individuals sharing tacit knowledge between each other in a tacit manner. Personal skills and experiences are shared through observation, imitation and practice and is regarded as a very social process, which is reflected by its name; socialization.

Therefore, in SME, knowledge sharing process is way more different than MNC. In that regards the challenges they face are different as well. SMEs face unique KM challenges which are distinct from those of their larger business counterparts. We often see that most SMEs have no explicit policy targeted at strategic KM, and they tend to treat KM on an operational level – at the level of systems and instruments (Durst and Edvardsson, 2012). Smith (2001) said, tacit knowledge is acquired, taught and shared through knowledge fairs, learning communities, study missions, tours, advisory boards, job rotation, stories, myths and task forces. But, it’s very difficult for SMEs to adapt this approaches because there are certain financial barriers. In SMEs tacit knowledge is very important but tacit knowledge is difficult to transfer. Tacit knowledge is the unarticulated part of knowledge residing in individual’s mind (Smith, 2001). It is lessons learned by individuals, know-how, judgment, rule of thumb and intuition (Grayson Barriers and enablers of Knowledge & O’Dell, 1998) and depends upon personal skills and expertise which develop through training and experience (Nonaka, 1994). Vachani (1998) said, If knowledge is tacit and
difficult to transfer, resources are needed for the higher level or coordination required to facilitate trouble-free transfer.

Knowledge sharing (KS) refers to the process by which team members share ideas that are task-related, information, improvements as well as suggestions with one another (Cyril, Gerald, Goh, Yih, Tiong & Tan, 2013). Historically, tension exists between process and practice. Process represents explicit knowledge, or how knowledge is organized. Practice represents tacit knowledge, or the way work is really done. The gradual shift from a standard linear process, like re-engineering, to non-linear, web-like applications of knowledge management has created tension that is difficult to reduce. Companies that deal successfully with this tension use the various types of tacit and explicit knowledge (Smith 2001). Epple et al.(1996) believed that by sharing existing knowledge, firms would enjoy better performance despite the fact that the effectiveness of sharing activities is difficult to measure and differs among firms (Argote and Ingram, 2000) But, in SMEs, the biggest challenge is to create the continuum between tacit and explicit knowledge as there is no legitimate model within the organization and most knowledge is transferred in an informal way.

In the section 2.5 of this chapter we have tried to discuss the factors that influence knowledge sharing activities in SMEs

2.5 Factors affecting knowledge sharing

There are some factors such as trust, formalization, knowledge technology, empowering leadership, effective reward systems, motivation which influence knowledge sharing among the small and medium sized enterprises (Cyril, Gerald, Goh, Yih, Tiong & Tan, 2013). Von Krogh and Roos (1996) and Tschannen-Moran (2001), who centered their work on knowledge management and knowledge sharing on the issues of trust among employees. There were other researchers who based their analysis on the level of collaboration within firms focusing on employees’ attitude, age, level of education, experience, supervisor, and team support (e.g. De Long and Fahey, 2000; Husted and Michailova, 2003; Sveiby and Simons, 2002).

2.5.1 Trust

Trust is an integral part of knowledge sharing due to the inherent value in knowledge. A person holding unique knowledge within a company can better be placed in relation to co-workers as they may be more capable or experienced in the eyes of management (Cyril, Gerald, Goh, Yih, Tiong & Tan, 2013). This may lead to financial rewards, promotions or salary increases for the individual. Von-Krogh (1998) suggests that in addition
to having clear organizational vision and goals, there is a need for the firm to cultivate adequate levels of trust and openness to encourage knowledge sharing. Higher levels of trust within the firm would encourage employees to share knowledge among themselves (Chan and Chow, 2008). In SME trust is even important as the knowledge sharing activities is based on trust. Trust is needed between individuals to share knowledge and without which its impossible to think of knowledge sharing. If people don’t trust they are most likely not to share knowledge with others. They fear that their knowledge could be misused or undermine their position in the organization.

Riege, (2005) noted that the people in informal networks build trust with each other and share knowledge independently and collaborate with each other to gain better insights. The knowledge sharing activities between individuals can neither be forced to do or supervised by a third person but rather the trust that exists between the employee and the organization. Disterer (2001) also pointed that when people perceive the job security as low the individual who possesses the knowledge sees it as an insurance for not loosing the job. This hoarding of knowledge is higher in knowledge intensive firms where people with special knowledge compete against each other to excel their career path.

2.5.2 Formalization

Formalization is described as the degree to which organizational activities are apparent and clearly stipulated in written documents such as standard operating procedures, job descriptions, regulations and policy manuals (Hall, 2002; Rainey, 2003). Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) specified that a combination of a formal organizational structure and a non-hierarchical, self-organizing organizational structure are needed to encourage knowledge creation and sharing capabilities in firms. The expectation is that with less formalization, SMEs will be able to create less bureaucratic and more responsive work environment to allow employees to share ideas more freely (Cyril, Gerald, Goh, Yih, Tong & Tan, 2013). This process of formalization helps an organization to identify the contribution of each employee towards knowledge sharing. The process, activities that are part of formalization process could used for rewards and incentive system. The ICT can help an organization to overcome the geographical, organizational barriers and facilitate knowledge sharing between firms when there is physical distance between subsidiaries (Corso et al., 2006).

ICT helps in organizing and archiving documents, files and helps in easily accessing files when needed. Only having a ICT system in place will not be sufficient, people should be motivated to use these systems. They should be informed about the importance and ease of using systems and the benefits it provides to the people and organization. Benson,
Furst and Balckburn (2007) recommend that the most important thing to con-sider when implementing ICT is to have a ‘‘right’’ communication technology. This could imply that the technology should be simple in understanding, common throught the organi-zation, and everyone should have access to it. The use of informal communication technol-ogy like ‘‘instant messengers’’ could be a good option. These informal communications sys-tems are quick and valuable tool for employees to become familiar with each other.

2.5.3 Knowledge technology

Much of the literature relating to innovation and management of new technology over-looks the importance SMEs place on the value and implications of independent and im-parial advice in the area of new technology selection, adoption and implementation. Knowledge technology or better known as information and communication technology (ICT) is an important enabler of knowledge sharing initiatives in firms. Research indi-cates that effective information technology infrastructure is a crucial element in building and integrating firms’ operations, which provides linkages of information and knowledge in firms (Argyris and Schon, 1978; Duncan, 1972; Teece, 1998). In other words, ICT applications and tools such as intranets and extranets, discussion forum boards, shared workspaces, Wikis, blogs and groupware are useful to encourage employees to communi-cate and share knowledge required in getting specific tasks accomplished. If we focus on subsidiaries of SMSs then we can understand knowledge technology is more important over other factors. Now a days knowledge sharing activities between the head office and subsidiary are mostly done either over phone or through video conference. Either way it needs a secured technology which will link up these activities into a chain.

2.5.4 Empowering Leadership

According to Srivastava et al, (2006), employees will be inspired and motivated to share knowledge among themselves if and when they receive equitable recognition from their empowering leaders. The more their superiors recognize the employees’ contribution, the more motivated the employees would be. The coaching behavior of an empowering leader will also help members among the team to solve problems together and therefore provide opportunities to share knowledge (Arnold et al,2000).

Empowerment leadership inspire employees towards more successful outcomes. SMEs have a great opportunity to derive significant benefits from empowering their employees, which could have an encouraging effect on knowledge sharing capabilities. Ethical and empowering leadership have long been suggested as important predictors of leader effec-tiveness(Hasan et al, 2013).In SME we mostly experience tacit form of knowledge. Therefore, Nonaka (1994) urged, people who are the knowledge repositories, desire to achieve the long-term sustainability and the success of the company, they must move their
knowledge and skills to group and organizational levels. In that regards, empowering these people is very important from leaders perspective. Empowering leaders share decision-making authority with their subordinates, consult with subordinates regarding important decisions that may relate to their work, allow subordinates more autonomy, and remove unnecessary bureaucratic constraints (Hasan et al, 2013).

Leadership plays a vital role in the organization to create an environment where people are able to share knowledge, integrate it and utilize the knowledge gained (Eggu, Hari, & Renukappa, 2005). A commitment from the leadership where people feel empowered and are motivated to share knowledge is vital. This will be tough task and will take time and effort to implement because people do not like change. They resist working in new ways and accept only when the new way can be applied with ease. Leadership should also understand that people should be provided with resources and mistakes should be tolerated. The leadership should create a culture where people are not afraid of making mistakes. Rather should be encouraged to share the mistakes and the lessons that gained from them so that in future these mistakes could be avoided.

2.5.5 Motivation

Motivation is a psychological aspiration which speed up the process of knowledge sharing. Findings from previous studies indicate that employees who appear motivated tend to be happy with their firms and would tend to be more willing to contribute ideas and share specific knowledge or experience on work matters with their colleagues (Fathi et al., 2011). Hence, employees in SMEs will be more willing and inclined to share work experiences and knowledge, if they are motivated. Knowledge sharing is a strategic driver which speed up the process and helps firm to grow more in long run. Therefore, it is very important for the employees to share the tacit knowledge that they gathered through their past experience. It is only through knowledge sharing that knowledge becomes a strategic driver for competitive advantage, being the means for organizational and individual learning to happen (Alavi and Leidner, 2001)

The relationship with other employees and culture of the workplace are also important factors that motivate people to share knowledge. In individualistic societies like Europe, people’s motivation factors are good peer relationship, positive relationship with superiors. While in collectivist societies like Asia people’s motivation factors are relationships within the groups (Bock, Lee & Lee, 2010). If an individual has motivation to share knowledge then that sharing could be through organizational culture, trust, rewards. Lin (2007) noted that if employees believed in the ability to share knowledge that is useful for the organization are more motivated in doing so.
2.5.6 Effective Reward System
The performance assessment or reward system employed should be practical, significant, and open to encourage knowledge sharing activities in a firm. Rewards come in many forms and include both monetary (annual increments, bonuses, profit sharing etc.) and non-monetary incentives (recognition, praise etc.) (Srivastava et al., 2006). When an employee gets the reward for his/her performance he/she feels more motivated which spark the desire to work more effectively. Moreover, it builds a strong rapport between the employees within the firm as they compete with each other to bring the best output for the company. It also helps to create a platform for the employees to prove their intellectual excellence through hard work and dedication.
3 Research Methodology

In this chapter the methodology used to gather the data to study the purpose and details the strategy used to study research questions is presented. It begins with the understanding of the research philosophy, followed by design of the research, the data collection methods, the criteria for selecting participants for this study, ethical considerations and finally the trustworthiness of the study.

3.1 Research Approach

In general we have two different aspects of conducting research and these are positivism and social constructionism (Easterby-Smith, Thorpe, & Jackson, 2015). The idea of positivism is that reality is objective and causalties can be explained through measurements and numbers. Moreover, human interest is irrelevant and the researcher has to be independent from the research objective (Easterby-Smith et al., 2015). In social constructionism the researchers get the access to observe a specific phenomenon in order to increase general understanding. When we started to think about the research approach to answer the research questions we have, we started to focus on constructionism. We tried to have a deeper insight by observing the flow of knowledge. We believed constructionism is the right approach to dig deep into the flow of knowledge. Our aim was to see how the flow works from either way. We experienced lots of difficulties while sharing the knowledge from a developed country to a developing one. Therefore, we choose social constructionism in order to figure out the key factors behind the chosen phenomenon.

Considering the aim of the research different approach can be chosen to conduct the research. In our case we have chosen qualitative research approach as we felt this is more suitable for us. Because, qualitative approach enables you to have more interaction with the informant and also gives a profound understanding to draw effective conclusion. On the other hand, quantitative research approach is used when the researcher try to generalize the results by sampling data from a larger population by adopting different kinds of surveys.

3.2 Research Design

Research design involves primarily the methods used organize the research activity, how data collection will be carried out so that the research aim of the study can be achieved (Easterby-Smith et al., 2015). To explain this in a better context an analogy might help clarify. If someone wants to cook a dish, then there is no point in going to the store and buying stuff randomly when one doesn’t know what he or she wants to cook. First, we need to decide what we plan to cook (simple fast food or a signature dish), which method is best suited for this recipe, do we have proper utensils to cook this dish. After planning all the above its best to go and buy the ingredients required to make the dish.
Similarly, a research purpose needs a plan or design before the data collection or analysis can be started. In the design stage, there are several decisions that must be made to proceed with data collection. How many participants or companies will be studied? What is the criteria for participant selection? How to decide what information is needed to be collected? These decisions need to be made during the planning stage and forms the basis of research design. The purpose of the study is to analyze how knowledge is shared and utilized between the SME’s and their subsidiary with focus on the technical knowledge and the role of the manager in this process. The method used for data collections is qualitative method employing case study. Because the phenomenon studied involves people or group of people a qualitative approach is best suited for exploring and understanding the meaning of individuals or group to a given problem (Creswell, 2013) has an inductive or deductive style, focuses on individual meaning, and it lends importance to the complexity of the situation. This approach is valuable as the views of the participants that they gained through their experiences from professional and personal life. This could have been hard if the quantitative method was employed in which it is hard to probe or follow-up the participants response to a particular question.

A case study is holistic and real-world perspective where essentially the researchers looks in depth in one or small number of, organizations, groups or individuals, over a period of time (Easterby-Smith et al., 2015; Yin, 2013). The unique factor of this company is that its head office is located in Sweden while the manufacturing of products, research and development is carried out in a subsidiary office in a foreign land. The flow of knowledge in this case can be considered as bidirectional since both the home and host country offices are equally important if not superior to one another. The physical location of these offices complicates the knowledge sharing and utilization. This distribution of knowledge is not new phenomenon and exists before, but in a traditional organization interaction between employees occur inside the physical boundaries of the organization (Corso et al., 2006). So, we decided to focus on this SME to study in depth to answer the research questions. Also, given the time constraints it might not be suitable or workable to study different sectors so we decided to focus on design and manufacturing sector.

3.3 Data Collection

Data can be simply defined as the set of values which are either qualitative or quantitative in nature which is collected, reported and analyzed for better use. There are basically two types of data namely primary and secondary data. Primary data is the data which is collected for the sole purpose of answering the research problem with best suitable procedure (Hox, & Boeije, 2005). Every time a primary data is collected which increases the knowledge
of the researcher and this data which then available and can be reused by others researchers is called the secondary data (Hox, & Boeije, 2005). Data collection is the process of obtaining and organizing data. This process usually begins during the literature review process (LoBiondo-Wood et al., 2014). During the literature review the authors started to analyze what methods of data collection was used by other researchers and align that with the interest in current research questions.

The data collection starts with the plan and a strategy to that will be used for sampling. In the qualitative research design most widely used mode of data collection is carried on a small purposive sampling, involving in-depth interviews, focus groups, participant observation (Hox, & Boeije, 2005). In this thesis the authors planned method is to have semi-structured interviews with the participants. Semi-structured interviews provide researchers the flexibility to probe further to an answer that he or she may think are important but while avoiding the ambiguity of unstructured interview and limited response answers in highly structured interview processes.

### 3.4 Participants Selection

The aim of the study is to how knowledge is shared and utilized from the participant’s perspective and the role of manager to promote the knowledge sharing between different offices. We plan to interview 6-8 employees in both the head office in Sweden and subsidiary office with the aim to gather data. This data gathered through interviews will provide an insight and in-depth of the problems or barriers from the participants point of view.

The sample is expected to contain the CEO/manager, human resource manager, project leader, lead designer, project coordinator from the head office and production manager, design engineer, plant manager, sales & marketing manager from the subsidiary office.

The aim of the study is to see how knowledge is shared and utilized from the participant’s perspective and the role of manager to promote the knowledge sharing between different offices. We interviewed some employees here in Sweden where the head office is located and we also visited India to conduct some interviews in the subsidiary. We tried to figure out how the knowledge flow works either way. Therefore, we choose the personnel who are mostly involved in knowledge sharing activities. For instance, CEO, Project Engineer,
Design Engineer etc. in the head office and from the subsidiary we choose Automation and Process engineer and Site Coordinator.

We interviewed 6 employees in both head office in Sweden and subsidiary office in India in order to collect the empirical data we needed. The data gathered through interviews helped us to get deep insight and in-depth of the problems or barriers from the participants point of view.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee in Head Office</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee 1</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>90 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee 2</td>
<td>HR Manager</td>
<td>60 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee 3</td>
<td>Design Engineer</td>
<td>60 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee 4</td>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>60 Minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee in Subsidiary</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee 1</td>
<td>Automation and Process Engineer</td>
<td>90 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee 2</td>
<td>Site Coordinator</td>
<td>60 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Employee 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>(Informal discussion)</td>
<td>90 Minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interviews in the subsidiary helped us to understand some critical factors which were very helpful to elaborate our understanding that we have discussed in Chapter 5 (Data Analysis).

### 3.5 Design of Interview:

We started to gather empirical data from the head office which is located in Sweden and we planned to conduct some interviews over phone or skype for subsidiary data collection. But later on, we understand that this might not be significantly enough to get good insight. Because “mediated interviews lack the immediate contextualization, depth and non-verbal communication” (Easterby-Smith et al., 2015, p. 135). So, we planned to conduct face to face interviews even in the subsidiary in order to gather a good amount of empirical data to set the cornerstone of our research.
In total we conducted 6 interviews covering 8.5 hours. We tried to ask relevant questions to all of our informants and we also took some field notes in cases we found significant changes while they were answering certain questions. Later, we transcribed each of the interviews to analyze them from different aspect. It’s important for the researchers to have an interview guide while conducting interviews (Easterby-Smith et al., 2015). Interview guide helps to maintain the flow as it contains opening questions, key questions and also some relevant questions to wrap out the whole interview in an effective manner.

To get depth knowledge about the core elements of our research topic we were in need of such informants who are very experienced and been a part of knowledge sharing activities within the company.

3.6 Ethical Considerations
Miles et al. (2014) emphasized, it is very important to have a profound ethical background in every phase of the research. When researchers interact with the informants they should raise ethical consciousness in order to respect the moral judgement of the informants. Easterby-Smith et al. (2015) mentioned about ten key principles which is very crucial to keep in mind as a researchers. In our study we also tried to focus on that ten principles and also tried secure an environment where our informants felt comfortable to share their views with us. As our study was to learn more about knowledge sharing from previous experience so we made our interview very much confidential and anonymous. Moreover, we made sure that our informants are comfortable to share their past experience and their future expectation. Firstly, we approach our informants via electronic mail and we mentioned about our purpose and why we chose him/her as our informant. Later, we fixed an appointment based upon their approval and convenient time schedule . Bell and Bryman (2007) described, informants should be well concerned about the purpose of the study and should feel interested to be a part of the study.

3.6 Quality and Trustworthiness
Guba (1981) focused on four basic components with a view to ensure trustworthiness in qualitative research and they are credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. Lincoln & Guba (1985), explained .credibility is the confidence in the “truth” of the findings whereas transferability means that the findings are applicable in other contexts, dependability is showing a consistency of the data and confirmability displays the degree of neutrality to which the findings are shaped by the respondent and not by the
researcher. In our study we tried to maintain the credibility by choosing the right person to know relevant information from his/her past experience. Tacit knowledge resides in mind and it's hard to explain or to be documented for future purpose. Therefore, we made sure that the person we are choosing has adequate experience and been in the knowledge sharing activities. Our research is transferable to other context is it can be applied to know different knowledge based activities within the company. For instance, transformation of knowledge can be discussed with the base of our findings here in this study. Shenton (2004) explained, dependability is the criteria what makes a research more trustworthy as it provides same result for same theory, method in different section of the study. We followed a case study approach and we had semi structured interview. In most cases we found similar response from our informants with very small deviations. Confirmability is also a part of trustworthiness and according to Shenton (2004) it basically represents the degree of involvement from researcher’s end. To ensure confirmability we have given enough platform to our informants so that they don’t get manipulated by our influence. We recorded every interview and transcribed each of them in order to ensure confirmability of our study.
4 Empirical Findings & Data Analysis

This chapter presents the analysis of the empirical data that has been collected. This chapter shows us how the literature review and the empirical data is related. The main aim is to compare the analysis of the data collection with that of literature and find out if what are the similarities and differences between the theory and results.

4.1 Introduction

The Swedish company in this case study is a SME based in Sweden. The company works as the Engineering, Procurement and Construction (EPC) in drying technology for industries and plants worldwide using their proprietary technology. As per their internationalization they established subsidiaries in a developing country. The subsidiaries are used for production and manufacturing of components. The head office in Sweden is responsible for the designing, layout, sales and marketing. Apart from this the company had many suppliers, partners and sub-contractors that collaborate on various projects of the company. The head office is a very important location and works on the core competence and work on the critical activities. The authors consider it presumably that the head office is where most of the knowledge resides in the company. Hence, most of the knowledge that is transferred is from the head office to the subsidiaries and the activities are knowledge intensive.

4.2 Overview of the analysis

The participant selection was based on the organization structure and the focus was to select participants from different roles in the organization. This helped us to get a more in-depth view of different people working under different roles for a single organization. The interviews that had been conducted were first transcribed using a transcribing software into text format in word files. After formatting and editing the files were analyzed using an application software. First, the keywords in the interviews with the highest instances occurred in the interviews were found. Then common words that occur in these keywords such as like, much, take, feel was excluded from the search criteria. Based on the remaining keywords initial codes for the analysis were identified. A tree map of these keywords was constructed to understand the context to get a better idea of the words that preceded and succeeded these keywords. Finally, from these the final codes were identified. The aim of using tree map was to understand the context of the participants in which...
that word being talked. This helped us save time and allowed us to focus more on the interview analysis.

### 4.3 Codes Identification

The identification of initial codes from the transcribed interview files were carried by doing a search query in the software which resulted in almost every word that was said in the interview. This makes the analysis very difficult with many common words such as *like, much, take, feel* and so on. The next step was to exclude these words from the search query and focus on the important keywords. Then a text cloud as shown in figure (123) was extracted. The size of the text highlights the number of times that word occurred i.e., higher the count of word the bigger is the text size.

Based on these initial codes the analysis moved forward to identify the most important and critical factors that affect the knowledge sharing and utilization. We found some factors that are similar for large organizations that we found in our literature review. Also, we found some codes that we couldn’t find in our literature review for the SME’s. The word cloud helped us to find codes more efficiently.

![Word cloud for the top 50 keywords in the interviews](image)

Initially organizational structure’s role in knowledge sharing within the firm is analyzed. This is followed by culture, virtual teams, trust, motivation, reward are discussed. These factors are analyzed in detail to see the influence they have on the knowledge sharing and utilization in the firm. Figure (456) illustrates the structure how that analysis is done.
4.4 Organizational Structure Factor

Organizational structure is important for sharing of knowledge within the firm boundaries. It is defined by the routines where tasks and responsibilities are formally divided, classified and synchronized. To facilitate knowledge sharing it is important that the organizational structure is designed to be flexible (Gold, Malhotra & Segers, 2001). A study by Mierzejewska, (2014) described that organizational structure needs to be flexible and should focus on four factors namely centralization, formalization, standardization and configuration. Centralization refers to a system where the decisions are being made at a higher level. Formalization is the pattern of behavior and can be gauged by the documents they produce, the details of those documents and their use. Standardization refers to the integration of the organizations functioning. Configuration refers to the relations among different departments or units within the organization.

The aim of the establishing the subsidiary was to offshore the production and manufacturing of the products based on the cost advantage and infrastructure availability in the developing country. The organization did not expect that this would be a hard task as often it’s the head office that handles all the important work. The important part was not to transfer the technical details but the organizational values. As an example, the structure of the organization at the parent company has a flat structure and they emphasized that the subsidiary should also have a flat structure and a have a similar way of working environment with the similar responsibilities that of the head office. The organization soon realized that the flat structure was not working in the subsidiary. One the participant described it as ‘‘It’s a very flat structure like a typical model in Sweden or in Europe in general but in the subsidiary, it is more like a hierarchical structure which is common in that part of the world. There is difference between the organization structure in Sweden and Subsidiary.’’

Another participant echoed this as ‘‘It’s a mixed structure. it’s a flat structure in Sweden there is no hierarchy but in subsidiary there is hierarchy. So, we follow both of them. We tried to have a flat structure before but it’s a big mess with the flat structure. Maybe in future after 10-20 years when the culture will change then that can work, but as of now it is not so effective.’’ Hence, it was decided the organization structure at the subsidiary should be a hierarchical at present.
This type of organizational structure is defined as hybrid structure where some responsibilities are dedicated to one structure and some to other (Ahmady, Mehrpour, & Nikooravesh, 2016). The motive behind having a hybrid organization is to have the advantaged of two structures. The navigation from one structure to another may change the relations and the structure becomes unclear. But, it also enables the organization to be flexible especially when the organization is changing. This was evident when there was ambiguity in the subsidiary as to who should the employees in case an issue or problem arises. As a participant described “In my opinion I think we need to do some changes, sometimes if you think of the hybrid structure then you need to think of both sometimes it works as inverse. There are very few people sitting at the bottom and lot of people sitting at the top because we have to maintain the hierarchical system and then the flat structure so it becomes an inverted pyramid. For example, if I am working on a project then I have to report to manager in-charge of subsidiary operations also I have report to the client and at the same time I have to report to headquarter so sometimes it’s too much communication and that effects quality of work sometimes. it’s a complicated thing.” This confirms that theory by Nonaka & Takeuchi (1995) which described that an organization should have a combinational of formal organizational structure, non-hierarchical and self-organizing organizational structure to encourage knowledge sharing.

4.5 Culture Factor
Culture is defined by Hofstede (1984) as the collective programming of the mind distinguishing the members of one group or category of people from others. Triandis (2001) defined that Culture is to a society what memory is to an Individual. A study by Krishna, Sahay, & Walsham, (2004) concluded that working in cross-cultures has its own share of problems. Further, as countries tend to have unique ways of working and that can prove as a barrier when working with cross-border collaboration. Another issue identified by Krishna, Sahay, & Walsham, (2004) is the cultural adaptation of the different teams working on a project. Members from both teams should be able to adapt not only to different styles or working but also cultural norms such as authority, social conduct and language barrier. It’s easy to underestimate the importance of culture in a society and expectations are set without a proper knowledge of the culture. One participant described this as “My colleagues describe it and those that have been working with the subsidiary a lot say it’s
very different like they are hardworking but only do exactly as they are instructed to do instead of suggesting or arguing if they see any problems and are not used to asking."

Knowledge sharing is facilitated by the sender organization and it depends on the absorptive capacity of the recipient organization to possess capacity to absorb and utilize such knowledge. As one participant said "'The main issue or problem is that it takes lot of time in communication to express your plan or idea to people in subsidiaries. Like we get a lot of questions form the workshop and if we don’t tell them everything properly then that can lead to a problem in the manufacturing process which could be costly and time consuming for us. This is largely associated to the culture where people are not encouraged to ask questions to clarify things when they have identified or encountered it when the problem was small. They accept what we tell them and that is problem. We are trying to change this attitude but it’s hard to change.'" 

Triandis (2001) describes cultures mainly as individualistic (North and Western Europe, and North America) and collectivist (Asia, Africa and the South America). People in collectivist cultures rely with other people in their culture and the importance is given to the needs of the group in the group rather than themselves and are concerned with relationships. While people in individualistic cultures are independent from other people in their group and they focus on their personal goals more than goals of people in their group. This was also shown by Ohbuchi et al, (1999) and found that when people in collectivist cultures are in conflict situations are concerned about maintaining their relationships with others, while the individualists are concerned about attaining justice.

These cultures were observed during the interview of the participants. One of the participant described this as ‘’In Sweden, you don’t need to push so much to get things done and people take responsibility and everyone is individualistic and everyone understands their responsibility but in subsidiary you have be on the push-push-push all the time and micromanage in a different sense but on the other hand we really don’t know about their situation. we talked about feedback and we expect them to say this is the problem but they just say yes-yes-yes we always get yes-yes and when we expecting things happening and things don’t happen and then we have issues and it’s hard for them because we don’t really see the results. If we are already aware of the issues then we can work on them and prepare and if we don’t then we expect things are going good.’’
4.6 Virtual Teams Factor

Virtual teams help organizations to improve productivity, gain knowledge at a global scale, and transfer best practice among other team members in the group (Pinjani, & Palvia, 2013). Virtual teams have very little or no face-to-face interactions and rely on technology very extensively. Also, people in the collectivists cultures are reluctant to ask for information when they need it and they may be loyal to their local managers. One of the participants described it as “We have created this subsidiary as a support companies and in projects where we needed specialization we have brought people from subsidiary to work closely on the project and they were based here for six months or one year to work out the project details which is more effective then they based in subsidiary. For example, to be effective and save time the designer here conveys the design to the manufacturing unit in a very detailed format so as they understand the specifications very clearly then we communicate continuously with the subsidiary about the material, time plan, quality, and work progress. So, we work out a solution where they can talk one to one with each other in a best possible way. The work is carried out through managers and supervisors in subsidiary but we do the inspections on a regular basis”.

Members in the virtual teams must develop mechanisms for sharing knowledge, learnings, and know-how which is critical for their missions. Another important part is that not only the sharing of hardware and software, but also the ability and willingness of the members to actively participate in the knowledge sharing process. While every organization would like the employee in the subsidiary to think and work like them. In reality, it is unrealistic to consider that given the various factors that exists between the head office and subsidiary. The organization can reduce this gap by employing someone who is a resident of the subsidiary country but have been educated and resident in the head office country or region. This employee who has experience of both the cultures will act a bridge initially and later can help to reduce the distance between head office and subsidiary.

4.7 Trust Factor

Trust plays an important role in the quantity and quality of knowledge shared between people (Rosen, Furst, & Blackburn, 2007). Trust can be defined as the level of confidence of team members has in one another. When there is physical distance between the headquarter and subsidiary, people work in isolation in these two units and the need for collaboration and coordination is very important which requires trust building. A trusting
relationship leads to greater knowledge sharing among people as it reduces formalization and organizational structure is less rigid. The trust between the head office and the subsidiary could be fragile and time-based and could lead to tensions among different members very easily because of physical distance between them. Knowledge sharing with team members can a risky job if one fails to understand the reactions of the team member (Rosen, Furst, & Blackburn, 2007).

There was a considerable amount of trust deficit between the people at head office and the subsidiary. One of the participant described as ‘’We usually trust them to do things but we are bit mistrustful that they are late in informing us if there is any problem that has come up so that it is a delay or the problem becomes much larger because information is not sent on time and they are not asking they need help’’.

The trust was not an issue at the head office where all the participants said that they had good trust with other colleagues. The trust relationship in the head office could be due to all the employees being at one physical place and having face-to-face meetings and discussions. Whenever there is an issue or problem other people are at a hands distance. Whereas, people in the head office and subsidiary extensively rely on communication technology. As one of the participant described ‘’We sit down and we have meetings like once a week to discuss the project. We go through every single step and if there is any questions and doubts or any issues you want to raise we go through and work that way so it’s very open someone doesn’t agree with something we say right away. If you don’t say no which means you agree and if someone makes a mistake this going to cost a lot of money and lot of time especially and when you build build from zero-scratch to multi-million kronor plant. So, you want it to succeed this is what you work for you bring something from zero and you want it to succeed 100%’’. This is in-line with what Vachani (1998) described that institutional distance can pose challenges for both large and small companies and SME’s are more likely to face problems. The reason is that SME’s often lack experience dealing with diverse international environments and have fewer resources to tackle challenges (Vachani, 1998). These differences can give rise to conflicts and thus affect the success of the organization.

To succeed each unit should focus to understand the organizational culture of the other. Furthermore, elements of other unit should be integrated into their own culture. The advantage of such an initiative could be that the subsidiary will be able to capture advance
knowledge from the head office while at the same time the head office can learn about the local market. The base of this relationship should be trust and respect for one another. This was echoed by a participant as “In my opinion, it’s not so good. it’s just like passing the paper and I am not saying that the problem is from only one side but both sides because of the cultural and socio-economic differences we do not have time to listen to each other and if we don’t listen to each other than it will not work. For example, if I want to communicate with accountant I dont know anything about the accountant and they don’t know anything about each other. If I believe that he or she know perfectly what their responsibilities are and they can do it good. If we have a respect like this about each other only then we will listen to the accountant. So, first thing we need to respect each other based on their knowledge”.

4.8 Motivation Factor

Different types of organizations have different sources of motivation and members of these organizations may also differ in their knowledge sharing willingness and behavior. (Ryan & Deci, 2000) describe two types of motivation namely extrinsic or intrinsic motivation factors. Intrinsic motivation can be defined as doing something that is challenging or enjoyable while extrinsic motivation can be defined as doing something because it leads to a different result (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Motivation is needed for individuals for knowledge sharing without it they knowledge is limited to individual. For example, if a new technology or tool is introduced for knowledge sharing there could be organizational and individual factors that affect the implementation. If the employees are not motivated to share the knowledge, the technology or tool do not create any additional value and do not enhance knowledge sharing.

Intrinsic motivation was found to be the main factor for willingness to knowledge sharing as this motivation as the individual acts challenge or satisfaction ( Liu & Fang, 2010; Ryan & Deci, 2000). This factor was also found in participants at the head office who responded that they enjoy the work and feel satisfied when the project is completed. One of the respondents described it as “I think it’s very interesting because it’s much large process equipment and plants that this company compared to the company I worked earlier its almost 20 times bigger in value its what I understood and learned that with the plants in reality its looks 20-30 meters high. I learn much lot more of how it thermal
expansion and the details of designing this large equipment. I think it’s really interesting and useful for me and I enjoy the challenge in designing these projects’’.

If an organization develops a culture where people are motivated internally without forced controls, this may lead to better performance of not just the people but also the organization. People working in the head office responded positively as the structure was very open and transparency in organization was a cornerstone in motivating the employees. One of the participant described ‘’We have very open structure to work here. We have open communication where people can talk about the projects, the problems with the projects, or some other work-related problem or family problems. We have regular planning meetings where we provide platforms to discuss the projects, come up with suggestions, plans with what to do. We discuss with each other face-to-face so the whole team is here and get things done. Plus, we have regular discussions anyway where employees telling how to do what to do and with questions they can always come and talk. The idea is to keep things as open as possible to provide a better working environment. They are motivated to work on projects which are unique and great. They are encouraged to come up with ideas, suggestions and feedback which would help make the project better’’.

While intrinsic motivation was found to be an important factor in head office but, not all of the activities performed by individuals are not intrinsically motivated (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Extrinsic motivation is something that is associated with an activity which individuals performs when the result is different. Individuals under extrinsic motivation perform under controls or regulations rather than the enjoyment of the challenge. Extrinsic motivation factor was found to be present at the subsidiary where controls and regulation were put at place with one participant mentioned as ‘’I think first model we worked with is soft values and now we are trying hard values like controls so we don’t pay for example unless work is done and it makes them work and things like that. They have to make a business plan and they have to follow the plan and the plan is set every month. So, we have placed like reporting and get further insights so we can prepare’’. This confirms findings by Fathi et al., (2011) that if employees are motivated then they tend to be happy and would be more willing to contribute ideas and share knowledge.
4.9 Reward Factor

Organizational rewards work as a motivation for individuals and many organizations have introduced reward systems to encourage employees to share their knowledge with others. Bartol & Srivastava, 2002) define rewards could be of two types intrinsic and extrinsic. Intrinsic rewards such as pleasure derived from performing the task itself. Extrinsic rewards could range from monetary incentives such as bonuses to non-monetary awards such as gift to awards such as praise and public recognition that do not have a monetary equivalent value. Organizations employ extrinsic rewards more often while intrinsic rewards are also important (Bartol & Srivastava, 2002).

There was no individual reward system or performance based reward system in the company under study. However, there was a loyalty-cum-project based reward in the organization. If an employee is loyal to the organization for let’s say n number of years then he or she will get some part of the profit after the completion of the project. The reward is calculated as a percentage of profit that the organization has achieved and is divided among all the employees based on the number of years an employee has been working.

One of the participant described as ‘‘Performance based pay is not done here because performance based pay never generated any loyalty and it doesn’t generate any benefit. I mean this is by studies that have proved that performance based pay does not work. Incentive based pay works where you get people extra benefits or one-day extra holiday or they have children and you go ahead take time you know or you should appreciation that works more because performance based pay you have the money and you forget because its gone and that performance based pay has never worked as far as our understanding so in this company we don’t have performance based pay. We have bonus system that is based on loyalty and project profit and that motivates people to stay longer because we train people and it takes lot of resources and money for us to train the people and we want to keep them in the organization’’.

The organization also has some form of intrinsic rewards system in the form of project challenges and size of the projects, feedback to the management and so on. This was observed when a participant described it as ‘‘Of course, we do feel rewarded. We are motivated to work on projects which are unique and great. We are encouraged to come up with ideas, suggestions and feedback which would help make the project better. It’s a
reward where our feedback and ideas are being listened and applied which makes you feel motivated and glad that your work is being appreciated’’.

This project based reward system was found to be present in the head office while there was no such reward system or any other perks in the subsidiary. One participant mentioned ‘’As of now there is no such reward system here but I am not sure about the head office’’.

4.10 Leadership Role

The role of leader or management in encouraging, motivating and building trust is very important irrespective of whether it’s a team or an organization that the leader is leading. The leader needs to develop a culture in the organization where sharing of knowledge practiced by building trust among his team members. The culture should be open where people share ideas, offer constructive criticism and approach other team members when they need help. The culture should make members feel safe and admit their mistakes. Rosen, Furst & Blackburn (2007) found that people look for cost-benefit analysis with respect to knowledge sharing where costs of looking less competent is measured when they ask for help. In other words, people avoid asking questions or raise issues which would make them look less competitive and offer suggestions which are not so well thought to look more competitive. This behavior was found in the interviews where one participant described it as ‘’For example if in the system if you find a problem and if that problem can be solved and if it is within the budget or can be covered with the budget then the problem should not come out. If you know the problem and the solution and the solution is not expensive so that problem should not go outside. It’s a very straight forward understanding. If it’s costing more and taking lot of resources only then the problem comes outside. If not, your problem is always with you and you have find your own ways and you have to cultivate habit to solve that problem otherwise it should not go outside’’.

Leader or Management can overcome this by create a culture where people have time for communication and reflection of their work and should be provide time for this. Mutual trust is must for people to share knowledge where everyone has expectations. Leader or management should be viewed as peers and not superior and they should focus on sharing the knowledge they have with the team in order to build a strong foundation. This will set an example of the culture and encourages people to share their knowledge with their
peers. The management of the organization under study seems to be on the right path by understanding the importance where one of the participant described “It’s very difficult. We are trying to make people in subsidiary more open, more honest, give their best all the time but, I see the limitations, lots more coaching is needed, more work is needed more physical presence is needed. We need to spend more time to be more open and easy to work and we are looking at that aspect and we are trying to work on that but people in subsidiary doesn’t really work out the way you want them to work. So, we need to have someone who is more communicating with us and transfer that part in subsidiary. We don’t need to have one on one but a single point of contact who can communicate with all of them and then relay that to us and vice versa we are trying to work on that way and try. It’s like our way or working with open communication, transparent but we need somebody who can work the subsidiary way more authoritative may be, more one-way communication, whatever things that are needed to make the work done’’.

When enabling a sharing partnership Sahlin-Andersson&Söderholm (2002, chapter 4.1.4) accentuate the importance of communication between the companies. The empirical findings stress also the need for extensive communication in the co-operation, due to the shared tasks and to manage the transfer. Projects and products are for both organisations managed from Sweden. SwedenAB has been the driving force to setting up the organisational communication structure consisting of for instance regular meetings using telephone conferences and occasional on-site meetings. Fallowing Cummings&Teng (2003, chapter 4.1.3) stating when the organisational distance is large the communication is often more difficult. The communication between the companies is also complicated in technical terms as the infrastructure is a major problem, which has a great impact on the transferred activities as they are performed in a distributed way and dependent on fast communication between the companies.

Theories Confirmation

1. Lack of investment in KM

Theory: McAdam and Reid (2001) revealed that the SME sector was less advanced, with a mechanistic approach and a lack of investment in KM.

Notes: It is both formal and informal but we are trying to make it formal in the sense that we are making documents, files and storing them.
Is the organization tried or looking to implement some systems for sharing of knowledge?

No. We have looked at some ways and found out that it does not suit our organization and it was not attractive. We are working on documenting and storing and moving good towards it and we don’t think we may need any software or application. 16.30

2. SME’s tend to block knowledge

Smaller firms tend to prevent the outflow of knowledge from the company and thereby block knowledge sharing (Beijerse, 2000; Matlay, 2000; McAdam and Reid, 2001; Corso et al., 2003; Bozbura, 2007; Hutchinson and Quintas, 2008).

Notes: We always protect the knowledge in the sense that we spill it out to anybody. The drawings are confidential and stamped and stored in secure place. Most of the information we share is verbally and that can’t be shared or explained very easily. There are strict instructions on sharing with others but of course you have a risk when it comes to sensitive information sharing. It has not happened till now but it may occur and we must be prepared for that. But of course, we have to share information in order to get things done. So, we always say that it has to be protected and shared in a safe and secure way.

3. Decision making by 1 or 2 persons make it difficult to implement KM systems

Theory: Durst and Edvardsson (2012) said it is not uncommon that the processes of business planning and decision-making are limited to only one person in SME. But, it is always very difficult for 1 or 2 persons to perceive the need of the organization from all aspect. More importantly, it is very challenging for a decision-making individual to choose the exact knowledge from the abundance of knowledge.

Notes:

4. Institutional distance

Theory: Vachani (1998) urged that, while institutional distance can pose challenges for both large and small companies, SMEs are more likely to face problems stemming from it as they are less likely to have accumulated experience in dealing with diverse international environments and have fewer resources to tackle challenges relating to transfer of organizational practices. The level of subsidiaries’ problems is expected to depend on the historical relations between the host and home countries (Vachani, 1998).
5 Discussion and Conclusion

5.1 Leadership Role

The role of leader or management in encouraging, motivating and building trust is very important irrespective of whether it’s a team or an organization that the leader is leading. The leader needs to develop a culture in the organization where sharing of knowledge practiced by building trust among his team members. The culture should be open where people share ideas, offer constructive criticism and approach other team members when they need help. The culture should make members feel safe and admit their mistakes. Rosen, Furst & Blackburn (2007) found that people look for cost-benefit analysis with respect to knowledge sharing where costs of looking less competent is measured when they ask for help. In other words, people avoid asking questions or raise issues which would make them look less competitive and offer suggestions which are not so well thought to look more competitive. This behavior was found in the interviews where one participant described it as “For example if in the system if you find a problem and if that problem can be solved and if it is within the budget or can be covered with the budget then the problem should not come out. If you know the problem and the solution and the solution is not expensive so that problem should not go outside. It’s a very straight forward understanding. If it’s costing more and taking lot of resources only then the problem comes outside. If not, your problem is always with you and you have find your own ways and you have to cultivate habit to solve that problem otherwise it should not go outside”.

Leader or Management can overcome this by create a culture where people have time for communication and reflection of their work and should be provide time for this. Mutual trust is must for people to share knowledge where everyone has expectations. Leader or management should be viewed as peers and not superior and they should focus on sharing the knowledge they have with the team in order to build a strong foundation. This will set an example of the culture and encourages people to share their knowledge with their peers. The management of the organization under study seems to be on the right path by understanding the importance where one of the participant described “It’s very difficult. We are trying to make people in subsidiary more open, more honest, give their best all the time but, I see the limitations, lots more coaching is needed, more work is needed more physical presence is needed. We need to spend more time to be more open and easy to work and we are
looking at that aspect and we are trying to work on that but people in subsidiary doesn’t really work out the way you want them to work. So, we need to have someone who is more communicating with us and transfer that part in subsidiary. We don’t need to have one on one but a single point of contact who can communicate with all of them and then relay that to us and vice versa we are trying to work on that way and try. It’s like our way or working with open communication, transparent but we need somebody who can work the subsidiary way more authoritative may be, more one-way communication, whatever things that are needed to make the work done”.

5.2 Conclusion

In this section the research questions of this thesis are presented based on the analysis and empirical findings.

There is a growing realization that the success of knowledge management is crucially determined by knowledge sharing. Knowledge management is not restricted to building knowledge and storing it somewhere within the organization. It cares about leveraging the value of such knowledge. With the advent of globalization, organizations already facing growing competition from other firms was intensified. Firms realized that knowledge was an integral part of the organization. It must be managed in a proper way to maintain the competitive advantage over their competitors. Knowledge management became an important tool to maintain the knowledge that was present in-house as well as new knowledge that was being generated within and outside the firm boundaries. Academics and scholars widely research knowledge management alike. Many scholars have identified knowledge sharing as an important part of knowledge management. While scholars have widely studied the knowledge sharing in the large organizations there is limited research done on SME’s. Also, the knowledge sharing is found to vary between large and SME’s, mostly due to lack of resources and importance of knowledge sharing as perceived by the SME’s (Durst & Runar Edvardsson, 2012; Riege, 2005; Hutchinson & Quintas, 2008). Knowledge sharing in large organizations is mostly formal and most of it is documented and stored in technology platforms while in SME’s most of the knowledge sharing is informal and happens face-to-face. Given the dynamic and social nature of knowledge, managing it is only possible if people are able to share the knowledge they have and build on the knowledge others have.
5.2.1 Answer to Research Question-1

How is knowledge sharing and utilization in SME’s with subsidiary in developing country compared to SME’s in one location?

The results in this thesis show that the knowledge sharing in SME’s with a subsidiary in developing country is similar to that of SME’s located in one location. But, there are many factors that play a more significant role when the SME’s is in a developing country. The results also show some factors that are not presented in the literature review that we studied for this thesis. The reason could be that most of the literature review focuses on SME’s located in specific location or in same country where the difference factors such as culture, language barrier is low. The knowledge sharing in the organization is informal at present and management has realized that in order to be competitive the knowledge sharing should be made formal. The management is making efforts to make knowledge sharing in formal procedure which will take time. “At present our knowledge sharing is informal. That’s a big problem because we have few senior employees who are going to retire soon and we need to plan in formal to reporting. We are trying for instance ISO certified system of formally documenting it’s based on experience of our CEO and other senior employees and they know how to manage. So, we are trying but it’s not there”.

This is in line with the literature that knowledge sharing in SME’s is mostly informal (Hutchinson & Quintas, 2008; Ngah & Jusoff, 2009; Supyuenyong, Islam & Kulkarni, 2009; Esposito & Evangelista, 2016).

The organization acknowledged that knowledge sharing is an important part of their culture and that it can lead to competitive advantage. Further, since the organization is knowledge intensive this is even more important to manage knowledge in the firm. However, the management is not prepared to invest in a knowledge management system since it involves high cost and the perceived benefits of having such a system compared to large organizations. “We don’t plan to have a knowledge management system. We have looked at some of them and found out that it does not suit our organization and it was not attractive. We are working on documenting and storing and moving good towards it and we don’t think we may need any software or application This was also highlighted”. This factor was also found in the literature where managers were not eager to invest in a
knowledge management system due to its difficulty in establishing its added value (Baptista Nunes et al., 2006; Rosen, Furst & Blackburn, 2007; Esposito & Evangelista, 2016).

We found that the employees at the head office and subsidiary were not well informed about the challenges and the vision of the company. Every participant had a different answer when they were asked about the biggest challenges that the organization is facing and the vision of the organization. There was lack of information that was provided by the management about the challenges that the organization is facing and how they plan to overcome those challenges.

5.2.2 Answer to Research Question-2

What are the factors that hampers/fosters knowledge sharing in SME’s with subsidiary in developing country?

The factors that affect the knowledge sharing in SME’s is widely studied and researchers have found multiple factors. During this study we found factors that were mentioned in the literature while also some which were not included.

The study provides evidence that, while SMEs, including knowledge intensive ones, acknowledge that adequately capturing, storing, sharing and disseminating knowledge can lead to greater innovation and productivity. The managers are not prepared to invest the relatively high effort on long term knowledge management goals for which they have difficulty in establishing the added value. Thus, knowledge management activities within SMEs tend to happen in an informal way, rarely supported by purposely designed ICT systems. This was also found in this study where the knowledge shared was mostly informal and there was a considerable lack of investment on knowledge management tools.

The use of ICT is only limited to email, phone and video calls and not other tools were used. The reason was the confidentiality of the technology and the risk of technology being exploited by using different tools for communication and knowledge sharing. We also found that the knowledge sharing is mostly one way from head office to the subsidiary. The knowledge sharing is the form of detailed drawings, instructions, solving production issues and so on. It could be described as passing of papers and not exactly as knowledge sharing especially tacit knowledge. The head office and the subsidiary are
very different in terms of structure, culture and they perform very distinct tasks. This has created a huge vacuum between these two offices in how projects should be executed with both having a very different views. This has led to an culture which could be described as ‘’what we are doing is right and best way to do it’’. Employees at head office and this subsidiary think the biggest issue is culture between these two workplaces. Though culture could be a big factor the focus should be on reducing or eliminating those differences not increasing them.

The challenge of leader or management will be to overcome this cultural barrier and create a vision for the organization. People need an idea that would help them understand what they are supposed to be working toward.

5.3 Limitations
The limitations of this study are similar with most of the qualitative studies. In a qualitative study, it’s not easy to generalize the findings. Also, we have employed case study method and we have studied only one organization. The organization is knowledge intensive and these findings could provide some scope for this study to be applicable to similar studies. The time limit and the respective parallel studies made us to limit our data collection. The other problem was finding an organization that has a subsidiary in developing country and conducting interviews with employees in both locations was not possible. The other aspect of conducting interviews in one organization limits the number of people we can interview. If we had had more organizations and employed multiple methods for data collection then the study could have been generalized to more industries. However, this study provides some insight into what challenges the SME’s face when they plan to or already have established subsidiary in a developing country.

The interviews conducted were not evenly distributed between the head office and the subsidiary. The reason was the time limit that the authors spend in the developing country and availability. It was a short trip to one of the authors home country and limited window to conduct the interviews. Some of the employees were not present at the subsidiary because they were on business trip and arrived after few days. We tried to conduct the interviews through Skype or over telephone but the participants were busy in their work.
Another limit was the language barrier. All the participants at the head office were all Swedish and their native language was not English in which the interviews were conducted. The participants at the subsidiary office had different native language other than English. This did not affect the quality of the interviews but the participants could have been able to explain some concepts better in their native language then English. Also, the authors native language in not English as this would have helped to understand the interpretations of the participants in better way and help probe on a question more.

5.4 Future Research
The aim of this thesis was to understand how knowledge is shared in SME’s with subsidiary in a developing country. There are many barriers that affect the knowledge sharing among employees when there is physical distance between the offices. The study was limited to one organization and one industry. We suggest that further studies should incorporate more organizations in different fields to get a better picture of the issues. At present this study focused on a single country and in future SME’s with subsidiaries in different developing countries could be studied. This multinational study will provide a deep understanding of the problem. Further, the authors did not study the interrelationships between the numerous factors of knowledge sharing. How is one factor related to another and what makes some factor to be more important than others. Another research could be to study when the organization has subsidiary in a developed country to cross examine the factors that affect the knowledge sharing between subsidiaries in developing and developed countries.
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Appendix

Appendix A: Interview Questions

1. How is the organization structure in your perception?

2. Do you think the organization structure is required to be modified?

3. How is the organizational culture? Atmosphere at work

4. If you find some problems and bring them up are they being appreciated and welcome?

5. Apart from skype and email do the organization uses any other systems or apps for all employees to be connected

6. How is knowledge shared in the organization between the parent and subsidiary?

7. Do you expect something in return when sharing knowledge?

8. Does working in virtual team solves the problem or creates more problem?

9. Does the knowledge sharing differ from person to person in your department? Which one is easier to share, with someone speaking the same language or different language than your mother tongue?

10. Is skype a sufficient mode of communication to share the knowledge (probe if there is something that could do better)

11. Does the organization encourage knowledge sharing? How? Why not?

12. Is the knowledge shared in formal or informal procedure? Why is that good?

13. Do you have any example where delay in sharing of knowledge led to loss in project? What happened and why?

14. Do you feel that knowledge sharing improves your job satisfaction or leads to feeling threatened? If yes, why? If no why not?

15. Does the organization have a reward system for good work?

16. How do you transfer knowledge and experience after learning from a project?

17. How is the support from the management in Head office when a problem is identified?
18. What are the biggest challenges from your perspective that is hurting the organization? Any suggestion how this can be overcome?

19. Which way do you prefer for communication and knowledge sharing?
Appendix B: Coding of Keywords

Initial word count frequency:

To find the codes for analyzing empirical studies first a word frequency count of all the word that appeared in the interview transcript were found which is shown below. This word frequency cloud was reduced further to find the themes that we analyzed in this thesis in Chapter-4.

Appendix C: Word Tree

Word tree is a picture showing the selected words that were given as input in the software application. The word tree shows what was the preceding and succeeding sentence in the interview. Word tree helps to understand the context of the responses that occurred in the interview. This is particular important in qualitative analysis to understand the context in which the interviewee responded to a particular word. Below are the word tree for some of the themes that were analyzed in Chapter-4.
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