Abstract

Most of the developments in the knowledge management field are driven by international corporations, management consultants, and other for-profit organizations. Considering their success, government organizations, including some municipal agencies, are now beginning to understand the significant impact knowledge management can have on their efficiency, performance, and human capital management. In the Knowledge Era, knowledge management can also help government agencies improve the quality of its communication with a citizenry developing higher expectations for government transparency and responsiveness. The successful implementation of knowledge management is commonly threatened because organizations often underestimate the impact that the workers and an organization’s underlying cultural dynamics have on its integration into the workflow. Organizational culture is an amalgam of institutional and shared histories, explicit values and beliefs, and common attitudes and behaviors that must be understood in order to be managed effectively. Using a single case study methodology, this research project explores a multi-level theoretical framework for assessing the knowledge sharing readiness of the employees at a small, independent municipal civilian police oversight agency that incorporates the impact of organizational culture, combined with several human behavioral theories including, including the social capital theory, expectancy theory, the theory of reasoned action, the theory of planned action, public service motivation theory and others to understand the determinants, barriers, and predictors of effective knowledge sharing in both private and public sector organizations. The paper will also take a solution-oriented approach to examining obstacles encountered by both public and private sector organizations in their efforts to design and implement KM systems. An assessment tool was developed to assess the organization’s knowledge sharing readiness.
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Chapter 1: Problem Definition

Background

All organizations depend upon accurate, timely information and knowledgeable employees to function effectively. Private sector organizations have long recognized the value added benefit of strategic knowledge management, but public sector organizations have been much slower to harness its potential. Government organizations, particularly municipal governments, tend to be slow-moving, traditional hierarchical bureaucracies, with inward-looking perspectives. Nonetheless, they are knowledge-intensive organizations whose information and institutional knowledge are often its most sought after “products” (land records, birth certificates, court decisions, etc.) are diligently managed, archived, and even digitized for ease of public availability in online platforms. Municipal government organizations are highly effective at retaining records for the public and even transferring knowledge of institutional processes and procedures (known as explicit or “know what/know how” knowledge) to its knowledge workers. They are not, however, nearly as effective at preserving the knowledge embedded within its knowledge workers (known as tacit or “know why” knowledge).

When knowledge is not strategically managed (i.e., acquired, shared, stored, etc.) in an organization, it negatively impacts worker productivity and often leads to poor service delivery. This represents a significant problem for the day-to-day effectiveness of municipal governments, but it also portends long-term maladies for effective human capital management, the potential for public-private data partnerships, and even the organization’s existence, particularly during a climate of economic instability or government austerity.
The Case Study – Office of Citizen Complaint Investigations (OCCI)

Almost twenty years into the new millennium, the Office of Citizen Complaint Investigations (OCCI), the civilian police oversight investigative agency for the city of Middleton, U.S.A., has no website or social media presence. The Middleton Police Department (MPD) is a large urban police department with approximately 1,500 sworn police officers and located in the Midwestern United States. Under the direction of MPD’s eleven-member civilian Police Department Oversight Board (PDOB or Board), OCCI is responsible for receiving, investigating, and resolving complaints regarding non-criminal allegations of misconduct against Middleton PD’s police personnel. As a knowledge-based function, OCCI’s investigation of citizen complaints seeks to instill citizen confidence in the integrity and accountability of the Middleton Police Department. Disciplinary actions against officers are determined based upon the fact-finding and recommendations of the civilian investigators. Therefore, all of OCCI’s nineteen civilian investigators have received extensive training to ensure the actions of MPD officers are examined through a procedurally sound investigative process.

While the Middleton OCCI has no external online presence of its own, the Board has a bare bones website and an inactive Facebook page. Some information regarding the volume of citizen complaints received and closed by OCCI and instructions for filing a complaint are listed on the Board’s website. There is no accompanying information that contextualizes the data into a form that is meaningful to the general public.

The Middleton Police Department has a modern information and communication technology (ICT) infrastructure and a full-service in-house IT division. OCCI shares these ICT resources with the police department and OCCI’s leaders and investigative staff have previously demonstrated the will and ability to adopt radical changes to its processes and procedures. Those
changes resulted in major advancements in the quality, reliability, and timeliness of their investigations. These factors signal OCCI’s organizational readiness to successfully adopt an IT-supported knowledge management system and to take full advantage of its benefits. OCCI’s physical infrastructure and internal processes are sufficient to support any new management practices that its leadership may contemplate in the future.

Regardless of its limited transparency, OCCI is still an appealing knowledge sharing case study because it has made significant improvements in its performance in the last few years. This is due, in large part, to intervention from the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ). In 2011, under new leadership and after eight previous years of stagnation, OCCI finally succeeded in meeting and maintaining the DOJ’s high standards. Systemic DOJ-mandated changes transformed the entire Middleton Police Department, including OCCI. U.S. Attorney Barbara L. McQuade and Acting Assistant U.S. Attorney Molly J. Moran, in their 2017, report concluding the DOJ’s court-mandated supervision of the department, declared:

The [Office of Citizen Complaint Investigations] now adheres to the same investigative standards as the [MPD]’s internal investigations and has successfully overcome its challenges with meeting investigative timelines, backlogged complaints, turnover in leadership, and a shortfall in qualified civilian investigators. Today the [OCCI] is effectively managed and fully staffed with civilian investigators whose independent investigations help ensure the [MPD] remains accountable to the community.

When the civilian Police Department Oversight Board hired its new executive director, he began requesting data from the police misconduct investigations to analyze complaint trends and patterns and to gauge the value OCCI’s investigations are providing to the public, the Board, and the MPD. What the executive director discovered is that the data currently created and
retained for future use by OCCI is just related to complainant demographics and OCCI’s productivity. The data is only relevant internally, with little, if any, value to the public or OCCI’s other stakeholders. Similar to Davenport and Prusak (2000), the executive director understood that data and information have no value until it is contextualized into information that can be used to support decision making— or knowledge.

**Statement of the Problem**

OCCI’s current knowledge management solutions are generally ad-hoc, lack systematic organization, and are not promoted by management as an organizational knowledge sharing or retention tool. When knowledge is not strategically managed (i.e., systematically acquired, shared, stored, etc.) in an organization, it leads to redundancies in knowledge discovery and creation, negatively impacts worker productivity, and often leads to poor service delivery. This represents a significant problem for the day-to-day effectiveness of government organizations. The management strategy known as *knowledge management* has acquired a variety of definitions since its inception nearly 30 years ago (Koenig, 2018). The definition being adopted for this research study comes from the online Business Dictionary:

> Strategies and processes designed to identify, capture, structure, value, leverage, and share an organization's intellectual assets to enhance its performance and competitiveness. It is based on two critical activities: (1) capture and documentation of individual explicit and tacit knowledge, and (2) its dissemination within the organization.

According to Shahidi, Abdolvand and Harandi (2015, p. 11), “lack of a suitable infrastructure and demonstrable readiness for organizational change” are impediments to an organization’s implementation of a knowledge management strategy (see Figure 1). It has already been established that OCCI has a suitable physical infrastructure to support any
knowledge management system. Therefore, the focus of his case study is the examination of OCCI’s “readiness” for a strategic knowledge management system, a major organizational change.

**Research objective.** Shahidi, et. al (2015) suggested the success of knowledge management is commonly threatened because organizations ignore the people and cultural dynamics. Myers (2017) inferred many organizations lack an environment where information is systematically shared because colleagues do not value collaborating with each other or the organizational culture is inhospitable or indifferent toward internal knowledge sharing.

Analysts have estimated Fortune 500 companies lose a combined $31.5 billion per year from employees failing to share knowledge effectively. By trying to recreate the wheel, repeating others’ mistakes, or wasting time searching for specialized information or expertise, employees incur productivity costs and opportunity costs for the organization. Of course, public sector organizations are not driven by profit margins, but inefficiencies due to redundancies and wasted time are still costly. Knowledge management is primarily concerned with identifying people-oriented processes, thus the objective of this study was to explore the extent to which OCCI’s current organizational climate is conducive to successful implementation of a knowledge management strategy and to then design a knowledge readiness strategy by asking the following:

1. **What are the socio-behavioral enablers and barriers of a knowledge sharing culture?**
2. **What are the socio-behavioral predictors or determinants of a knowledge sharing culture?**
3. **How can the socio-behavioral predictors or determinants of a knowledge sharing culture be incorporated into a methodology that an organization’s readiness for a knowledge sharing system?**
4. What is the theoretical framework for a knowledge sharing readiness program should OCCI later choose to pursue a holistic knowledge sharing or knowledge management system?

**Assumptions**

- OCCI is a fictional organization, but was closely modeled after an existing civilian police oversight agency in the United States for the purpose of this study.
- That survey sample was representative of all investigators. The total population of 19 investigators is small and the sample represents only 1/3 of the total population by request of OCCI.
- The methodologies utilized in studies of knowledge management in private sector organizations are applicable to government-sector organizations unless the researcher indicates otherwise. *There is almost no scholarly literature, peer-reviewed or otherwise, in wide circulation that explores trends and applications of knowledge management principles in civilian police oversight agencies. This researcher had to cast a wider net to include other types of agencies, both public and private.*
- The inferences made from the publicly available documents concerning OCCI and from media coverage of historical milestones represent the strategic priorities of OCCI.

**Limitations and Delimitations**

- Data collection occurred through a cross-sectional survey. A longitudinal study of investigator attitudes toward knowledge sharing and workplace culture would have been impractical.
• The potential socio-behavioral determinants, barriers, and predictors of knowledge sharing are numerous. This study focuses on only four: culture, motivation, commitment, and communication.

• OCCI’s leadership declined to participate or permit the use of any of the agency’s or the police department’s data that is not readily available to the public.

• OCCI is particularly small in comparison to the size of case study subjects referenced in the literature review, thus the results may not be transferable to larger public sector organizations. It should be noted, however, that at the 2017 annual conference of the National Association for Civilian Oversight in Law Enforcement (NACOLE) in Spokane, Washington, this researcher interacted with representatives of oversight agencies, ranging in size from 1 to 50+ employees, so the results of this study may be applicable to other oversight agencies of similar size.

• The survey participants were selected using a purposive selection method. They may have been somewhat ideologically homogeneous because all but one were on the same investigative team.

• Finally, the pre-defined size and scope of this research project could not accommodate the amount of research required to design a holistic knowledge management system for OCCI. Rather, the recommended “design” is limited to readying the organization for knowledge sharing by focusing on the modification of the attitudes and behaviors of the organization’s human capital.

Research Audience and Rationale

The audience for this research proposal is OCCI’s Chief Investigative Officer (CIO), the Police Department Oversight Board (PDOB), and it’s Executive Director. The rationale for this
study was the potential value that knowledge management can add to OCCI’s fulfillment of its mission: improving service delivery and improving the public’s perception of the police department by building trust. As the Middleton PDOB celebrates the 50th anniversary of its founding in 2020 and MPD’s sustained compliance with the U.S. Department of Justice’s constitutional policing standards, the Board has discussed branding the PDOB as a center of excellence, promoting and contributing to the availability of professional and scholarly research and data in the study and practice of civilian police oversight.

Theoretical Framework

This research project relies upon a multi-level knowledge sharing organizational readiness model patterned on those developed by Lin (2005), Wang & Noe (2010, and Taghavi, Sherafat, and Kalehbasti (2013). It is a multi-level approach that incorporates several theoretical human behavior and organizational change constructs, including social cognitive theory, motivation theory, social exchange theory, social capital theory, and expectancy theory.

Research Study Scope

The “target population” for this case study consists of OCCI’s entire 23-member staff including the two administrative support personnel, 19 investigators, 3 supervising investigators, and OCCI’s Chief Investigative Officer. The Executive Director of the Board increased the total target population to 24 persons.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

Knowledge management is a management discipline that enables an organization to leverage its knowledge assets to continuously improve its operations and service delivery. It consists of various processes, including the creation, acquisition, transfer, organization, diffusion, and usage of knowledge (Koenig, 2018). Despite the varying definitions of knowledge management, the theme common in contemporary literature is that knowledge, especially the “know how” and “know why” knowledge that resides in the minds of knowledge workers is an organization’s most valuable (Liebowitz, 1999). In both the private and public sectors, the quality and value of an organization’s tangible assets – human capital and information technology infrastructure are essential to its growth and sustainability. However, in the context of public sector organizations, where efficient public service delivery and enhancement of the quality of life are the organizations’ primary objectives, knowledge assets are gaining recognition as essential predictors of organizational effectiveness and sustainability Gafoor and Cloete (2010). The knowledge-based view of organizations suggests an organization’s mission-critical intellectual resources are key organizational assets that enable innovation and achieve results that benefit society. Public sector innovation is about new ideas that work at creating public value by addressing a public policy challenge through the achievement of a desired public outcome. Organizations able to effectively manage their knowledge resources can expect to reap benefits such as improved customer service, reduced human capital management and infrastructure costs, better decision making, quick and efficient problem resolution, and efficient transfer of best practices.
Tacit knowledge, usually centered on sharing experiences and skills,” is most often an organization’s most valuable knowledge asset, but the least codifiable or controllable through knowledge management activity. It is often transferred through means such as apprenticeship or demonstration. Argote and Ingram (2000) noted a significant amount of organizational knowledge is tacit knowledge possessed by individual knowledge workers. As such, without tapping into an employee’s motivation for sharing, tacit knowledge is the least likely to be shared and documented, leaving much of it stored in employees’ heads (DeLong, 2004). The departure of employees has the potential to cause significant losses of the organization’s knowledge assets, resulting in erosion of organizational memory, reduced productivity, reduced capacity for service delivery, “reinventing the wheel,” and opportunity losses (DeLong, 2004).

Awareness of the importance of knowledge management has already been apparent in the private sector for decades. The public sector, however, has increasingly become aware of its value. It is slowly gaining ground in municipal governments as well (Gafoor and Cloete, 2010).

The Case for Knowledge Management at OCCI

Investigations can only be as good as the information available to the investigator. As law enforcement “outsiders,” civilian oversight investigators often face skepticism from law enforcement officers (LEOs) who believe civilians are unqualified to evaluate officers’ actions and decisions because, they reason, civilians are incapable of understanding an LEO’s professional insights and motivations. Whecter (2004) suggested that to overcome the skepticism of LEOs, civilian investigators must acquire or have access to as much knowledge as possible.

An oversight body’s independence is essential to its functioning. The extent to which the organization operates free of the influence of political actors and the agency it oversees will largely determine its effectiveness. In order to properly investigate alleged misconduct, oversight
agencies must be able to obtain evidence and all other relevant information since an investigation is only as good as the information to which the investigator has access. For the benefit of the public and in support of its mission, the oversight agency also has a responsibility to report its findings, recommendations, and accomplishments to the public for scrutiny as well as all “corrective actions” that result. The Columbia University Center for Center for the Advancement of Public Integrity (CAPI) (2017) strongly suggests the use of media coverage (including social media) of corruption and oversight operations to generate more public interest and to foster trust and support for both the oversight agency and the organization it oversees. CAPI also suggests oversight agencies should be communicating and collaborating with other like-minded organizations to better educate the public and provide them with actionable information – or knowledge.

CAPI certainly seems cognizant that the Knowledge Era has created a citizenry accustomed to instant information access and increased expectations of government transparency and accountability. To ensure the efficacy of the Office of Citizen Complaint Investigations as a legitimate tool of police accountability, its investigative process should be perceived as impartial, consistent, and thorough by its stakeholders: the complainant, police officers, the police department’s disciplinary unit, the police department, and the community. Gafoor and Cloete (2010) maintain knowledge and information can serve as strategic tools, not just in the private sector, but in local governments, allowing them to embrace the role of knowledge-based enterprises, improving service delivery and creating service delivery excellence. With knowledge workers spending up to 20% of their week compensating for a lack of embedded knowledge-sharing (McKinsey, 2012), there is no question of the value knowledge management can add to municipal government agencies.
There are two popular taxonomies of knowledge, explicit and tacit knowledge. They are distinguished by their means of sharing or transfer. Explicit knowledge refers to knowledge which is readily available, codified, digitized, and easily disseminated (Davenport & Prusak, 2000). Two of the most prominent examples of explicit knowledge regularly utilized by OCCI are the police department’s policy and procedure manual (MPD Manual) and OCCI’s standard operating procedure (SOP) manual. The MPD Manual consists of hundreds of pages where the officers’ code of conduct, duties, responsibilities, limitations, and restrictions are documented in explicit detail. The Office of Citizen Complaint Investigations’ SOP, a much smaller document consisting of approximately 50 pages, includes OCCI’s mission statement, statement of investigative authority, chain of command, and investigative protocols. An electronic version of the MPD Manual is available to all police department personnel, including OCCI investigators, via the police department’s intranet. OCCI, however, does not have its own intranet, but all investigators are given a hard copy of the SOP upon hire.

Tacit knowledge is internalized knowledge encompassing the expertise, skills, understanding, and experience – “know how,” and “know why”– of the people within the organization. Examples of tacit knowledge captured and available on the MPD intranet are training videos for users of the department’s various electronic information systems. On the other hand, nearly all of OCCI’s tacit knowledge is embedded in the minds of the investigative personnel or within its processes. A comprehensive OCCI training manual was created in 2012 and distributed to new investigators. It included templates and samples of commonly used documents. The training for new investigators consists of lectures, tours, observing experienced OCCI investigators, reviewing the OCCI training manual, and reading the MPD Manual and OCCI SOP. In lieu of distributing the training manual, OCCI trainers now email copies of
commonly used document templates to new investigators as needed. There is no central departmental electronic repository for any OCCI documents. Tacit knowledge is accumulated through social interactions within each of the three investigative teams. OCCI investigators are strongly encouraged to seek work-related guidance only within the confines of his/her team and supervisor so that the team’s work product remains consistent with the expectations of his/her assigned supervisor. In municipal government agencies, knowledge sharing requires the dissemination of individual employees’ work-related experiences throughout the agency and may even include collaboration with other agencies to make more knowledge and dissemination to stakeholders in the form of actionable information that enables decision-making.

**Knowledge Sharing, the Building Block of Knowledge Management**

*Knowledge sharing (KS)* is the process through which solutions (especially, information, skills, or expertise) are exchanged among people (Koenig, 2018). According to Witherspoon, Bergner, Cockrell, and Stone (2013), knowledge sharing is the building block for the success of an organization and managing knowledge depends foremost upon people’s willingness and ability to share and use knowledge. Knowledge sharing transforms individual knowledge into organizational knowledge (Li, Montazemi & Yuan, 2006). Koenig (2018) asserted knowledge sharing is one of the most important factors affecting organizational agility and performance. Organizations that successfully implement strategic knowledge sharing recognize 1) it is a people-driven process systematically implemented to produce continuous improvement and 2) knowledge sharing must be supported in a knowledge sharing culture to be sustained. The success of knowledge sharing is measured by its ongoing effectiveness in meeting the organization’s objectives, therefore it requires a strong organizational commitment to maintain that effectiveness.
Knowledge sharing within teams leads to superior team performance. Despite the growing literature on KS, little attention has been paid to employee knowledge sharing activities in governmental organizations and little empirical research has been conducted on how organizational context affects employees’ knowledge sharing activities in public and private sector organizations. While advanced IT applications and network systems facilitate employees’ knowledge sharing, employees are still considered the main driver in the sharing of knowledge and information in organizations (Kim & Lee, 2006). Therefore, an important challenge for organizations is creating an organizational culture that increases colleagues’ motivation and opportunities to share information.

**Rationale for Knowledge Sharing at OCCI**

The new knowledge-based economy presents opportunities for OCCI and other government agencies to strategically use their highly specialized knowledge assets to innovate and improve the quality of their data by contextualizing it (Gafoor & Cloete, 2010) and packaging it for on-demand reuse by citizens and external organizations. Though very little literature was available concerning knowledge sharing in local government organizations in the United States, there is certainly some evidence that municipal governments understand the value of knowledge management, particularly in Australia and the emerging economies in Africa (especially South Africa; Gafoor & Cloete, 2010), Asia, and the Middle East. The various studies lauded knowledge sharing as a means to improve organizational performance, facilitate decision making by the organization’s leaders, improve human capital planning and management, and create a learning culture committed to continuous improvement. The more specialized and specific the knowledge base of the municipal organization, the greater its’ potential for improving service delivery and the quality of the information and knowledge it provides to its citizenry.
Since 2012, a renewed focus on police reform and accountability has resulted in improvements in the quality and availability of reform related data and placed more focus on solutions. A noted criminologist argued that fixing underlying problems of citizens’ distrust and lack of faith in police is the only way to really start building safer communities (Lopez, 2016). The lack of reliable data and information on police misconduct and uses of force, including officer-involved shootings of unarmed persons, had been a major hindrance to understanding the scope of the problem and advancing ongoing national discussions. More recently, however, data has become the driver of criminal justice reform. There has been a steady shift towards “evidence-based” and “data-driven” reform initiatives by state governments, non-profit advocacy groups, and research institutions in an effort to validate potential outcomes and benefits to both jurisdictions and individuals. The Internet, social media, intranets, Web 2.0, and other ongoing advancements in information and communication technology (ICT) are supporting the efforts of civilian oversight agencies to collaborate, capture, create, and transfer accountability data, investigative best practices, and successful reform solutions. Often, however, researchers, municipal civilian police oversight practitioners, and other criminal justice reform advocacy organizations are still relying on national-level statistics such as Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) data. While national data is important and can provide valuable insight into trends, reliance on only one repository is insufficient. This data can have inconsistent standards or lack full participation and uniformity in reporting from all jurisdictions.

The codification and transfer of tacit knowledge and on-the-job experience from seasoned OCCI investigators, particularly the former sworn investigations (all age 55+), would retain decades of tacit knowledge and preserve it as organizational memory for many years to come. However, sharing and transfer of knowledge is a challenge because of the unstructured
nature of tacit knowledge and cultural barriers observed during the course of this study. The creation of a systematic knowledge sharing system has not been a priority.

Without suitable knowledge sharing mechanisms and demonstrable readiness for organizational change, any organization’s knowledge sharing strategy will fail (Shahidi, et. al, 2015). Knowledge management research has considered many factors in the form of enablers, facilitators, motivators, inhibitors, barriers, and deterrents, which have a profound effect on the tacit knowledge-sharing behavior of individuals (Joia & Lemos, 2010; Li, 2010). Nonetheless, despite the growing literature on knowledge sharing, there exists little empirical research illuminating employee knowledge sharing activities in municipal organizations or that explains how organizational culture affects employee knowledge sharing activities in U.S. public sector organizations.

**Theoretical Framework for Assessing Organizational Readiness for Knowledge Sharing**

The researcher reviewed literature representing a broad spectrum of theoretical perspectives on the determinants, barriers, and predictors of effective knowledge sharing in both private and public sector organizations. The most widely discussed theories were related to social cognitive theory, social exchange theory (Liang, Liu, Wu, 2008), expectancy theory (Rotter, 1967) and motivation theory (Lin, 2006).

Organizational readiness for change is considered “a critical precursor to the successful implementation of complex changes” (Wiener, 2009, p. 1). An organization’s new strategic emphasis on knowledge sharing involves asking employees to adopt new attitudes and behaviors related to knowledge sharing. Research suggests it is important to design knowledge sharing initiatives aligned with existing employees’ workflow and linked to the organizational strategy (Wang & Noe, 2010), thus an organizational change strategy will be required. Wang and Noe
(2010), reviewed a cross-section of qualitative and quantitative studies examining the causal relationships between both organizational and individual-level characteristics and knowledge sharing to evaluate appropriate workplace interventions. Their research identified five theoretical foundations grounded in human behavior: organizational behavior, interpersonal and team characteristics, cultural characteristics, individual characteristics, and motivational factors. Those five theoretical foundations form the basis for this study’s knowledge readiness assessment.

Taghavi, Sherafat, and Kalehbasti (2013), for a public service organization, developed a knowledge management readiness model consistent with the findings in the Wang & Noe (2010) study. The 2013 study is the basis of the diagnostic tool for evaluating OCCI’s readiness for implementation of a knowledge sharing strategy.

**Readiness** for change refers to the “shared psychological state of organizational members” as they prepare to implement a change (change commitment) and “the shared belief in their collective capability to do so” (change efficacy) (Wiener, 2009, p. 1). Organizational readiness implies both the capability and capacity to engage in knowledge management and to make use of its advantages. Weiner cautions that organizational change is difficult but, according to motivation and social cognitive theory, manageable. Weiner concluded that, among other determinants, organizational readiness and the cooperation of its members also correlate with the degree to which the organization’s members value the expected change. Social cognitive theory suggests that when organizational readiness for change is high, organizational members are more likely to initiate change (e.g., institute new policies, procedures, or practices), exert greater effort in support of change, and exhibit greater persistence in the face of obstacles or setbacks during implementation. Motivation theory not only supports these hypotheses, but suggests another –
when organizational readiness is high, organizational members will exhibit more pro-social, change-related behavior and effort.

Organizational behavior is the study of beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors displayed by people in the workplace. Every organization is a social construct, a collections of individuals, and therefore, socially oriented. Knowledge sharing within an organization is so heavily dependent upon the subjective attitudes and behaviors of its individual workers that behavioral scientists argue that managers who know why workers behave the ways they do are better equipped to motivate employees to contribute to the achievement of organizational goals. The researcher intends to use this construct, along with several other cultural determinants or factors of socio-behavioral readiness as identified in the literature, beginning with trust.

**Trust.** Rotter (1967) defined trust as a “generalized expectancy that the verbal statements of others can be relied upon” (Rotter, 1967, p. 651). Trust was found to be the most important component in the cultivation of a knowledge sharing culture. In the meta-analysis conducted by Liang, Liu, Wu (2008), they identified nine studies that found significant positive influences on individuals’ knowledge-sharing behavior; while five other studies did not agree with this finding. The findings confirm that the social exchange theory plays an important role underlying individuals’ knowledge-sharing behavior. The results also demonstrate that social interaction and trust derived from the social exchange theory and moderated by IT contextual factors can predict individual’s knowledge-sharing behavior.

The four major determinants of organizational readiness for knowledge sharing: culture, communication, motivation, and commitment all contribute toward building trust throughout the organization. Knowledge sharing is a social process that occurs in a social context (Alavi, Kayworth, & Leidner, 2005), thus, it is a truly social process. Consequently, it is important to
examine the organizational culture to investigate whether this culture supports the transfer of knowledge.

**Culture.** The Online Business Dictionary defines organizational culture as the values and behaviors that contribute to the unique social and psychological environment of an organization. Organizational culture is based on shared attitudes, beliefs, customs, and written and unwritten rules that have been developed over time and are considered valid in the organization. Although the culture is dependent upon both the organization’s and its individual workers’ characteristics, it is the individuals’ behaviors that are most central to defining the overall culture (Anderfuhr-Biget et al 2010 in Austen & Zacney, 2015). Janz and Prasarnphanich (2003) also concluded organizational culture is the most important contributor to knowledge sharing. Organizational culture “encourages the sharing and spreading of what is learned, aiming at the development and success of the organization” (Rebelo, 2006, as cited in Schmitz, Rebelo, Gracia & Tomás, 2014, p. 114). A learning organizational culture is an important prerequisite for the establishment of an effective knowledge management strategy and, thus, positively related to the implementation of organizational knowledge sharing practices (Lehner, 2012; Schmitz et al., 2014). It is defined by the extent to which an organization engages in knowledge transfer (Rebelo & Gomes, 2011). Egan, Yang, and Bartlett (2004) found learning cultures positively influence employees’ motivation to transfer learning.

**Communication.** Consistent with the theme of knowledge sharing being a social process, Van den Hooff and De Ridder (2004), found the quality of communication also affects knowledge sharing. The positive relationship between internal organizational communication and knowledge sharing was confirmed in other studies as well, relating to both the public and private sectors (Al-Alawi, Al-Maarzoqi & Mohammed, 2007). The studies measured the
organizations’ communication climate in terms of the perception of certain communication behaviors within the organization (Van den Hooff & de Ridder, 2004). Communication climate can be broadly categorized into two different forms: supportive and defensive. A supportive communication climate exists when knowledge workers, management, and executives voluntarily or willingly share knowledge, opinions, or organizational priorities (Van den Hooff & de Ridder, 2004). A defensive communication climate exists when members of the organization hoard information or avoid knowledge sharing, or openly voicing opinions and organizational priorities (Larsen & Folgero, 1993). Van den Hoof and de Ridder (2004) found that a supportive communication climate is a key determinant of knowledge sharing, therefore, it can be hypothesized that a supportive communication climate will encourage employees to share their knowledge.

Motivation. The expectancy theory, posits that the more positive outcomes are perceived to be associated with a given action, the more inclined a person is to execute that action. In addition to the interpersonal circumstances that encompass knowledge sharing, there is the more personal factor, motivation to share knowledge. Bock and Kim (2002) found knowledge sharing is often perceived as unnatural because some workers believe knowledge is so valuable that they regard it as a personal asset. Knowledge sharers voluntarily share, acting on the basis of intrinsic motivation. Two intrinsic motives are knowledge self-efficacy and enjoyment in helping others (Lin, 2007). By sharing their knowledge with colleagues, employees can improve their knowledge self-efficacy which provides them with a feeling of self-satisfaction or pride (Lin, 2007). Lin (2007) also concluded some employees simply enjoy helping others by sharing their knowledge.
Without a strong personal motivation, people are unlikely to share their knowledge with their colleagues (Stenmark, 2000 as cited in Liang, Liu, Wu, 2008). The social exchange theory (Blau, 1964 as cited in Liang, Liu, Wu, 2008,) was used as theoretical basis for the examination of socio-behavioral knowledge-sharing predictors. According to the theory, passive knowledge sharers calculate their interactions with other individuals in terms of an intangible costs-benefits analysis based on their expectation of reciprocity (Lin, 2006). They reserve sharing knowledge until prompted. From this perspective, extrinsic motivation is an expectation of organizational rewards and reciprocal benefits, (e.g., praise from others, money, promotion, elevated status). These individuals may socialize with the purpose of building relationships by exchanging knowledge with others. Davenport and Prusak (1998) articulated some of those relationships might include benefits such as future reciprocity, status, job security, and job promotions.

Lin (2007) concluded motivation was one of the key determinants or variables influencing knowledge sharing between individuals in organizations. The literature did not show consistency regarding the extent to which extrinsic motivation is indicative of an individual’s knowledge sharing readiness. Intrinsic motivation, on the other hand, certainly seems to be a reliable determinant for knowledge sharing (Lai & Chen, 2014).

Commitment. Organizational commitment is an “attitudinal variable” (Lin 2007). It connotes the employee’s feeling of emotional attachment or association with the organization. An important type of commitment is affective commitment (Spector 2012). In particular, the affective component of organizational commitment has been found to be related to knowledge sharing (Van den Hooff & de Ridder, 2004). It can be defined as employees’ identification with the organization, as well as their dedication and emotional connection to it (Allen & Meyer, 1990). The research of Van den Hooff & de Ridder (2004) demonstrated employees’
commitment is affected by the amount of information they get about their working environment, as well as by the possibility to engage in communication. Consequently, communication climate is an important prerequisite for employees’ commitment (Postmes, Tanis, & de Wit, 2001). Moreover, affective commitment has been found to be positively related to knowledge sharing and appears to be an important part of a knowledge sharing culture (Van den Hooff & de Ridder 2004).

Summary

An organization’s culture is an amalgam of institutional and shared histories, explicit values and beliefs, and common attitudes and behaviors. Change programs can involve creating a culture, refining or combining cultures, or reinforcing cultures. Once the culture is understood, it should be addressed as thoroughly as the other components of the knowledge management infrastructure (e.g., information and communication technology). Leaders should be explicit and consistent in their promotion of the culture and underlying behaviors that will best support the new way of doing business, and then create opportunities to model and reward those behaviors. The researcher frequently relied upon the readiness frameworks developed by Lin (2005), Wang & Noe (2010), and Taghavi, Sherafat, and Kalehbasti (2013), thus they were used to inform the methodology of quantitative assessment of OCCI’s knowledge management readiness in Chapter 3.
Chapter 3: Research Methodology

Municipal government agencies like the Office of Citizen Complaint Investigations are increasingly turning to knowledge management because they recognize they will inevitably be forced to compete in the current knowledge economy in order to survive and remain relevant. The purpose of this case study was to explore whether OCCI has an agile organizational culture, equipped to sustain the systematic mobilization of its mission-critical knowledge assets to serve the public more effectively. Knowledge management theorists and practitioners generally agree on the following: (1) In the absence of readiness for organizational change and a sufficient knowledge sharing infrastructure, any attempt at a comprehensive knowledge management strategy is futile (Shahidi, Abdolvand & Harandi, 2015); (2) KM is a people-driven, holistic management strategy that can only be sustained in a culture that values knowledge and recognizes its strategic value; and (3) sustainable knowledge sharing must be supported in a knowledge sharing culture. Therefore, the study began by exploring the existing knowledge management literature to discover practical applications of knowledge management, as well as theoretical determinants of organizational readiness for cultural change initiatives. The researcher eventually narrowed the focus from knowledge management to knowledge sharing as it is generally accepted as the “building block” for the success of an organization (Witherspoon, Bergner, Cockrell, and Stone, 2013).

Research Approach

OCCI is responsible for receiving, objectively investigating, and resolving complaints regarding non-criminal allegations of misconduct against Middleton PD’s police personnel. As a knowledge-based function, OCCI’s investigation of citizen complaints seeks to instill citizen confidence in the integrity and accountability of the Middleton Police Department. Disciplinary
actions against officers are determined based upon the fact-finding and recommendations of the
civilian investigators. Therefore, all of OCCI’s 19 civilian investigators have received extensive
training to ensure the actions of MPD officers are examined through an informed and
procedurally sound investigative process.

Most of the 19 investigators have at least 4.5 years of seniority. Two have less than two
years of OCCI seniority and no prior experience in civilian police oversight. Nearly all OCCI
investigators have at least a bachelor’s degree or equivalent experience as a ranked police officer
(sergeant or above). Five are retired Middleton PD sergeants who served a minimum of twenty
years on the force. Another had at least five years of experience as a police officer in a different
urban community, but the remaining investigators have no prior professional experience in law
enforcement. The median age of the fifteen females and four males is forty-four years, with all
five retired sergeants ages 55+. All nineteen investigators are over 30 years old.

OCCI’s leadership team consists of three supervising investigators and the Chief
Investigative Officer who reports directly to the Board. However, the chief investigative officer’s
position was vacant throughout most of this research study. It has since been filled. One of the
three male supervising investigators retired ten years ago from the Middleton PD at the rank of
lieutenant with thirty years on the job. At over sixty years old, he served as the acting chief
investigating officer until the position was recently filled. The two other supervising
investigators are lifelong civilians with bachelor’s degrees. One is over sixty years old. The other
is in his mid-forties. All have at least twelve years of seniority at OCCI. Each supervising
investigator leads a team of between six and seven investigators. The executive director, a
lifelong civilian in his mid to late fifties, was hired by the Middleton Police Department
Oversight Board three years ago. The researcher has more than 6 years of OCCI experience.
This single-case study qualitative research method involved two phases, each with its own methodology. Theoretical data was obtained through documentary assessment and empirical data by means of interviews with municipal personnel present in the selected departments. The sampling procedure followed for the study was purposive (Schutt, 2006). Okere (2017) highlighted three main factors that enable and hinder knowledge management: people, processes, and technology. Knowledge sharing strategies fail when organizations ignore the significance of the people and cultural dynamics during planning and implementation of knowledge management. This study expands previous research in that it focuses on an American municipality, a rare subject of knowledge management research. The present study could enhance the understanding of knowledge sharing in a different type of organization than has previously been researched. The results may contribute to the continued diversification of knowledge management research and to the furtherance of research in civilian police oversight.

Knowledge management is primarily concerned with identifying people-oriented processes, thus the objective of this study was to explore the extent to which OCCI’s current organizational climate is conducive to successful implementation of a knowledge management strategy and to then design a knowledge readiness strategy by asking the following:

1. What are the enablers of and barriers to a knowledge sharing culture?
2. What are the socio-behavioral predictors or determinants of a successfully implemented public sector knowledge sharing system?
3. How can the determinants and barriers to successful knowledge sharing be incorporated into a diagnostic tool that predicts an organization’s readiness for knowledge sharing.
Data Collection Approach and Procedures

**Literature review.** The first phase included a review of the literature, beginning with a broad review of the following subjects: knowledge management, knowledge management implementation in the public sector, and knowledge management in civilian police oversight. A more narrow review included searches for: determinants of effective knowledge management implementation, knowledge management readiness, organizational change theories, and other socio-behavioral and information behavior theories.

**Literature review strategy.** In structuring the literature review, the researcher reviewed a reasonably large body of academic and policy writings on knowledge management dating back to the 1980s, ranging to as recent as March 2018. The researcher conducted key word searches on the Internet, using the Google and Google Scholars search engines. The research services, JSTOR, ProQuest, and Emerald were also searched. Generous use of reference lists and citations from peer-reviewed academic papers and policy reports was performed. Finally, the researcher also reviewed reference lists provided on the websites for non-profit oversight and law enforcement agencies and other related professional associations.

The researcher also reviewed approximately a dozen academic research papers on civilian oversight in the United States, in addition to the review of various government websites, including, the Department of Justice, United Nations, and the actual municipal oversight agency’s website upon which the fictional town of Middleton, U.S.A is adapted, and the website of the professional association, National Association for Oversight in Law Enforcement.

**Methods**

**Online Survey.** The second phase included a quantitative examination, via an anonymous 79-question online (via SurveyMonkey) survey, probing the perspective of
individual OCCI knowledge workers (the investigators). The survey questions were developed by the researcher for the purpose of this study, however approximately half of the questions were adopted from two online knowledge management assessments, identified below. The anonymous online survey measured several contextual dimensions based on the theoretical and practical applications of KM discovered during the literature review.

**Online Survey Strategy.** Quantitative data was collected through an online SurveyMonkey survey of six (n=6) current OCI investigators out of the possible 19 non-managerial investigators. A somewhat homogeneous purposive sampling method identified the subset of the population. The team consisted entirely of women, so the researcher chose one of the four male OCCI investigators to make the sample somewhat more demographically representative. Team A was thought to be more or less representative of the entire population, but it was a somewhat false choice, because OCCI’s authorization to utilize its employees was restricted to Team A. To allow plenty of time for responses, the participants were initially asked to respond within 48 hours, but the deadline was later extended for up to a week. The researcher was aware of Team A’s fondness for team meals at local restaurants so, in return for completing the survey authorization form, the researcher offered the choice of treating the team to lunch or giving them $10 gift cards. Six chose the team lunch, including, the male from Team B. The MPD retiree refused to take any compensation at all and the newest OCCI investigator opted for the gift card. To prevent the researcher from inadvertently matching the survey responses with the participant, SurveyMonkey did not track the IP addresses. During a trial run of the survey, the researcher noticed SurveyMonkey does not conceal the date and time of individual responses, so the researcher used a paid assistant to retrieve the results. Although, the researcher requested
in-person and via e-mail that the participants avoid revealing to the researcher whether or when they completed the survey, compliance with that request was low.

**Primary research question and sub-question data details.** The research problem articulates a lack of in-depth understanding of barriers, enablers, and determinants of effective knowledge sharing in public sector organizations. Therefore, the current study aimed to answer the following questions: (1) What are the most significant socio-behavioral determinants of successful knowledge management practices? And what are the most significant barriers? (2) How can socio-behavioral barriers to knowledge sharing be overcome to encourage knowledge sharing and prevent the loss of the organization’s intellectual assets and organizational memory? (3) How can the determinants of and barriers to knowledge sharing be measured to predict an organization’s readiness for knowledge sharing. (4) What behavioral strategies can be implemented to prepare or lay the groundwork for a knowledge sharing culture?

**Participants**

**Survey Sample.** They survey sample consisted of six (n=6) current OCI investigators out of the total population of nineteen (N=19) non-managerial investigators. The purposive sample selection method resulted in a somewhat homogeneous sample. Five of the six participants were members of the same investigative team, Team A. The team consisted entirely of women, so the researcher chose one of the four male OCCI investigators from Team B to make the sample somewhat more demographically representative. Team A was thought to be more or less representative of the entire population, but it was a somewhat false choice, because OCCI’s authorization to utilize its employees was restricted to Team A. researcher received 8 survey authorization forms, but only six participated for a yield rate of 75%. The even-numbered sample size was too small for the meaningful use of any advanced statistical data, so the raw numbers
and percentages were used to compare the responses in the text and graphics included in Chapter 4.

**Demographic background.** Demographic information was not collected due to the small sample size, however, the following is the known group demographic data. The sample included one retired black female sergeant over the age of 60 years, a non-sworn white Hispanic woman over the age of 60 years, and three non-sworn black women between the ages of 37 and 55 years. The sixth participant was a non-sworn black male between 30 and 35 years. The

**Materials**

The survey served a two-fold purpose. Knowledge management research has considered many factors in the form of enablers, facilitators, motivators, inhibitors, barriers, and deterrents, which have a profound effect on the tacit knowledge-sharing behavior of individuals (Joia & Lemos, 2010; Li, 2010). Thus, the survey included questions designed to gauge individual attitudes regarding job satisfaction, work-life balance, communication climate, knowledge sharing, the effectiveness of OCCI’s leadership, motivation, knowledge asset management, and more.

**Questionnaires**

**Target Population.** Most of the 18 investigators have at least 4.5 years of seniority. All have at least a bachelor’s degree or equivalent experience as a ranked police officer (sergeant or above). Five are retired Middleton PD sergeants, one had at least five years of experience as a police officer in a different urban community, but the remaining investigators have no prior professional experience in law enforcement. The median age of the fourteen females and four males is forty-four years, with all five retired sergeants ages 55+. All eighteen investigators are over 30 years old.
OCCI's leadership team consists of three supervising investigators and the chief investigative officer who reports directly to the Board. However, the chief investigative officer’s position was vacant throughout most of this research study. It has since been filled. One of the three male supervising investigators retired ten years ago from the Middleton PD at the rank of lieutenant with thirty years on the job. At over sixty years old, he served as the acting chief investigating officer until the position was recently filled. The two other supervising investigators are lifelong civilians with bachelor's degrees. One is over sixty years old. The other is in his mid-forties. All have at least twelve years of seniority at OCCI. Each supervising investigator leads a team of between six and seven investigators. The executive director, a lifelong civilian in his mid to late fifties, was hired by the Middleton Police Department Oversight Board three years ago.

**Instrumentation.** The researcher developed a research model based on the following studies listed in order of influence on the current study:

- Lin (2005) - integrated a motivational perspective into the theory of reasoned action to explore the effects of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation on employee knowledge sharing intentions
- Taghavi, Sherafat, and Kalehbası (2013) - investigated the factors influencing the successful implementation of knowledge management.

**Proposed Approach for Data Analysis and Synthesis**

A combination of graphics and summarizing text were used to summarize and illustrate the research findings.
Methodological Limitations

The quantitative survey data had several significant methodological limitations that may have negatively affected the validity, reliability, and transferability of the results to other similar studies.

**Small Population and High Margin of Error.** Sample (n=6) represented 33% of the total population (N=18), with a margin of error of +/-34% with a 95% confidence level. At an 85% confidence level, the margin of error improved to 25%, still far from ideal.

**Selection Method.** The purposive selection of the survey participants may have reflected a homogeneity in the responses given their proximity and frequency of contact and experiences. The sample may have not have represented the attitudes of the total population given that all participants work for the same supervisor and may reflect his attitudes from his managerial perspective.

**Question Bias.** Questions that may have produced results different from my own perceptions of the subject matter may have been eliminated or not considered. Single Time Period - All variables were based on a questionnaire completed by a single source at one time period. These limitations do not allow researchers to rule out possible alternative explanations for significant results (such as shared common method variance) and prevent causal inferences.

**Self-Reporting Bias.** The researcher noticed the survey participants generally rated their own behaviors or motivations more favorably than they rated the behavior or motivations of others. This finding was consistent with reportedly lower levels of trust in the organization reported by all participants. However, the finding may also reflect some self-reporting bias which is not uncommon in self-reporting surveys.
Future Studies

Future studies of knowledge management and knowledge sharing can be focused on exploring the same issues in other under-researched U.S. oversight agencies (e.g. a government or institutional ombudsperson) or public services in the U.S. The relationship of knowledge sharing readiness to an organization’s external communications, such as the use of social media or its collaborations with other public institutions may be enlightening. If the case study involves a small total population, it would be more ideal to either survey the entire population or use qualitative method which is appropriate for
Chapter 4 Data Analysis

The following represents the findings from both the qualitative and quantitative research methods. The qualitative research consisted of primary research conducted through observation of the OCCI investigators as they performed their daily functions. The complexity of their knowledge work, along with the ergonomics, floor plan, tools, and equipment. The quantitative method consisted of a 79 question, anonymous online survey. The researcher was unsure at the time of the survey exactly which elements would become part of the eventual knowledge sharing readiness methodology, which explains the large number of questions. The resulting data is represented in Chapter 4 in both graphic and text formats. Corroboration, conflicts, and other relationships between and among variables will be discussed and analyzed.

Data Presentation and Analysis

Qualitative Data

**Historical Data.** The researcher reviewed organizational artifacts such as annual reports, annual budgets, external communications to community groups, and online information from the Department of Justice to gain a better understanding of the underlying rationale for some of the executive decision-making since the executive leadership (the executive director of the Board and the newly appointed Chief Investigative Officer) did not cooperate with this study.

**Needs Analysis and SWOT Analysis.** The needs analysis and SWOT Analysis were eventually found unnecessary as the scope of the research transitioned from an assessment of the organization’s knowledge management gaps to its knowledge management/knowledge sharing readiness gaps. The transition came about as a result of the knowledge management literature’s emphasis that knowledge management is, first and foremost, a people-centered strategy. The researcher also recently recalled an anecdote shared by Dr. Cloutier in January 2018 regarding
The needs analysis and SWOT analysis determined OCI faces several knowledge management gaps:

- Distributing the latest and most relevant knowledge and how-to guidance to its own staff members and partners wherever and whenever needed.
- Streamlining the ongoing handling of mission-critical tasks and decision making.
- Preserving institutional knowledge.
- Auditing current knowledge assets, mapping knowledge resources, and improving access to other DPD databases.
- Deliberately designed, proactive, reliable knowledge-sharing systems.
- OCCI struggles with remaining relevant to its community, in large part, due to its limited capacity for capturing, storing, and interpreting relevant oversight-related data and an ineffective external communication strategy.
- However, the research revealed employee engagement was also a significant factor.

Thomas and Keithley (2002) discussed the following people-related symptoms (also observed at OCCI) of an organization in need of knowledge management:

- Groups working in silos, unable to share knowledge or lessons learned
- Knowledge workers reinventing the wheel
- Inability to leverage the power of collaborations
- Captured knowledge existing in disjointed, non-integrated IT systems
• Implicit knowledge held by experienced knowledge workers, which leaves with them when they leave the organization.

**Observations (Primary Research).** The researcher’s observations were performed for the purpose of gathering background information regarding the investigators’ functions and the work climate. The researcher also listened to investigators’ workplace concerns and discussions of best practices relating to the organization’s knowledge asset related management practices. The investigators were aware of the researcher’s presence, however, they were not aware until much later that the researcher was making formal observations or of the subject matter of the present study. Some of the same investigators later participated in the survey and expressed pleasure at seeing some of their concerns represented. Below are the observations that informed both the SWOT Analysis and the Needs Analysis. The results of each informed the content of the survey questionnaire. The following represents the basis for the questions regarding each construct ultimately analyzed in the theoretical framework identified in Chapter 4.

• *OCI’s current organizational and management structure.* OCCI’s investigative staff is appointed by the Board. Three supervising investigators each head an investigative team of roughly five to six investigators. Each OCI investigative team functions as a silo because the supervisors discourage members of each team from sharing information and investigative resources. The supervisors do not display cooperative behavior and their attitudes appear to be reflected in their subordinates. The supervisor of Team A has literally expressed his displeasure about observing his subordinate investigators fraternize or discuss their cases with members of Teams B and C or their supervisors.

• *Communication.* The three OCCI investigative teams used to meet weekly under the leadership of the previous Chief Investigative Officer. The meeting involved one-way
communication regarding meeting timelines for case completion. No general organizational information was discussed in the meetings. Since the previous CIO’s departure, team meetings are not mandated and occur infrequently.

- **Duties.** The job of the OCI investigator is very writing intensive. Its investigators spend a great deal of their time documenting their investigative efforts and preparing detailed reports that are often used later in disciplinary hearings to support disciplinary actions against officers and as evidence in civil litigation. In its effort to improve the quality and consistency of its investigative reports, OCI began requiring hiring skills assessments that require candidates to prepare two impromptu writing samples, one of which includes a reasoning assessment through a case study exercise. Once hired, the new investigator receives inconsistent training because there are no standard training models, materials, or timelines. A massive training volume and curriculum were prepared by Supervisor A, a retired MPD lieutenant, in 2011 and used to train all but three of the fourteen civilians hired since then. The other two supervising, neither of whom ever worked as law enforcement officers, did not participate in the 2012 preparation of the training program, nor have they used it. During the course of this research, the training curriculum was used during onboarding, but the training manual was not distributed to the new investigator.

- **Knowledge asset management.** Although OCCI’s mission is to “fairly, effectively, and objectively … investigate and make recommendations regarding non-criminal complaints” of officer misconduct, OCCI’s intellectual assets and the knowledge resources dedicated to this function have not been consolidated and organized in a user-friendly manner. They are also inconsistent with the investigators’ typical workflow patterns. This unnecessarily complicates onboard training and makes incumbent
investigators dependent upon creating individual workarounds that perpetuate organizational disorder and stifle the creation of innovative, uniform, streamlined, and contemporary knowledge management best practices.

- **Knowledge asset management.** OCI’s team silos silo-effect has caused most of OCI’s mission-critical internal knowledge assets to be diffuse. OCI’s most commonly used “external” knowledge resources, such as the DPD policy manual, can be accessed via the DPD intranet. Other commonly used electronic information systems (EIS), such as those that store police reports can be accessed from investigators’ desktop PCs. E-911 and dispatch records are stored in a different system. Scout car video and body-worn camera video is stored in yet another system. Police officers’ daily activity logs are transitioning to an EIS, but they are currently available in hardcopy at each precinct station. And so on. OCCI does not have its own intranet.

- **Knowledge asset management/Availability/Redundancy.** Investigators regularly make decisions based on DPD policy directives, statutes, legal advisory opinions, and other external secondary sources that are updated regularly. Local ordinances, statutes, federal precedents, state attorney general opinions are available online, but all of this has to be researched anew each time one of the fifteen investigators is analyzing facts and evidence to determine the proper findings. OCI has never had a systematic process for timely notification and distribution of these updates to investigators.

- **Knowledge asset management/Availability/Redundancy.** Rather than having a function or an organizational system dedicated to automatically updating obsolete external knowledge resources or disseminating legal and policy updates, each of the nineteen investigators has his or her own personal knowledge management system. By recreating
the wheel, repeating other investigators’ mistakes, or otherwise wasting time searching for specialized information or subject matter experts, investigator productivity, and the quality and integrity of the work product suffers. This redundancy, combined with a federal mandate to complete all cases within 90 days leaves little time for investigators to focus on big picture activities such as collecting quantitative data to recognize complaint patterns and trends and undesirable policing practices and patterns that could inform policy recommendations from the Board.

- **Knowledge asset management/Lack of Security Clearance.** There are both internal (DPD) and external electronic information systems (EIS) from which OCI investigators regularly request information, but to which OCI investigators have no or limited access. It is unclear whether OCI has a current, accurate inventory of DPD EIS that have been evaluated for their potential value to OCI investigations. Similarly, OCI does not currently have a systematic means of capturing, storing, centralizing, and archiving knowledge from all of its resources, including its most valuable knowledge asset – its human resources. Most of the knowledge civilian police misconduct investigators require is not acquired through formal education. It is gained through increased experience and informal knowledge transfer when employees talk to each other.

- **Knowledge asset availability.** Two of the most prominent examples of explicit knowledge regularly utilized by OCCI are the police department’s policy and procedure manual (MPD Manual) and OCCI’s standard operating manual (SOP). The MPD Manual consists of hundreds of pages where the officers’ code of conduct, duties, responsibilities, limitations, and restrictions are documented in explicit detail. The Office of Citizen Complaint Investigation’s SOP, a much smaller document consisting of approximately 50
pages, includes OCCI’s mission statement, statement of investigative authority, chain of command, and investigative protocols. An electronic version of the MPD Manual is available to all police department personnel, including OCCI investigators, via the police department’s intranet. OCCI, however, does not have its own intranet, but all investigators are given a hard copy of the SOP upon hire.

- **External Communication.** Since a significant majority of citizen complaints have historically been resolved with the disposition of “not sustained” (or “inconclusive,” a universal phenomenon common to all retrospective investigations), citizens become dubious of the veracity of the findings, perceiving such investigations as merely perfunctory. OCCI, like all other democratic institutions, should be expected to explain its actions to its stakeholders. As a municipal government agency investigating matters that evoke strong emotions from all sides, it is imperative that the services provided by OCCI, be strictly aligned with its mandate and responsibilities to the public.

- **Training and Development/Workforce Improvement.** All of OCCI’s 19 civilian investigators have received extensive training and receive guidance from the supervising investigators to ensure the actions of MPD officers are examined through a procedurally sound investigative process. The investigators and Supervisor A indicated it is commonly believed the previous Chief Investigative Officer informally relaxed the internal standards for quality and consistency somewhat once the federal supervision concluded. However, the only ongoing training is an annual 24 hour training in police tactics and practices taken along with police officers. Investigators receive training as needed and for new MPD databases and reports systems.
• *Performance Evaluation/Compensation.* Until winter 2018, OCCI had not conducted any formal performance reviews since 2013. Although the investigators are appointed by the Board, the investigators are represented by a collective bargaining unit that negotiates wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment. The investigators do not receive any incentive compensation (i.e., merit pay or bonuses). They do receive a total rewards benefits package.

• *Information and Communication Technology Infrastructure.* Middleton OCCI has no external online presence of its own, the Board has a bare bones website and an inactive Facebook page. Some information regarding the volume of citizen complaints received and closed by OCCI and instructions for filing a complaint are listed on the Board’s website. There is no accompanying information that contextualizes the data into a form that is meaningful to the general public.

• *Knowledge Asset Management/Knowledge Creation/External Communication.* The executive director of the Board has been requesting data from citizen complaint investigations to analyze complaint trends and gauge the value that OCCI’s investigations are adding to the community and to the organization (i.e. an early warning intervention system for officers frequently accused or involved in misconduct allegation). The executive director eventually discovered the data currently generated by OCCI is relevant internally, in large part, only to OCCI (e.g., productivity data). The executive director expressed his concern, stating that data has no value until it is contextualized into useful information.
Quantitative Data

Survey Questionnaire. A 79 item, anonymous online survey questionnaire, was created by the researcher collecting information querying OCCT’s organizational culture and the investigators’ attitudes about knowledge sharing, the efficacy of the organization’s current knowledge asset related practices, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, communication climate, and more. Due to the small sample size, no demographic information was collected

Data Analysis Summary

Quantitative Research – Survey Questionnaire

The researcher aimed to answer the following four research questions as originally stated in Chapter 1:

1st. What are the socio-behavioral enablers and barriers of a knowledge sharing culture?

Based on the case studies and theoretical frameworks discussed in the literature review, all of the socio-behavioral attributes, attitudes, and behaviors are considered enablers or barriers (when inverted), but only four are considered predictors or determinants of individual knowledge sharing intentions. The four predictors or determinants are addressed in the following question.

2nd. What are the socio-behavioral predictors or determinants of a knowledge sharing culture?

The researcher did not test the entire universe of possibilities due to the limited scope of this study. The researcher tested motivation, rewards, self-enjoyment, attitudes toward knowledge sharing, and communication climate.
3rd. *How can the socio-behavioral predictors or determinants of a knowledge sharing culture be incorporated into a methodology that an organization’s readiness for a knowledge sharing system?*

The researcher adapted the Lin (2007) study of the effects of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation on employee knowledge sharing intentions. The study combined the theory of reasoned action (TRA) of Fishbein and Ajzen which posited “individual beliefs and attitudes explain most human behaviors. TRA has been found useful in predicting a wide range of behaviors, including behavioral intentions and actual behavior in social psychology” (p. 22). The researcher used a quantitative research method, a survey designed to test five constructs including, expected organizational rewards (OR), reciprocal benefits (RB), enjoyment in helping others (EH), attitudes toward knowledge sharing (AT), and knowledge sharing intentions (IN).

4th. *What is the theoretical framework for a knowledge sharing readiness program should OCCI later choose to pursue a holistic knowledge sharing or knowledge management system?*

Based on the results from question #3, a knowledge sharing readiness program would incorporate the following general principles:

i. Organizational rewards would not be considered as a primary knowledge sharing motivator. At best, it may serve as a temporary or periodical incentive.

ii. Active participation from all investigators at every stage of the planning process.
iii. Supervising investigators would have an active and ongoing role in coaching and promoting employees and assuring them that their contributions are significant to the organization.

Assumption #1 - Expected organizational rewards will positively affect employee knowledge sharing intentions. Q12 compared to Q19 and Q13

This research finding was consistent with the Lin (2015) study which found employee attitudes predicted knowledge sharing intentions, but extrinsic motivations (rewards, etc.) did not significantly influence employee attitudes. This may be explained, in part, by the public service motivation (PSM) theory which was not addressed in Chapter 3. In short, the PSM theory attributes a person’s desire to serve the public as a function of intrinsic motivation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q12. To what extent do you share knowledge with colleagues and management to gain recognition or be rewarded?</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A moderate amount</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None at all</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answered</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipped</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q19. If you know how to help your colleague when you hear her/him ask for help with a knowledge-related question, you are most likely to:</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refer him to a superior</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempt to help her or refer her to someone who can (e.g., a subject matter expert)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act like you did not hear his request and mind your business</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell her you don’t know the answer even if you do</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First and foremost, decide how/whether you will respond, based on your attitudes about her or his Supervising Investigator</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>Answered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipped</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q13. To what extent do you share knowledge with colleagues and management to satisfy your self-fulfillment needs?</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A moderate amount</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None at all</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answered</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipped</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assumption #2 - Employees’ attitudes toward knowledge sharing positively affect knowledge sharing intentions. Q19 compared to Q13

This research finding was consistent with the Lin (2015) study which found employee attitudes predicted knowledge sharing intentions. OCCI investigators were more likely to share knowledge due to their intrinsic motivation which was reflected in the behavioral knowledge sharing question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q19: If you know how to help your colleague when you hear her/him ask for help with a knowledge-related question, you are most likely to:</th>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refer him to a superior</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempt to help her or refer her to someone who can (e.g., a subject matter expert)</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell her you don’t know the answer and mind your business</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell her you don’t know the answer even if you do</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act like you did not hear his request and mind your business</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answered 6
Skipped 0

Assumption #3 - Reciprocal benefits will positively affect knowledge sharing intentions. Q21 compared to Q19

This research finding was consistent with the Lin (2015) study which found an employee’s belief in actually receiving something in return for sharing knowledge is a demonstration of trust. In Chapter 3, it was Rotter (1967) who defined trust as a “generalized expectancy that the verbal statements of others can be relied upon” (Rotter, 1967, p. 651). This is consistent with the social exchange theory which emphasizes the important role of trust underlying individuals’ knowledge-sharing behavior.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q21: To what extent do you avoid voluntarily sharing knowledge due to others not wanting to reciprocate?</th>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A moderate amount</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None at all</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answered 6
Skipped 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q19: If you know how to help your colleague when you hear her/him ask for help with a knowledge-related question, you are most likely to:</th>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refer him to a superior</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempt to help her or refer her to someone who can (e.g., a subject matter expert)</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell her you don’t know the answer and mind your business</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell her you don’t know the answer even if you do</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act like you did not hear his request and mind your business</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answered 6
Skipped 0
Assumption #4 - Enjoyment in helping others (or intrinsic motivation) will positively affect employee knowledge sharing intentions. Q13 compared to Q19

This research finding was consistent with the Lin (2015) study which found employees who feel pleasure in helping others tend to be more motivated to share. Similar to Assumption #1, this correlation may be explained, in part, by the public service motivation (PSM) theory. But it is most closely explained by the expectancy theory which, as addressed in Chapter 3, posits that the more that positive outcomes are perceived to be associated with a given action, the more inclined a person is to execute that action. In addition to the interpersonal circumstances that encompass knowledge sharing, there is the more personal factor, motivation to share knowledge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q13. To what extent do you share knowledge with colleagues and management to satisfy your self-fulfillment needs?</th>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A moderate amount</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None at all</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q19. If you know how to help your colleague when you hear her/him ask for help with a knowledge-related question, you are most likely to:</th>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refer him to a superior</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempt to help her or refer her to someone who can (e.g., a subject matter expert)</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you not hear his request or mind your business</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell her you don’t know the answer even if you do</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First and foremost, decide how/whether you will respond, based on your attitudes about him or her, Supervising Investigator</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus far, the researcher has addressed the components necessary to assess an organization’s readiness for systematically sharing its knowledge assets. While it is tempting to skip directly to the implementation phase, the most essential phase of any management strategy is planning, hence the ages old maxim: “failing to plan is planning to fail.” Therefore, in Chapter 5, the researcher has proposed a basic framework for an OCCI Knowledge Sharing Readiness Protocol which is built upon the following pillars:

1. Employee attitudes predict knowledge sharing intentions, but employee motivations do not significantly influence employee attitudes.

2. Reciprocal benefits significantly influence employee attitude and employee intentions toward knowledge sharing.
3. Reciprocal benefits significantly influence employee attitudes toward knowledge sharing. So, if employees believe they will be rewarded for knowledge sharing, this implies they trust the organization.

4. Employee attitudes toward KS and employee intentions regarding KS were strongly associated with the intrinsic motivation to share knowledge.

All research findings were consistent with the Lin (2015) model. This suggests OCCI investigators exhibit a high likelihood of readiness for knowledge sharing based upon the given constructs.

**Limitations and Future Research**

- The most significant limitation of this study was the sample size. Though the findings of this model were consistent with knowledge sharing readiness, it would be ideal for all OCCI investigators to take the survey.

- It would be intriguing to test how employees of public sector organizations compare to employees in for-profit organizations, given the dynamic introduced by the public service motivation theory.
Chapter 5: Summary Conclusions, and Recommendations

Overview

Despite the varying definitions of knowledge management, the theme common in contemporary literature is that knowledge, especially the “know how” and “know why” knowledge that resides in the minds of knowledge workers is an organization’s most valuable asset (Liebowitz, 1999). The findings of this study confirmed knowledge sharing is a multi-level phenomenon that incorporates several theoretical human behavior and organizational change constructs, including social cognitive theory, motivation theory, social exchange theory, social capital theory, expectancy theory, public service motivation theory, and the theory of reasoned action.

Summary

The survey of OCCI investigators confirmed many of the findings and conclusions observed during the literature review. Although a quantitative research method may not have been appropriate in this case study of a small public sector organization, with closer adherence to the theoretical model, the findings would likely have been more reliable. Nonetheless, this researcher is comfortable recommending the framework below as a knowledge sharing readiness program to improve the likelihood of success should OCCI’s leadership determine at some point in the future that it would like to pursue a knowledge sharing or holistic knowledge management strategy.

Knowledge sharing transforms individual knowledge into group or organizational knowledge, therefore, it is only fitting that the Office of the Citizen Complaint Investigations (OCCI) be heavily invested in effectively identifying and sharing its knowledge assets. The goal is to make knowledge sharing and re-use “just the way you work.” In order for this to happen,
the organization has to focus on building knowledge management principles into everything the workers do as a part of their daily tasks. Leadership should adopt it as part of the organization’s mission and values statements, embed it in the work product by incorporating into the strategic plan for human capital management, and promulgate it as an essential component of the communication climate.

**Conclusions**

An organizational culture that emphasizes trust and displays a commitment to using its knowledge resources effectively for the benefit of the entire organization, including the workers, is conducive to knowledge sharing. The importance of organizational culture lies in its ability to have a direct effect on employees' knowledge sharing behavior as well as an indirect effect through influencing managers' attitudes toward knowledge sharing.

1st. **What are the socio-behavioral enablers and barriers of a knowledge sharing culture?**

Based on the case studies and theoretical frameworks discussed in the literature review, all of the socio-behavioral attributes, attitudes, and behaviors are considered enablers or barriers (when inverted), but only four are considered predictors or determinants of individual knowledge sharing intentions. The four predictors or determinants are addressed in the following question.

2nd. **What are the socio-behavioral predictors or determinants of a knowledge sharing culture?**

The researcher did not test the entire universe of possibilities due to the limited scope of this study. The researcher tested motivation, rewards, self-enjoyment, attitudes toward knowledge sharing, and communication climate.
3rd. How can the socio-behavioral predictors or determinants of a knowledge sharing culture be incorporated into a methodology that an organization’s readiness for a knowledge sharing system?

The researcher adapted the Lin (2007) study, Effects of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation on employee knowledge sharing intentions. The study combined the theory of reasoned action (TRA) of Fishbein and Ajzen which posited “individual beliefs and attitudes explain most human behaviors. TRA has been found useful in predicting a wide range of behaviors, including behavioral intentions and actual behavior in social psychology” (p. 22). The researcher used a quantitative research method, a survey designed to test five constructs including, expected organizational rewards (OR), reciprocal benefits (RB), enjoyment in helping others (EH), attitudes toward knowledge sharing (AT), and knowledge sharing intentions (IN). The five constructs were represented by the following five research questions.

4th. What is the theoretical framework for a knowledge sharing readiness program should OCCI later choose to pursue a holistic knowledge sharing or knowledge management system?

Based on the results from question #3, a knowledge sharing readiness program would incorporate the following general principles:

i. Organizational rewards would not be considered as a primary knowledge sharing motivator. At best, it may serve as a temporary or periodical incentive.

ii. Active participation from all investigators at every stage of the planning process.
iii. Supervising investigators would have an active and ongoing role in coaching and promoting employees and assuring them that their contributions to the knowledge sharing priorities of the organization are valued by the organization.

Recommendations

An environment where an individual’s knowledge is valued and rewarded and a culture that encourages employees to share it is critical to the success of strategic, systemic knowledge sharing. The need to actively and consistently promote knowledge management to employees should not be underestimated. To change the attitude and behavior of the people and reduce barriers, a knowledge sharing culture, can be built upon the following framework:

A. Raising awareness of the benefits of knowledge sharing. Staff and managers should be aware of the changes and advantages that KM can bring to them and organization. They must understand than not only is knowledge power, but sharing knowledge is also power.

B. Develop high levels of affective commitment. Without organizational commitment, “the most creative and sophisticated plans and programs of top managers don’t seem to get far. With it, the most modest plan and the most straightforward programs seem to come out well” (Albrecht 1999, p.173).

i. Building an environment of trust. People tend to share knowledge when they know each other. The level of trust has direct bearing on knowledge sharing. The more trust that exists, the more people are willing to share.

C. Encourage more opportunities for open (two-way) communication. Successful teams get together on a regular basis to update each other on recent events and lessons
learned and go over upcoming activities. It is important to strike a balance between
the team members’ need for information and the time invested in such meetings.
Regular team or department meetings should not become too long and can be at times
just a short check-in. It is good practice to prepare a brief agenda for the meeting and
send out any supporting materials in advance to ensure that all salient

D. Developing leaders who foster sharing, as role model. A champion is needed to KM
implementation.

E. Establish a formal rewards and recognition system for knowledge sharing. Employees
must be rewarded and recognized, not only for sharing their knowledge with others,
but also for being willing to use others’ knowledge. Provide adequate incentive
programs to motivate knowledge contributors to share their knowledge. These
programs can focus on extrinsic rewards, such as better work assignment, promotion
incentive, salary incentive, bonus incentive, or job security. This can be accomplished
by:

   i. Acknowledging the contributor of ideas, knowledge, and time by linking
      this to their semi and annual performance evaluation, promotion, and pay.
   ii. Providing special recognition to volunteers, change agents, and role model
        and rewarding them.
   iii. Celebrating success stories and propagating tales of savings and
        contributions in order to gain acceptance among employees and engage
        them in further participation.

F. Institutionalize human capital management practices that encourage an internal
knowledge-sharing culture. Davenport and Prusak (1998, 88) provide an interesting
answer to how organizations can transfer knowledge effectively. “The short answer, and the best one, is: hire smart people and let them talk to one another. Unfortunately, the second part of this advice is the more difficult to put into practice.”

i. Making knowledge sharing a job requirement.

ii. Hiring people with an ability to share knowledge

G. Incentivize the former sworn OCCI investigators to begin capturing their insights as former professional police officers with supervisory experience if they are anticipating retiring from OCCI.

i. Exit interviews (for retirees and other long time investigators)

**Future Research Suggestions**

- Several limitations of this study include, most significantly, the sample size. Though the findings of this model were consistent with knowledge sharing readiness, it would be ideal for all OCCI investigators to take the survey.

- It would be intriguing to test how employees of public sector organizations compare to employees in for-profit organizations, given the dynamic introduced by the public service motivation theory.
Definition of Terms

*Sworn v. Unsworn:* Law enforcement jobs can be put into two basic groups, sworn and non-sworn. Sworn are those positions which in the performance of their duties carry a firearm, have arrest power, and have a badge. This would include police officers, deputy sheriffs, state troopers, and FBI Agents.
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April 26, 2018

Ms. Marquitta Stanton
581 Newport Street
Detroit, MI 48215

Dear Marquitta:

RE: CMU Master’s Thesis – Knowledge Management in Police Oversight Organizations

I have reviewed your request to interview personnel from the Office of the Chief Investigator (OCI) during a voluntary focus group for your Central Michigan University research project’s case study of a hypothetical civilian police oversight organization. I feel that this project will be beneficial to the Office of the Chief Investigator.

You have my permission to conduct a voluntary focus group composed of OCI personnel on your investigative team. You are authorized to secure a private meeting room at the Detroit Public Safety Headquarters during regular business hours for that purpose.

The following stipulations shall be observed: the name of the organization must be disguised in the project.

I have received your assurance that your project will not be made public with any information that would lead a reasonable person to believe the Office of the Chief Investigator or the Board of Police Commissioners are the subjects of the case study.

If you have any questions regarding this letter of approval, please give me a call at (313) 492-8444.

Sincerely,

\[Signature\]

LAWRENCE AKBAR
Supervising Investigator
Board of Police Commissioners
Office of the Chief Investigator
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Study Title: VALUE-ADDED: A CASE STUDY RESEARCH PROPOSAL FOR KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT IN A CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT ORGANIZATION

Student’s Name and Department: Marquitta Stanton  
Instructor’s Name and Department: Dr. Marc Cloutier, MSA Department

Include contact information for you and your instructor: Marquitta (313) 300-1312  
Dr. Cloutier (210) 670-7003

Introductory Statement

In exchange for lunch on me, would you please assist me with my research project? I am a graduate candidate for the Master of Science in Administration (MSA) degree program with a concentration in Human Resource Management at Central Michigan University. To successfully fulfill my graduation requirements, I am conducting a research project regarding organizational behavior and management. I would like to invite you to participate in a small focus group to share your insights and experiences regarding your current position and your employee. Neither you, nor your place of employment will be identified in the research paper.

If you have any questions, you are welcome to call me or my professor, Dr. Cloutier, at the number above.

What is the purpose of this study? The purpose of the study is to assess whether/how strategic knowledge management could benefit you and your co-workers as you carry out your duties and responsibilities as civilian police oversight investigators and how knowledge management could add value to your organization and the citizens it serves.

What will I do in this study? As part of this focus group, you will spend between 1 and 1.5 hours with me and a small group of your co-workers discussing your experiences and insights. If a second day is required, I will let you know well in advance. Once the group is finalized, we can discuss the time, location, and lunch menu.

You are eligible to participate because you are employed as a civilian police oversight investigator. If you decide to participate in this research project, I will go over this consent form and, as a group, we will go through a series of interview questions about your professional experiences and insights.

If you decide to participate in this research project, I will go over this consent form, ask your permission to tape the interview, and then go through a series of interview questions about the <insert topic>.

If you give permission to be audiotaped, please sign here:______________

Alternative: If you do not wish to be audiotaped, please sign here:______________

How long will it take me to do this? Approximately 1.5 hours

Please initial that you have read and understood this page_______
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Are there any risks of participating in the study? No. The questions are relatively neutral. Nonetheless, they will not be shared with anyone other than Dr. Cloutier and one other CMU MSA program administrator.

What are the benefits of participating in the study? Undying appreciation from yours truly – and a free lunch!

Will anyone know what I do or say in this study (Confidentiality)? Neither you, nor your workplace will ever be identified in the study or the final research paper. Only my professor, Dr. Cloutier, and one other MSA program advisor will view the research paper. I will use false names such as “Worker A” to represent you in the paper.

With your permission, I will audio record the focus group session(s) so I can refer to them later for accuracy. Once I have received credit for completing the project, I will promptly and permanently erase the files.

Any data, notes, or audio files under my control will, if disclosed, only be presented in a manner that does not reveal the subject’s identity, except as may be required by law.

Will I receive any compensation for participation? I will feed you! We can discuss lunch options as a group several days before the focus group.

Is there a different way for me to receive this compensation or the benefits of this study? If you prefer not to enjoy lunch prior to or during the focus group, I am open to treating you to a gift card as a token of my appreciation.

Who can I contact for information about this study? Marquitta (313) 300-1312; Dr. Cloutier (210) 670- 7003

You are free to refuse to participate in this research project or to withdraw your consent and discontinue participation in the project at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. Your participation will not affect your relationship with the institution(s) involved in this research project.

Please note that if you are not satisfied with the manner in which this study is being conducted, you may report (anonymously if you so choose) any complaints to the MSA Program by calling 989-774-6525 or addressing a letter to the MSA Program, Rowe 222, Central Michigan University, Mt. Pleasant, MI 48859.

My signature below indicates that all my questions have been answered. I agree to participate in the project as described above.

_________________________________ Date Signed
Signature of Subject

_________________________________ Subject’s Initials
A copy of this form has been given to me.

_________________________________ Date Signed
Signature of Responsible Investigator
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(RESEARCH REVIEW APPLICATION FOR MSA 685/699 AND EDU 776 CAPSTONE COURSE PROJECT)

Project title: VALUE-ADDED: A CASE STUDY PROPOSAL FOR K-MGMT IN A CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT ORGANIZATION

Student name: MARQUITA STANTON  
Student ID#: 665845

E-mail address: mstanton12@gmail.com  Work phone: (313) 996-2504  Home phone: (313) 300-1312

Concentration: MSA - Human Resources Administration

Instructor’s name: DR. MARK CLOUTIER  Instructor e-mail: cloutimg@cmich.edu

Course: MSA 699  EPN: 2233045  Program center: Dearborn Center

Do you intend to use human subjects or human subjects data in your project? Yes ☑ No ☐
Do you intend to publish your project or present project results outside of your organization? Yes ☐ No ☑

If you answered “yes” on both questions, you are required to complete CITI training and seek approval through CMU’s Institutional Review Board (IRB). The IRB process requires registration in IRBNet and submission of your application materials and supporting documents through IRBNet. Please consult with your instructor and the appropriate program office for assistance.

If you answered “no” to one or both questions, you may use this form for your research review. Read the following directions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-human subject research</th>
<th>Human subjects research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the box below describe the purpose of your research, describe the data you plan to use, and specify the sources of your data (URL, organizational source, etc.).</td>
<td>In the box below describe the purpose of your research; specify the source of your subject pool, the number of subjects, and the selection criteria. Specify your relationship to the subjects (co-worker, supervisor, work in same organization, etc.). Describe your research methodology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required attachments: Permission letter on the organization’s letterhead if the data is not available to the general public.</td>
<td>Required attachments: Copy of survey or interview questions, cover letter or consent form, permission letter on the organization’s letterhead if the subject pool is not selected from a public source such as a phone directory or web page.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The purpose of this case study research proposal will be to initiate discussion and policy development regarding the use of strategic knowledge management by a municipal civilian police oversight investigative agency. There are now more than 150 citizen oversight agencies in the U.S. that have some input into the investigation of citizen complaints. This proposal will discuss the unique, process-centric nature of citizen complaint investigation and seeks to suggest some best practices for designing and implementing a strategic knowledge management system for this large, urban, municipal police department as the case study. The goal of the research will be to suggest a practical KM plan that will support quality improvement, cultivation of a learning culture and investigators’ organizational engagement. The paper will also take a solution-oriented approach to examining obstacles encountered by both public and private sector organizations in their efforts to design and implement KM systems.

This single case study will employ a number of organizational and management theories and gather qualitative data collected from a small (n = 4) focus group of OCCI investigators based on their responses to pre-determined open-ended questions with the goal of contextualizing the quantitative data.
I will be using a pseudonym for the organization's name. The name of the organization will not be published. I still require the organization's permission to utilize its data. This form will not be available to the public.

Directions: Insert digital signature or type in your name as verification/approval of the information presented in this application. Your signature also confirms your commitment to appropriate research ethics while conducting this research. Submit this form and applicable attachments to your instructor. Please wait for written approval prior to beginning data collection.

Student signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

Instructor signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

Program approval signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

(Please type or print your name.)
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Survey Questions are attached to e-mail

Knowledge Management Survey v.3.0 - Questions Only (79 total)

Q1. (CHOOSE THE TOP THREE) How does the organization's management team most commonly share duty-related knowledge/information with you?

Q2. How do you most commonly become aware of updates to laws, policies, or substantive circumstances related to how you determine the findings of your investigations?

Q3. How do you most commonly share new knowledge or information you have acquired with your colleagues?

Q4. There is hardly any duplication of effort in this organization.

Q5. The organization is effective at providing community stakeholders (e.g., the community, the Board, the police department/disciplinary, the mayor and City Council, and complainants) with data/information they can use.

Q6. The organization prioritizes providing data stakeholders (e.g., civil liberties/civil rights organizations, NACOLE/other civilian oversight agencies, social/criminal justice reform organizations, other government agencies, etc.) with data/information about our investigations that they can use.

Q7. In my day to day work, it is easy for me to find the right information when I need it.

Q8. How effective is everyone in the organization at sharing knowledge internally?

Q9. How effectively does your team share knowledge resources with fellow teammates?

Q10. How often do you share knowledge with your with colleagues and management?

Q11. How effectively does senior management share its strategic priorities and other information relating to future directions that will directly impact your work?

Q12. To what extent do you share knowledge with colleagues and management to gain recognition or be rewarded?

Q13. To what extent do you share knowledge with colleagues and management to satisfy your self-fulfillment needs?

Q14. To what extent do you share knowledge with colleagues and management to enhance your career?

Q15. The organization takes steps or dedicates personnel to preventing investigators from having to re-create or re-discover knowledge resources.

Q16. To what extent do you believe your colleagues share knowledge because people who share knowledge are regarded as experts?
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Q17. To what extent do you avoid voluntarily sharing knowledge with your colleagues because you are afraid your job would be in danger if you made a mistake?

Q18. To what extent do you avoid voluntarily sharing knowledge with your colleagues because there is not enough trust that exists within the organization?

Q19. If you know how to help your colleague when you hear her/him ask for help with a knowledge-related question, you are most likely to:

Q20. To what extent do you avoid sharing knowledge with your colleagues?

Q21. To what extent do you avoid voluntarily sharing knowledge due to others not wanting to reciprocate?

Q22. To what extent do you believe your colleagues avoid voluntarily sharing knowledge because not enough trust exists in the organization?

Q23. To what extent do you believe your colleagues avoid voluntarily sharing knowledge because they believe other colleagues will not reciprocate?

Q24. How high a priority do you think the organization places on knowledge sharing?

Q25. How high a priority do you think the organization places on retaining knowledge so it can be used again by investigators and management?

Q26. How high a priority do you think the organization places on updating (or keeping current) re-usable internal knowledge resources (i.e. rosters, phone directories, names and contact information for subject matter experts, etc.)?

Q27. The organization has a work environment that is open, transparent and trusted.

Q28. (CHOOSE TWO) From which of the following would THE ORGANIZATION benefit most?

Q29. (CHOOSE AT LEAST TWO) Over the next three years, which of the following will have the greatest impact on the ability of the organization to retain its knowledge resources? (For example, "know why" knowledge related to whether a fact pattern describes potential misconduct, effective interviewing techniques, etc.)

Q30. (YOU MAY CHOOSE UP TO TWO) Which of the following is/are the biggest cultural barrier(s) to knowledge sharing in the organization?

Q31. The organization's management team incentivizes employees to perform above expectations.

Q32. The organization's management makes me feel my job function is significant to the organization.

Q33. I feel my work directly contributes to the organization's mission.
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Q34. The organization's management makes me feel my work product contributes significantly to the organization's mission.

Q35. I am satisfied with the job-related training my organization offers.

Q36. I am satisfied with my overall compensation.

Q37. I am satisfied with the culture of the organization.

Q38. My colleagues and I have a good working relationship.


Q40. Employees in the organization treat each other with respect.

Q41. The organization's management is dedicated to my professional development.

Q42. I am satisfied with the career advancement opportunities available to me at this organization.

Q43. Employees in the organization take the initiative to help other employees when the need arises.

Q44. The organization's management and employees trust each other.

Q45. I am compensated fairly relative to my local market.

Q46. Employees in this organization are willing to take on new tasks as needed.

Q47. Employees in this organization willingly accept change as a part of working life.

Q48. The organization's management recognizes and values its intellectual assets (including the knowledge of its employees).

Q49. The organization's management regularly reviews the effectiveness of the organization's knowledge management.

Q50. Good knowledge management behavior, like sharing and reusing knowledge, is actively promoted within the organization on a day to day basis.

Q51. Bad knowledge management behavior is actively discouraged within the organization.

Q52. Recording and sharing knowledge is routine and second nature in this organization.

Q53. I am satisfied with the workplace flexibility provided by this organization.

Q54. I am confident the organization's fiscal well-being is stable.

Q55. I am confident I will be recognized for my excellent work.

Q56. I have the chance to use my strengths every day at work.
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Q57. In my work I am always challenged to grow.

Q58. How challenging is your job?

Q59. In a typical week, how often do you feel stressed at or about work?

Q60. How difficult has it been for you to balance your work life and personal life while working for the organization?

Q61. How effectively do you feel your skills have been put to use at the organization?

Q62. How well do the members of your team communicate with each other?

Q63. How helpful has the organization's management been in stimulating your professional growth?

Q64. Overall, how much did you like working here?

Q65. (CHOOSE TWO) From which of the following would YOU benefit most?

Q66. My colleagues are cooperative and helpful when I ask them for information and advice.

Q67. How helpful has your position been in stimulating your professional growth?

Q68. Is the organization's work environment positive, neither positive nor negative, or negative?

Q69. In your opinion, which of the following needs improvement at the organization? Select the top 3.

Q70. How confident are you that you have your debt under control?

Q72. How helpful was the training you received when you started your job?

Q73. How much value do you think management places on the quality of the organization's work product?

Q74. The information and resources I need to do my job effectively are readily available.

Q75. Knowledge sharing is seen as a strength and knowledge hoarding is seen as a weakness in this organization.

Q76. How proud are you of the organization's brand?

Q77. How often do you seriously consider quitting or retiring from your job?

Q78. Was this survey too long?

Q79. (OPTIONAL) Please feel free to leave a brief critique or comment about the survey, how you think the subject matter impacts "the organization," or provide further explanation of your responses, etc. Any feedback related to the study is welcome. (Up to 100 characters)
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Adult Consent Form

Study Title: VALUE-ADDED: A CASE STUDY OF KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT IN A CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT ORGANIZATION

Student’s Name and Department: Marquitta Stanton
Instructor’s Name and Department: Dr. Marc Cloutier, MSA Department

Include contact information for you and your instructor: Marquitta (313) 300-1312
Dr. Cloutier (210) 670-7003

Dear Colleague:

Would you please assist me with my research project by completing an electronic survey? I am a graduate candidate for the Master of Science in Administration (MSA) degree program with a concentration in Human Resource Management at Central Michigan University. To successfully fulfill my graduation requirements, I am conducting a research project concerning organizational behavior and knowledge management. Neither you, nor your place of employment will be identified in the research paper. Your responses will be completely anonymous. I will not know how you responded to any individual question.

If you have any questions, you are welcome to call me or my professor, Dr. Cloutier, at the numbers above.

What is the purpose of this study? The purpose of the study is to assess whether/how strategic knowledge management could benefit you, your co-workers, and/or your organization, as you carry out your duties and responsibilities as a civilian police oversight investigator.

What will I do in this study? You will spend between 18-22 minutes responding to an electronic multiple choice survey. You may complete the survey on your computer, tablet, or cell phone.

You are eligible to participate because you are employed as a civilian police oversight investigator. If you decide to participate in this research project, I will go over this consent form with you.

How long will it take me to do this? 18-22 minutes

Are there any risks of participating in the study? No. You will not be identified and I will not know how you responded to the questions. You name appears only on this consent form. It will not be matched with your survey responses and it will not appear in my research paper. Only Dr. Cloutier and I will be aware your name appears on this consent form.

What are the benefits of participating in the study? Undying appreciation from yours truly – and, maybe, a free lunch!

Please initial that you have read and understood this page: [Signature]
**Will anyone know what I do or say in this study (Confidentiality)?** Neither you nor your workplace will ever be identified in the study or the final research paper. Only my professor, Dr. Cloutier, and I will view this form. Only one other faculty member will view my research paper.

Any data, notes, etc. under my control will only be presented in a manner that does not reveal the subject’s identity, except as may be required by law.

**Will I receive any compensation for participation?** Free lunch!

**Is there a different way for me to receive this compensation or the benefits of this study?** I am open to treating you to a $10 gift card as a token of my appreciation.

**Who can I contact for information about this study?** Marquitta (313) 300-1312; Dr. Cloutier (210) 670-7003

You are free to refuse to participate in this research project or to withdraw your consent and discontinue participation in the project at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. Your participation will not affect your relationship with the institution(s) involved in this research project.

Please note that if you are not satisfied with the manner in which this study is being conducted, you may report (anonymously if you so choose) any complaints to the MSA Program by calling 989-774-6525 or addressing a letter to the MSA Program, Rowe 222, Central Michigan University, Mt. Pleasant, MI 48859.

*My signature below indicates that all my questions have been answered. I agree to participate in the project as described above.*

[Signature of Subject] [6/20/18] [Date Signed]

*A copy of this form has been given to me.* [DC] [Subject’s Initials]

[Signature of Responsible Investigator] [6/21/18] [Date Signed]
Adult Consent Form

Study Title: VALUE-ADDED: A CASE STUDY OF KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT IN A CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT ORGANIZATION

Student’s Name and Department: Marquitta Stanton
Instructor’s Name and Department: Dr. Marc Cloutier, MSA Department

Include contact information for you and your instructor: Marquitta (313) 300-1312
Dr. Cloutier (210) 670-7003

Dear Colleague:

Would you please assist me with my research project by completing an electronic survey? I am a graduate candidate for the Master of Science in Administration (MSA) degree program with a concentration in Human Resource Management at Central Michigan University. To successfully fulfill my graduation requirements, I am conducting a research project concerning organizational behavior and knowledge management. Neither you, nor your place of employment will be identified in the research paper. Your responses will be completely anonymous. I will not know how you responded to any individual question.

If you have any questions, you are welcome to call me or my professor, Dr. Cloutier, at the numbers above.

What is the purpose of this study? The purpose of the study is to assess whether/how strategic knowledge management could benefit you, your co-workers, and/or your organization, as you carry out your duties and responsibilities as a civilian police oversight investigator.

What will I do in this study? You will spend between 18-22 minutes responding to an electronic multiple choice survey. You may complete the survey on your computer, tablet, or cell phone.

You are eligible to participate because you are employed as a civilian police oversight investigator. If you decide to participate in this research project, I will go over this consent form with you.

How long will it take me to do this? 18-22 minutes

Are there any risks of participating in the study? No. You will not be identified and I will not know how you responded to the questions. Your name appears only on this consent form. It will not be matched with your survey responses and it will not appear in my research paper. Only Dr. Cloutier and I will be aware your name appears on this consent form.

What are the benefits of participating in the study? Undying appreciation from yours truly – and, maybe, a free lunch!

Please initial that you have read and understood this page
Will anyone know what I do or say in this study? Neither you nor your workplace will ever be identified in the study or the final research paper. Only my professor, Dr. Cloutier, and I will view this form. Only one other faculty member will view my research paper.

Any data, notes, etc. under my control will only be presented in a manner that does not reveal the subject’s identity, except as may be required by law.

Will I receive any compensation for participation? Free lunch!

Is there a different way for me to receive this compensation or the benefits of this study? I am open to treating you to a $10 gift card as a token of my appreciation.

Who can I contact for information about this study? Marquitta (313) 300-1312; Dr. Cloutier (210) 670-7003

You are free to refuse to participate in this research project or to withdraw your consent and discontinue participation in the project at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. Your participation will not affect your relationship with the institution(s) involved in this research project.

Please note that if you are not satisfied with the manner in which this study is being conducted, you may report (anonymously if you so choose) any complaints to the MSA Program by calling 989-774-6525 or addressing a letter to the MSA Program, Rowe 222, Central Michigan University, Mt. Pleasant, MI 48859.

My signature below indicates that all my questions have been answered. I agree to participate in the project as described above.

Signature of Subject

Date Signed

A copy of this form has been given to me.

Subject’s Initials

Signature of Responsible Investigator

Date Signed
Study Title: VALUE-ADDED: A CASE STUDY OF KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT IN A CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT ORGANIZATION

Student's Name and Department: Marquitta Stanton
Instructor's Name and Department: Dr. Marc Cloutier, MSA Department

Include contact information for you and your instructor: Marquitta (313) 300-1312
Dr. Cloutier (210) 670-7003

Dear Colleague:

Would you please assist me with my research project by completing an electronic survey? I am a graduate candidate for the Master of Science in Administration (MSA) degree program with a concentration in Human Resource Management at Central Michigan University. To successfully fulfill my graduation requirements, I am conducting a research project concerning organizational behavior and knowledge management. Neither you, nor your place of employment will be identified in the research paper. Your responses will be completely anonymous. I will not know how you responded to any individual question.

If you have any questions, you are welcome to call me or my professor, Dr. Cloutier, at the numbers above.

What is the purpose of this study? The purpose of the study is to assess whether/how strategic knowledge management could benefit you, your co-workers, and/or your organization, as you carry out your duties and responsibilities as a civilian police oversight investigator.

What will I do in this study? You will spend between 18-22 minutes responding to an electronic multiple choice survey. You may complete the survey on your computer, tablet, or cell phone.

You are eligible to participate because you are employed as a civilian police oversight investigator. If you decide to participate in this research project, I will go over this consent form with you.

How long will it take me to do this? 18-22 minutes

Are there any risks of participating in the study? No. You will not be identified and I will not know how you responded to the questions. You name appears only on this consent form. It will not be matched with your survey responses and it will not appear in my research paper. Only Dr. Cloutier and I will be aware your name appears on this consent form.

What are the benefits of participating in the study? Undying appreciation from yours truly – and, maybe, a free lunch!

Please initial that you have read and understood this page.
Will anyone know what I do or say in this study (Confidentiality)? Neither you nor your workplace will ever be identified in the study or the final research paper. Only my professor, Dr. Cloutier, and I will view this form. Only one other faculty member will view my research paper.

Any data, notes, etc. under my control will only be presented in a manner that does not reveal the subject's identity, except as may be required by law.

Will I receive any compensation for participation? Free lunch!

Is there a different way for me to receive this compensation or the benefits of this study? I am open to treating you to a $10 gift card as a token of my appreciation.

Who can I contact for information about this study? Marquitta (313) 300-1312; Dr. Cloutier (210) 670-7003

You are free to refuse to participate in this research project or to withdraw your consent and discontinue participation in the project at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. Your participation will not affect your relationship with the institution(s) involved in this research project.

Please note that if you are not satisfied with the manner in which this study is being conducted, you may report (anonymously if you so choose) any complaints to the MSA Program by calling 989-774-6525 or addressing a letter to the MSA Program, Rowe 222, Central Michigan University, Mt. Pleasant, MI 48859.

My signature below indicates that all my questions have been answered. I agree to participate in the project as described above.

Signature of Subject

Date Signed

A copy of this form has been given to me. Subject's Initials

Signature of Responsible Investigator

Date Signed
CMU
CENTRAL MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

Adult Consent Form

Study Title: VALUE-ADDED: A CASE STUDY OF KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT IN A CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT ORGANIZATION

Student's Name and Department: Marquitta Stanton
Instructor's Name and Department: Dr. Marc Cloutier, MSA Department

Include contact information for you and your instructor: Marquitta (313) 300-1312 Dr. Cloutier (210) 670-7003

Dear Colleague:

Would you please assist me with my research project by completing an electronic survey? I am a graduate candidate for the Master of Science in Administration (MSA) degree program with a concentration in Human Resource Management at Central Michigan University. To successfully fulfill my graduation requirements, I am conducting a research project concerning organizational behavior and knowledge management. Neither you, nor your place of employment will be identified in the research paper. Your responses will be completely anonymous. I will not know how you responded to any individual question.

If you have any questions, you are welcome to call me or my professor, Dr. Cloutier, at the numbers above.

What is the purpose of this study? The purpose of the study is to assess whether/how strategic knowledge management could benefit you, your co-workers, and/or your organization, as you carry out your duties and responsibilities as a civilian police oversight investigator.

What will I do in this study? You will spend between 18-22 minutes responding to an electronic multiple choice survey. You may complete the survey on your computer, tablet, or cell phone.

You are eligible to participate because you are employed as a civilian police oversight investigator. If you decide to participate in this research project, I will go over this consent form with you.

How long will it take me to do this? 18-22 minutes

Are there any risks of participating in the study? No. You will not be identified and I will not know how you responded to the questions. Your name appears only on this consent form. It will not be matched with your survey responses and it will not appear in my research paper. Only Dr. Cloutier and I will be aware your name appears on this consent form.

What are the benefits of participating in the study? Undying appreciation from yours truly – and, maybe, a free lunch!

Please initial that you have read and understood this page: [Initial]

[Signature]
Will anyone know what I do or say in this study (Confidentiality)? Neither you nor your workplace will ever be identified in the study or the final research paper. Only my professor, Dr. Cloutier, and I will view this form. Only one other faculty member will view my research paper.

Any data, notes, etc. under my control will only be presented in a manner that does not reveal the subject’s identity, except as may be required by law.

Will I receive any compensation for participation? Free lunch!

Is there a different way for me to receive this compensation or the benefits of this study? I am open to treating you to a $10 gift card as a token of my appreciation.

Who can I contact for information about this study? Marquitta (313) 300-1312; Dr. Cloutier (210) 670-7003

You are free to refuse to participate in this research project or to withdraw your consent and discontinue participation in the project at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. Your participation will not affect your relationship with the institution(s) involved in this research project.

Please note that if you are not satisfied with the manner in which this study is being conducted, you may report (anonymously if you so choose) any complaints to the MSA Program by calling 989-774-6525 or addressing a letter to the MSA Program, Rowe 222, Central Michigan University, Mt. Pleasant, MI 48859.

My signature below indicates that all my questions have been answered. I agree to participate in the project as described above.

Signature of Subject

A copy of this form has been given to me. Subject’s Initials

Signature of Responsible Investigator

Date Signed

Date Signed
CMU
CENTRAL MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

Adult Consent Form

Study Title: VALUE-ADDED: A CASE STUDY OF KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT IN A CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT ORGANIZATION

Student's Name and Department: Marquitta Stanton
Instructor's Name and Department: Dr. Marc Cloutier, MSA Department

Include contact information for you and your instructor: Marquitta (313) 300-1312
Dr. Cloutier (210) 670-7003

Dear Colleague:

Would you please assist me with my research project by completing an electronic survey? I am a graduate candidate for the Master of Science in Administration (MSA) degree program with a concentration in Human Resource Management at Central Michigan University. To successfully fulfill my graduation requirements, I am conducting a research project concerning organizational behavior and knowledge management. Neither you, nor your place of employment will be identified in the research paper. Your responses will be completely anonymous. I will not know how you responded to any individual question.

If you have any questions, you are welcome to call me or my professor, Dr. Cloutier, at the numbers above.

What is the purpose of this study? The purpose of the study is to assess whether/how strategic knowledge management could benefit you, your co-workers, and/or your organization, as you carry out your duties and responsibilities as a civilian police oversight investigator.

What will I do in this study? You will spend between 18-20 minutes responding to an electronic multiple choice survey. You may complete the survey on your computer, tablet, or cell phone.

You are eligible to participate because you are employed as a civilian police oversight investigator. If you decide to participate in this research project, I will go over this consent form with you.

How long will it take me to do this? 18-20 minutes

Are there any risks of participating in the study? No. You will not be identified and I will not know how you responded to the questions. You name appears only on this consent form. It will not be matched with your survey responses and it will not appear in my research paper. Only Dr. Cloutier and I will be aware your name appears on this consent form.

What are the benefits of participating in the study? Undying appreciation from yours truly – and, maybe, a free lunch!

Please initial that you have read and understood this page: [Signature]

[Signature]
Will anyone know what I do or say in this study (Confidentiality)? Neither you nor your workplace will ever be identified in the study or the final research paper. Only my professor, Dr. Cloutier, and I will view this form. Only one other faculty member will view my research paper.

Any data, notes, etc. under my control will only be presented in a manner that does not reveal the subject's identity, except as may be required by law.

Will I receive any compensation for participation? Free lunch!

Is there a different way for me to receive this compensation or the benefits of this study? I am open to treating you to a $10 gift card as a token of my appreciation.

Who can I contact for information about this study? Marquitta (313) 300-1312; Dr. Cloutier (210) 670-7003

You are free to refuse to participate in this research project or to withdraw your consent and discontinue participation in the project at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. Your participation will not affect your relationship with the institution(s) involved in this research project.

Please note that if you are not satisfied with the manner in which this study is being conducted, you may report (anonymously if you so choose) any complaints to the MSA Program by calling 989-774-6525 or addressing a letter to the MSA Program, Rowe 222, Central Michigan University, Mt. Pleasant, MI 48859.

My signature below indicates that all my questions have been answered. I agree to participate in the project as described above.

[Signature of Subject]  6/15/18

A copy of this form has been given to me. [Signature of Subject's Initials]  6/15/18

[Signature of Responsible Investigator]  6/15/18

Date Signed
Adult Consent Form

Study Title: VALUE-ADDED: A CASE STUDY OF KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT IN A CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT ORGANIZATION

Student’s Name and Department: Marquitta Stanton
Instructor’s Name and Department: Dr. Marc Cloutier, MSA Department

Include contact information for you and your instructor: Marquitta (313) 300-1312
Dr. Cloutier (210) 670-7003

Dear Colleague:

Would you please assist me with my research project by completing an electronic survey? I am a graduate candidate for the Master of Science in Administration (MSA) degree program with a concentration in Human Resource Management at Central Michigan University. To successfully fulfill my graduation requirements, I am conducting a research project concerning organizational behavior and knowledge management. Neither you, nor your place of employment will be identified in the research paper. Your responses will be completely anonymous. I will not know how you responded to any individual question.

If you have any questions, you are welcome to call me or my professor, Dr. Cloutier, at the numbers above.

What is the purpose of this study? The purpose of the study is to assess whether/how strategic knowledge management could benefit you, your co-workers, and/or your organization, as you carry out your duties and responsibilities as a civilian police oversight investigator.

What will I do in this study? You will spend between 18-20 minutes responding to an electronic multiple choice survey. You may complete the survey on your computer, tablet, or cell phone.

You are eligible to participate because you are employed as a civilian police oversight investigator. If you decide to participate in this research project, I will go over this consent form with you.

How long will it take me to do this? 18-20 minutes

Are there any risks of participating in the study? No. You will not be identified and I will not know how you responded to the questions. Your name appears only on this consent form. It will not be matched with your survey responses and it will not appear in my research paper. Only Dr. Cloutier and I will be aware your name appears on this consent form.

What are the benefits of participating in the study? Undying appreciation from yours truly – and, maybe, a free lunch!

Please initial that you have read and understood this page
Will anyone know what I do or say in this study (Confidentiality)? Neither you nor your workplace will ever be identified in the study or the final research paper. Only my professor, Dr. Cloutier, and I will view this form. Only one other faculty member will view my research paper.

Any data, notes, etc. under my control will only be presented in a manner that does not reveal the subject’s identity, except as may be required by law.

Will I receive any compensation for participation? Free lunch!

Is there a different way for me to receive this compensation or the benefits of this study? I am open to treating you to a $10 gift card as a token of my appreciation.

Who can I contact for information about this study? Marquitta (313) 300-1312; Dr. Cloutier (210) 670-7003

You are free to refuse to participate in this research project or to withdraw your consent and discontinue participation in the project at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. Your participation will not affect your relationship with the institution(s) involved in this research project.

Please note that if you are not satisfied with the manner in which this study is being conducted, you may report (anonymously if you so choose) any complaints to the MSA Program by calling 989-774-6525 or addressing a letter to the MSA Program, Rowe 222, Central Michigan University, Mt. Pleasant, MI 48859.

My signature below indicates that all my questions have been answered. I agree to participate in the project as described above.

[Signature of Subject]  [June 15, 2018]

[Signature of Responsible Investigator]  [June 15, 2018]

A copy of this form has been given to me.  [Subject’s Initials]  [June 15, 2018]

Date Signed
Adult Consent Form

Study Title: VALUE-ADDED: A CASE STUDY OF KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT IN A CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT ORGANIZATION

Student's Name and Department: Marquitta Stanton
Instructor's Name and Department: Dr. Marc Cloutier, MSA Department

Include contact information for you and your instructor: Marquitta (313) 300-1312
Dr. Cloutier (210) 670-7003

Dear Colleague:

Would you please assist me with my research project by completing an electronic survey? I am a graduate candidate for the Master of Science in Administration (MSA) degree program with a concentration in Human Resource Management at Central Michigan University. To successfully fulfill my graduation requirements, I am conducting a research project concerning organizational behavior and knowledge management. Neither you, nor your place of employment will be identified in the research paper. Your responses will be completely anonymous. I will not know how you responded to any individual question.

If you have any questions, you are welcome to call me or my professor, Dr. Cloutier, at the numbers above.

What is the purpose of this study? The purpose of the study is to assess whether/how strategic knowledge management could benefit you, your co-workers, and/or your organization, as you carry out your duties and responsibilities as a civilian police oversight investigator.

What will I do in this study? You will spend between 18-22 minutes responding to an electronic multiple choice survey. You may complete the survey on your computer, tablet, or cell phone.

You are eligible to participate because you are employed as a civilian police oversight investigator. If you decide to participate in this research project, I will go over this consent form with you.

How long will it take me to do this? 18-22 minutes

Are there any risks of participating in the study? No. You will not be identified and I will not know how you responded to the questions. Your name appears only on this consent form. It will not be matched with your survey responses and it will not appear in my research paper. Only Dr. Cloutier and I will be aware your name appears on this consent form.

What are the benefits of participating in the study? Undying appreciation from yours truly – and, maybe, a free lunch!

Please initial that you have read and understood this page _LS_
Will anyone know what I do or say in this study (Confidentiality)? Neither you nor your workplace will ever be identified in the study or the final research paper. Only my professor, Dr. Cloutier, and I will view this form. Only one other faculty member will view my research paper.

Any data, notes, etc. under my control will only be presented in a manner that does not reveal the subject’s identity, except as may be required by law.

Will I receive any compensation for participation? Free lunch!

Is there a different way for me to receive this compensation or the benefits of this study? I am open to treating you to a $10 gift card as a token of my appreciation.

Who can I contact for information about this study? Marquitta (313) 300-1312; Dr. Cloutier (210) 670-7003

You are free to refuse to participate in this research project or to withdraw your consent and discontinue participation in the project at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. Your participation will not affect your relationship with the institution(s) involved in this research project.

Please note that if you are not satisfied with the manner in which this study is being conducted, you may report (anonymously if you so choose) any complaints to the MSA Program by calling 989-774-6525 or addressing a letter to the MSA Program, Rowe 222, Central Michigan University, Mt. Pleasant, MI 48859.

My signature below indicates that all my questions have been answered. I agree to participate in the project as described above.

[Signature]

Date Signed

A copy of this form has been given to me.

Subject’s Initials

[Signature]

Date Signed
Study Title: VALUE-ADDED: A CASE STUDY OF KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT IN A CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT ORGANIZATION

Student’s Name and Department: Marquitta Stanton
Instructor’s Name and Department: Dr. Marc Cloutier, MSA Department

Include contact information for you and your instructor: Marquitta (313) 300-1312
Dr. Cloutier (210) 670-7003

Dear Colleague:

Would you please assist me with my research project by completing an electronic survey? I am a graduate candidate for the Master of Science in Administration (MSA) degree program with a concentration in Human Resource Management at Central Michigan University. To successfully fulfill my graduation requirements, I am conducting a research project concerning organizational behavior and knowledge management. Neither you, nor your place of employment will be identified in the research paper. Your responses will be completely anonymous. I will not know how you responded to any individual question.

If you have any questions, you are welcome to call me or my professor, Dr. Cloutier, at the numbers above.

What is the purpose of this study? The purpose of the study is to assess whether/how strategic knowledge management could benefit you, your co-workers, and/or your organization, as you carry out your duties and responsibilities as a civilian police oversight investigator.

What will I do in this study? You will spend between 18-20 minutes responding to an electronic multiple choice survey. You may complete the survey on your computer, tablet, or cell phone.

You are eligible to participate because you are employed as a civilian police oversight investigator. If you decide to participate in this research project, I will go over this consent form with you.

How long will it take me to do this? 18-20 minutes

Are there any risks of participating in the study? No. You will not be identified and I will not know how you responded to the questions. Your name appears only on this consent form. It will not be matched with your survey responses and it will not appear in my research paper. Only Dr. Cloutier and I will be aware your name appears on this consent form.

What are the benefits of participating in the study? Undying appreciation from yours truly – and, maybe, a free lunch!

Please initial that you have read and understood this page: [Signature]
Will anyone know what I do or say in this study (Confidentiality)? Neither you nor your workplace will ever be identified in the study or the final research paper. Only my professor, Dr. Cloutier, and I will view this form. Only one other faculty member will view my research paper.

Any data, notes, etc. under my control will only be presented in a manner that does not reveal the subject’s identity, except as may be required by law.

Will I receive any compensation for participation? Free lunch!

Is there a different way for me to receive this compensation or the benefits of this study? I am open to treating you to a $10 gift card as a token of my appreciation.

Who can I contact for information about this study? Marquitta (313) 300-1312; Dr. Cloutier (210) 670-7003

You are free to refuse to participate in this research project or to withdraw your consent and discontinue participation in the project at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. Your participation will not affect your relationship with the institution(s) involved in this research project.

Please note that if you are not satisfied with the manner in which this study is being conducted, you may report (anonymously if you so choose) any complaints to the MSA Program by calling 989-774-6525 or addressing a letter to the MSA Program, Rowe 222, Central Michigan University, Mt. Pleasant, MI 48859.

My signature below indicates that all my questions have been answered. I agree to participate in the project as described above.

Signature of Subject

A copy of this form has been given to me.

Subject’s Initials

Signature of Responsible Investigator

Date Signed