2010

Play as a metaphor in building knowledge flow, social interaction and knowledge-based communities: an enjoyable, interaction and involvement way to improve organisational performance

Yan Qi
University of Wollongong

Recommended Citation

Research Online is the open access institutional repository for the University of Wollongong. For further information contact the UOW Library: research-pubs@uow.edu.au
NOTE

This online version of the thesis may have different page formatting and pagination from the paper copy held in the University of Wollongong Library.

UNIVERSITY OF WOLLONGONG

COPYRIGHT WARNING

You may print or download ONE copy of this document for the purpose of your own research or study. The University does not authorise you to copy, communicate or otherwise make available electronically to any other person any copyright material contained on this site. You are reminded of the following:

Copyright owners are entitled to take legal action against persons who infringe their copyright. A reproduction of material that is protected by copyright may be a copyright infringement. A court may impose penalties and award damages in relation to offences and infringements relating to copyright material. Higher penalties may apply, and higher damages may be awarded, for offences and infringements involving the conversion of material into digital or electronic form.
Play as a Metaphor in Building Knowledge Flow, Social Interaction and Knowledge-based Communities: an Enjoyable, Interaction and Involvement Way to Improve Organisational Performance

A thesis submitted in (partial) fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

from

UNIVERSITY OF WOLLONGONG

By

YAN QI

MIS (Master of Information Systems)
GIS (Graduate Diploma in Information Systems)

INFORMATION SYSTEMS

2010
CERTIFICATION

I, Yan Qi, declare that this thesis, submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award of Doctor of Philosophy, in Information Systems Discipline, University of Wollongong, is wholly my own work unless otherwise referenced or acknowledged. The document has not been submitted for qualifications at any other academic institution.

Signature of Candidate

----------------------------

-----------------------------
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This is a long and exciting journey for developing my doctoral thesis. I enjoyed the support, accompany and guidance of many people.

Firstly, I would like to acknowledge my supervisors Dr Helen Hasan and Dr Joseph Meloche. You encouraged me to think more deeply and creatively then I believed possible. Our discussions always provided me with encouragement and support, which kept me going. I believe that my thinking explored in the nurturing environment that you created.

I also would like to acknowledge my University and Research Student Centre for its assistance and support. I acknowledge the help of those I cannot name, specially the students and the Air China’ staffs who were voluntary involved in this research. You shared your time, feeling and thoughts with me. I have learned from you.

I would like to thank many of my friends who assisted me during my study. I particularly want to say thanks to Miss Sherry Lee, Miss Angela Liu and Miss Louise, Zhu. You always helped me with encouragement and pleasure every time when I was down. Your support was invaluable.

Last, but not least, I wish to thank the support and love of my parents, specially, my mum, you always support me with your smile even through you are suffering the cancer from 2008. I also want to say thanks to my boyfriend, Jonny Mao, did the cooking, shopping and housework at many times. You have all encouraged me with your confidence and love. This thesis could not have been written without you.
PUBLICATIONS

The following publications and conference papers are related to this thesis:

Qi, Y. 2010. "The use of team games to enhance the performance of collaborative work." Paper will be presented in the 17th International Conference on Learning, Hong Kong. (Accepted)


ABSTRACT

Knowledge plays a key role as a source of potential advantage for organisations and, knowledge management provides the means to realise this potential. When the environment is dynamic and complex, it becomes essential for organisations to continually create, store, transfer and apply their past and current knowledge into their products, processes and services for additional value. However, knowledge management is not a simple question of knowledge creation, retention, and transfer; rather, it requires interpretation and organisation of knowledge from multiple perspectives. Therefore, this research brings the concept of play into knowledge management theory and practice in order to give a different and more relevant perspective to the design and implementation of knowledge management initiatives, thereby improving organisational performance.

Play is a human activity that has been widely acknowledged to have significant emotional, social and cognitive benefits, yet its role in organisations has not been comprehensively researched or understood. The aim of this research is to take play seriously in organisations and, to view it as a natural and practical way to engage the knowledgeable workers in knowledge management practices, hence, improving organisational capabilities. The research pursues this aim by examining the question, ‘what are the benefits that play, as practice and as metaphor, can bring to the context of knowledge management?’ To answer this question, the research design involves conducting two case studies. Each of the two case studies involves participants in the purposeful activity of play: the first, an existing simulation training in an organisation, the second, a game that involved the participants in team development.

This research focuses on the improvement, through play activities, of knowledge flows and social interactions, building knowledge-based communities within organisations. The findings of this research indicate that play can be used to explore new ways of building competencies for organisations that leads to the ability to create new knowledge, empowering workers to be adaptable and cooperative. This research provides evidence of the benefits and impact of play in organisations – which cannot be ignored, and, advances the notions that play activities can provide advantages and outcomes not achievable elsewhere. This research establishes a new way to develop...
organisational capabilities for dealing with unexpected problems and unforeseen situations.

This research purpose is achieved by a review of relevant literature and subsequently through the use of a research methodology and approach that allows game players, as knowledgeable workers, to state how they understand play, knowledge management practices and the addition of play into knowledge management practices. Metaphor Theory provides a rich, enduring context for carrying out this research. Q Methodology is used as the primary form of research methodology. Activity Theory is also used to frame the analysis and discussion of the results. The integrated application of the concepts and techniques of Metaphor Theory, Q Methodology and Activity Theory make the methodology used in this research as innovative and meaningful as the findings themselves.
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