

Why Communities of Practice (CoP) are ‘Still’ Relevant for the Organizations?

Nikhil Agarwal^{1,*} & Ruchi Agarwal²

¹Institute of Study of Science, Technology and Innovation (ISSTI), School of Social and Political Sciences (SPS), University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK

²University of Edinburgh Business School, University of Edinburgh, UK

*Correspondence: Institute of Study of Science, Technology and Innovation (ISSTI), School of Social and Political Sciences (SPS), University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK. Tel: 44-787-906-1754. E-mail: nikhilagarwal@cantab.net

Received: April 3, 2016 Accepted: May 5, 2016 Online Published: June 29, 2016

doi:10.5430/sass.v3n2p17 URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5430/sass.v3n2p17>

Abstract

There is a continuous scholarly debate on emerging structure of Communities of Practice (CoP) in modern organizations. The understanding of CoP differs among the organizations and so are the benefits. Over the years CoP concept has emerged and the new subsets are introduced such as Communities of Innovation (CoInv), Communities of Participation (CParp) and Communities of Creation (CoC). This paper proposes that CoP should evolve itself, not constructed in the organizations. Authors argue these communities emerged and evolved out of the need for doing something new and relevant in the organization. The paper draws upon existing research to substantiate their case - why communities of practice are still relevant for the organizations? The paper insinuates a practice-based-standpoint supported through semi-structured interviews with ten corporate executives to understand the relevance of CoPs in current environment. Through this research, authors are proposing SKLC (Stakeholder, Learning, Knowledge, Collaboration) framework to comprehend the embryonic construction of CoPs. The framework would describe the way of CoP is understood and explore how CoP stakeholders augment knowledge through learning and collaboration. Further, this paper examines how the companies can use CoP to improve internal communications, improve profitability and align their processes.

Keywords: *communities; knowledge management; social capital; innovation*

1. Understanding Communities of Practice (CoP)

Right after graduating from the engineering school, Kartick joined a leading IT services company in Mumbai with the employee strength of over 15,000 people. He was struggling for the past few weeks to learn a specialize software tool. He was unable to find any support from his team seniors and colleagues, as the technology was fairly new. While sitting in the cafeteria during the afternoon break, he overheard the conversation about the same tool from somebody who perhaps works for another team. He walked over to their table and joined them for the conversation. Prashant, who was leading the discussion on the table, told Kartick about the informal online messaging group on ‘WhatsApp’ (Note 1). Kartick was pleasantly surprise to find over 120 members from his organization on the WhatsApp group who was sharing messages regarding the problems and solutions about the software tool (Note 2).

The communities of practice draws upon the perception of collective learning and group expertise (Coakes, 2004; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, McDermott, & Snyder, 2002). CoP concept is linked to collective expertise of employees working towards creative ideas or innovation (Leonard & Sensiper, 1998). Coakes (2004) argues, communities are one of the supporting organizational forms for innovation. The collective learning of the group can be used as effective tool for problem solving and sustainable organizational innovation. In the last few decades, organizations have changed in shape, size, behavior and needs. Some of the biggest and the fastest growing companies in the world are also the youngest ones (example Google). The new economy respects the knowledgeable

organizations, customers and professionals. Organizations who are able to demonstrate intelligent ways to deal with products, processes and customers are more innovative and more profitable. In the case of Kartick, The continuous quest to provide novel sustainable solutions to customers and acquire and disseminate knowledge has augmented the focus on Communities of Practice (CoP).

Inger (2002, p4) defines CoP as “*Groups of people who share a concern, a set of problems, or a passion about a topic, and who deepen their knowledge and expertise in this area by interacting on an ongoing basis*”. CoP is a group of like-minded people who comes together to share knowledge and learning from each other's experiences. The CoP members are individuals who have identified common solutions and shared good practices/ideas. CoPs are known by different names in organizations such as learning clubs, tech forums or thematic groups. The CoP evolves naturally or can be constituted as part of specific task with the goal of gaining knowledge related to a specific field (Lave & Wenger, 1991). The members of CoP develop themselves personally and professionally through the process of sharing information and experiences. In today's Internet era, CoPs are increasingly organized in an online environment. Software companies are launching new products to facilitate online CoPs or 'hang-out' spaces that allow users to form a more dynamic online community. Online CoPs are useful for organizations and groups whose members are geographically distributed. Other types of CoPs are open access (members of different organization or individuals can join) or closed CoPs (in-company CoP or captive CoP).

2. Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

It is well established in the literature that CoPs are supported by senior management as an encouragement to key employees and for provision of the resources (Saint-Onge & Wallace, 2012). Individuals are putting high stake on the value of learning; they want to enhance their knowledge base for proliferation of their own capacities. CoP provides an opportunity for both the organizations and its members - the fluidity of structure and diversity of experiences. Eckert (2006) captures the relevance of CoP for individuals and organization, he argues, a community of practice is central to many of its participant's identify construction (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2006). Fichter in his recent work examines how innovation communities can be actively supported and managed by steering or influencing their configuration or offering structures and methodological background (Fichter & Beucker, 2012). He argues there is no standard recipe for *managing* (or constructing) innovation community (Fichter & Beucker, 2012); communities change over the period of time, therefore, they should constantly adapt the changing environment (Barton & Drake, 2011; Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2006; Hildreth & Kimble, 2004). For instance, the disruptive technological innovation like RFID (Vail & Agarwal, 2007) have reconstituted the barcoding CoPs into the RFID CoPs in a retail organization (replacing the older, irrelevant CoPs with the new, more current ones). CoP shall be looked as strategic resource that is used to leverage organizations knowledge assets through collaboration and learning; this collective knowledge is called 'knowledge capital' by Saint-Onge (2012). Saint-Onge reasons, this knowledge capital will build the stronger customer relationship and a sustainable competitive advantage (Saint-Onge & Wallace, 2012).

There are scholarly debates on the other emerging subsets of CoP like Community of Participation (CParp), Communities of Innovation (CInov). Most of these subsets are formed to solve an unambiguous problem or to discuss a specific issue. In CParp, the individuals are able to participate in the activity/process/project regardless of his profession. Example of Community of Participation is Toastmaster club, where anybody can participate if he wants to improve his speaking ability. Various CParp are propping up in social media space related to art, music, politics, general interest etc. Community of Innovation (CoI) is dedicated to the encouragement of innovation (Coakes & Smith, 2007). Coakes (2007) claims these specific communities subsets like CoInv are a critical element of the corporate entrepreneurship process (Note 3).

The CoP definitions and benefits varies for individuals, communities and organizations (Millen, Fontaine, & Muller, 2002). Millen et al (2002) identifies the distinct categories of community benefits - individual, community and organizational. For individuals, the benefit is reputational, through raising his/her own profile in the organization by participating in CoPs. CoP also benefits in understanding what others are doing in the organization and employees own personal/professional development. The benefit for the communities is idea creation, free flow of information and providing an opportunity for members to think out of the box. The benefits for organization are more tangible i.e. business outcomes, timely completion of project and new innovations by leveraging community of practices for strategic advantage (Millen et al., 2002; Saint-Onge & Wallace, 2012). However, a few academics link it with only as a social phenomenon and not as Organisational learning tool (Harvey, Cohendet, Simon, & Dubois, 2013; Senge, 2014) and few others emphasize it as a part of learning organization and a kick-start for innovation culture (Harvey

et al., 2013; Jagasia, Baul, & Mallik, 2015). Therefore, value of CoP is still open for debate for corporates and worthy to discuss its relevance from pragmatic point of view (Bolisani & Scarso, 2014).

CoPs are a specific form of intra-Organisational framework and regarded as important structure within modern organizations and based on 'neo-institutionalism' (Greenwood & Hinings, 1996; Whittington, 2003). Institutionalization and deinstitutionalization of institution theory have been discussed community of practice in some previous literature (Kondra & Hurst, 2009; Oliver, 1991; Tolbert & Zucker, 1999). A theoretical framework of neo-institutional theory elaborates "a direct link to the 'communities of practice' approach to workplace knowledge, where legitimate participation within the community entails learning the 'proper speech' of that community" (p120). Therefore, CoP are part of more deinstitutionalization of institution theory following Oliver (1991) work published in the Academy of Management.

3. Methodology

For this inquiry, authors have adopted a qualitative research involving interviews of ten senior executives in corporate mainly in information technology sector. Authors have used creative interviewing as proposed by Douglas, (1985) and interpretive research (Walsham, 1995; 2006) to interview few selected senior executives from diversified organizations. Combination of creative interviewing and interpretive research had assisted in capturing the tacit, non-verbal elements from the interviewee and examining the underpinning statements. The representative sample of the organizations were diverse - banks, educational institutions, IT services companies and startups. The interview questions were sent by email to the individuals, followed by detailed telephonic/Skype/face-to-face discussions. The purpose behind the interviews was to assess the relevance of CoPs in their organizations and to understand the adoption of CoPs among employees. The questions were grouped to study following topics:

- Tools and methods to manage CoPs
- Growth/decline of CoPs in last decade in particular setting
- Adoption of CoPs by organization and employees
- Relevance of CoPs in given organization
- Emergence of new CoP models and practices

The extensive literature review and detailed review supports to observe the practices in the organization. The literature review has thrown several open questions that are worth exploring - How the CoP structure is changing over the years? Do an organization allows their employees to participate in a CoP outside of their own company? How CoPs are changing structure and practices of the organizations? Through the empirical investigation authors have attempted answering these questions and indicated directions for further inquiry.

4. Developing Communities of Practice (CoP)

"A Community of Practice is a unique combination of three fundamental elements: a domain of knowledge, which defines a set of issues, a community of people who care about this domain; and the shared practice that they are developing to be effective in their domain" (Wenger et al., 2002). Does it make good sense for Companies to develop Communities of Practice (CoP) from the top down, so to speak? Or is it better for companies to simply encourage their emergence from the bottom up. No one doubts that CoPs can be highly beneficial to the bottom line of companies in which they flourish. According to Wenger (2002), CoPs are social structure that require 'cultivation' to allow them to emerge and grow. Though organizations could sponsor CoPs, yet, it is responsibility of individuals to strengthen the community by series of activities for sustenance and relevance of practices. For large organizations the motivation for the CoPs to keep the employee engaged, but for the startups it is solving the operational problems through cost effective means. According to PKA, owner of a four-year-old startup:

"Startups prefer to solve their operational problems by encouraging their employees to 'ask' questions in online forums or open-access CoPs. Money savings is one of the reason, I cannot afford expensive advise from professionals, that's why I trust these communities."

In case of startup employees participating in open access CoPs, the new problems and solutions are added to public domain, which eventually help thousand of others who are trying to solve similar problems. The CoP skeleton is different in the large organizations. In organizations like Schlumberger and Caterpillar the incentives of promoting the CoPs are different. One case study describes how Schlumberger built and integrated CoPs into its existing project

team structure, with the result that the CoPs did not have the ability to solve issues and teams became isolated due to an inward focus and then lost the ability to generate new ideas (Note 4). Companies have a vital interest in work practices and often intervene in CoPs in unobtrusive ways that allow CoPs to maintain their autonomy while directing work practice. This approach can be effective in generating new knowledge while advancing the accomplishment of company goals (Hernández-Martí, 2005). However, it does involve some loss of control (Farrell, 2004). CoPs have been demonstrated to be effective in disseminating tacit knowledge in addition to explicit knowledge. Some companies have instituted what has been called “knowledge management” to overcome some of the cultural issues and exert some degree of control over grass-root CoPs and establish key metrics to show business results with varying degrees of success (Coakes, 2004). Other companies have gone further and established CoPs themselves. Caterpillar, for example, after a successful experience with a grass-root CoP, fostered over 3000 CoPs with the result that they have estimated that they have a 200 percent ROI of internal communities and more than 700 percent ROI for its external communities, saving over \$75 million (Powers, 2004).

The CoP can be formal and informal. Many organizations prefer CoPs than other form of action/discussion group because they consider CoPs as ‘live’ container of knowledge (Ray, 2006). The ‘live’ container has its own life; in beginning of the formation - the structure of CoP is fluid and delicate. Members try to assimilate the common grounds to develop levels of participation and provide vigor to the CoP. The CoP is most active in its middle stage once the majority of the members agrees to the core principles and engages in active participation. Wenger (1998) argues, CoPs are very much has life like products or firms; they too have life cycle of their own:

- a. **Potential:** Scattered individuals within the entity face similar situation but they have not formed a shared discussion practice.
- b. **Coalescing:** At this stage, few members come forward to have initial discussion. They identify a common emerging issue and agree on the potential for a structure.
- c. **Maturing:** The member forms the CoP, sets standards, defines clear goals, agenda and develops relationships.
- d. **Active:** This is the most productive stage in life-cycle of CoP. CoP members develops shared practices, do structured discussions and constitute activities.
- e. **Dispersed:** The CoP loses its relevance and no longer active. Though the CoP is used as a repository of knowledge.

It is observed that individuals in the organizations are constantly looking for formal or informal exchanges related to the processes, technology and practices. The major advantage of CoP lies in the flexibility of its structure, newcomers replace the old timers and organization demand forces communities to revise their relationship with the environment (Brown & Duguid, 1991). The newcomers are members with queries and old-timers are those who have either already benefited from the community interactions or they do not find anything innovative anymore in the community exchanges. The cyclic movements of newcomers and older timers keep the community ‘active’ and changing organizations requirements pushes the communities to evolve further w.r.t to environment. The members of one CoP can be members of other communities and discussion groups (Ray, 2006). The participation of a member in a CoP can vary according to his/her own interests. An individual can be a newcomer in one CoP and old-timer in other CoP. According to RG, manager in large IT services company:

“I have seen several technologies comes and go in my 18 years of career in IT and I cannot count how many discussion groups I have participated”

In modern organizations, employees are encouraged to participate in more than one CoPs according to their job profiles and interests.

The wider participation helps in ‘validating the authenticity’ of discussions and establishing credibility of the CoP, said RA, executive in financial services company.

For the individuals, the multiple community participation affords flexibility of knowledge construction. The continuous interactions between members cultivate the positive tension, which in-turn results in-group cohesiveness. In case of open access online CoPs, people from all across the world join the communities for greater interactions. For instance, Oracle Corporation encourages members of its user organizations to engage in discussions using the oracle forums.

5. Why CoPs Are ‘Still’ Relevant?

Many companies have invested substantial time, effort, and money in a community of practice, only to find that after an initial flurry of activity from across the business, participation drops off. There could be several ways to counter that trend including insuring that organizational hierarchies are reduced so that staff can interact more freely with all levels of management. The belief is by flattening the organization is a key element in the success of CoPs and that there is a tendency in organizations to create CoPs that try to maintain existing hierarchies, as opposed to grass-root CoPs that avoid company hierarchies. Localism is another factor in CoP burnout i.e. the dominance of the site that hosts them or where the majority of members reside (McDermott & Consulting, 2004). This can result directly from company involvement in their formation, rather than letting grass-root networking determine the membership.

The proliferation of social media has opened up possibilities for cross-company collaborations. The individuals from different organizations can participate in online forums and communities to facilitate their day jobs. Many firms are not against this ‘soft’ discussion at the public forum also known as open access CoPs (public CoPs). However, certain firms prohibit employees for open access community participation. Firms have developed explicit policies to discourage employees for discussion outside of firm’s domain. RG, manger with large IT services company, highlighted the ‘reputational risk’ of participating in the open access CoPs (public CoPs).

“Our company doesn’t allow users to participate in outside organization CoP (open access CoPs). There are various reasons; first, the competitors will take clues from the interactions and guess the depth of our engagement with client. Second, there is reputational risk – the open interaction will give wrong message to industry, that XYZ company don’t have such trivial understanding. It is dangerous for our business. I have strict policy about ‘no collaboration’ outside the company.”

The general fear among company leadership is about the leakage of confidential information in public domain. Identifying and pointing out specific instances of discussion in open access community can sometimes pose reputational risk.

Capturing knowledge and building up collective intelligence is becoming mantra for large corporations. In the process of capturing knowledge, CoPs are ‘pushed’ towards employees without proper briefing on how to take benefit from them. Schwen and Hara even point to unwilling membership resulting from overenthusiastic management forcing CoP participation, often in company-instituted CoPs. Even in well thought-out designed-CoPs, there is a tendency to abandon them when the initial objective was satisfied, often at a significant unrealized cost (Schwen & Hara, 2003). Constructed social structures in CoPs often cannot be self-sustaining. In fact, badly constructed CoPs have been known to stifle innovation, rather than promote it (Hislop, 2003). Vestal (2003) has developed the “Goldfish Principal” - “With fish food too much or too little leads to sluggishness”. Over-regulation or under-regulation of CoPs by organizations can produce the same result. There is more of a tendency on the part of a constructed CoP to overregulation, and on the part of a grass-roots CoP to under-regulation, although self-regulation emerges due to the self-organizing dynamic of CoPs. One other analogy seems appropriate here, that of the workers guilds from the middle ages (Millen et al., 2002). These were not the equivalent of today’s unions, but were rather the equivalent of professional organizations that existed outside of any particular company. The problem with constructed CoPs is the dominance of one company – one culture. In fact there is a tendency for that one company to micromanage CoPs and stifle them. Organizational performance can be increased even more by a CoP that is not overtly slaved to the organization (Lesser & Storck, 2001). On the other hand, it is important for an organization to recognize the CoP and support it in meaningful ways (Gongla & Rizzuto, 2001); but CoPs should evolve, not be constructed.

6. Stakeholder, Learning, Knowledge, Collaboration (SKLC) Framework for Communities of Practices

It is in best interest of the organizations to facilitate an enabling environment for CoPs to evolve. Organizations must implement a comprehensive strategy with execution plan for success of a CoP. In changing technology landscape, the lifecycle of the CoP is getting shorter than anticipated. On the other hand, the comprehensive strategy implementation is a long and tedious process; it is easier said than done. Using CoP terminology, we want to rename the comprehensive strategy as ‘*comprehensive community engagement strategy*’. The community engagement is part of development of any CoP. Nevertheless, the methodical participation will be beneficial for individual, community and organization. We propose a four-level framework for greater permeation and engagement of CoPs. We call this framework as SLKC (Stakeholder, Learning, Knowledge, and Collaboration).

Table 1. SKLC Framework for Greater Engagement of CoPs

SLKC Framework for CoP	How CoPs can be made relevant today
<u>Stakeholder</u> involvement	CoP should not be limited within organization boundaries. The organization should expand CoP to a larger audience. The larger audience includes employees, customers, suppliers and shareholders.
Collective <u>Learning</u>	The seamless interactions and collective learning between the communities would significantly enhance the capacities for the organization.
Capacity building through <u>Knowledge Capital</u>	The employees should be encouraged to enhance individual capacities through learning, training and interactions.
Cross-Organization <u>Collaboration</u>	In today's fast changing economy, the word competitor is fast replaced by collaborator. The organization should work out mechanism to facilitate cross-organization interactions to encourage collaboration. CoPs could act as bridge for employee-employee collaboration.

The framework proposed can be deployed for systematic process for improving collaboration and organizational growth. CoPs are used as highly effective tools for professional development; organizations use CoPs to improve professional skills and competencies. The direct link between practitioners and communities nourish learning, develop performance and enable them to manage their knowledge needs. CoPs remains relevant as they serve as a continuous learning tool for the interested members.

It [CoPs] helps to fill in the gap in one's knowledge by sharing the wealth of experiences, insights and perspectives of other colleagues from the same field/interest area, pointed SB, senior executive in a leading bank.

Training, talent management and capacity building should not only be responsibility of HR but project managers should equally share the duty. It is the collective responsibility of the project manager and the employee to develop their own capacities for business success. SKLC framework provides easy wide-ranging way to get trained at and provide unique opportunity for employees to share each other experiences.

Capacity building through knowledge capital is how value can be created in new economy for organizations and employees. The knowledge capital can be tacit and explicit (Collins, 2010). Tacit knowledge is deeply rooted in people's life experiences and learning, it is the know-how of how things works or happens - that are implied or indicated but not actually expressed. Explicit knowledge as name suggests is shared knowledge that is documented and communicated (Collins, 2010). It is the aim of the organizations to drive the efforts from tacit knowledge to explicit knowledge (Collins, 2010; Smith, 2001). The well documented, communicated and shared knowledge capital is useful to wider audience in the organizations. Practically speaking, the 'push' towards developing tacit knowledge to explicit knowledge is not always possible in the organizations. That is one of the reason, organizations are vary of critical talent loss; with the critical talent all the tacit knowledge also departs. It is a common perception that it is organizational responsibility for training and development of the employees, which is true to certain extent. However, in new economy employees should build their individual capacities through continuous learning, training and interactions. The developed capacities and learning can be shared with the community that would help organizations in documenting and communicating the knowledge to other stakeholders. CoPs are great places for informal and formal learning and training processes. The businesses and employees have now digested this fact that knowledge has become the most important factor of the economic life (Allee, 2000). An SLKC framework can provide a pervasive capacity building strategy through developing knowledge capital that would serves as a unifying frame for building organizational capability across multiple departments.

Cross-organizational collaboration is a very sensitive subject, due to business sensibilities. It is difficult to cooperate with organizations and share information. Through CoPs among organizations, it is easier to reach out and build the trust among the employees for seamless communication. The organizations should work towards identifying others organizations who would provide support to build the capacities through partnerships. We have seen the traditional methods of driving innovation and operational excellence have failed in new economy. The answer to spur

innovation through sustainable means lies in the cross-organization cooperation. The cross-organizational collaboration would reduce the redundancies in expertise, promotes economies of scale and enable like-minded organizations to compete in global marketplace. A word of caution to the organizations - before jumping on cross-organizational collaboration, they should nurture cross-functional collaboration. For instance, Google has designed work areas and the cafeteria to encourage interactions among employees from different functions. Another aspect of building cross-organizational and cross-functional network is smart usage of social media. The emergence of social networks has strengthened the relevance of CoPs. The social network and CoPs are complimentary to each other; they serve their own unique purposes. Social networks are proponents of social learning and CoPs build knowledge capital.

7. Discussions

Developing Communities of Practices could be a significant investment for the companies. The cost of the developing CoPs can include the participation time for community members, meeting and conference expenses, technology, content publishing and promotional expenses (Millen et al., 2002). The highest cost is the pro-rata salaries of the members participating and managing the CoPs. In most occasions these costs are unidentifiable and untraceable. The organization should not try to “reduce” the cost but to find ways to ensure maximum benefit for individuals, communities and organization itself. With technology intervention, the communities of practices can be transformed the knowledge-building communities (Hoadley & Kilner, 2005). Communities should be used to foster knowledge and to gain strategic leverage through learning environments by fostering deinstitutionalization (Jagasia et al., 2015; Oliver, 1991).

Using butterfly effect analogy, let us try to understand the spread of CoPs and its affect on practices and processes. The butterfly effect is term used in Chaos theory to explain how small changes to unrelated processes can have a seemingly large affect. The term was used by scientist to explain the weather changes in Texas caused by flapping of a butterfly's wing in South America. The tiny influence on one part of the world can cause significant change on the other part of the globe. The butterfly affect analogy fits appropriately in the business world. The globalization has opened up the avenues for the markets, at the same time; small events can have a huge impact on firms' ability. In organizations, CoPs exchanges can have lasting impact on firms' long-term ability. The carefully constituted CoPs can give competitive advantage for a firm and vice versa in case of non-serious CoPs. As argued earlier, the CoPs development & deployment can be strategic, tactical and operational. The strategic dimension of CoP is meant to sense the environment and technology proliferation. Tactical implementation could lead to greater collaboration among teams and people where they talk to each other to share experiences, insights and find meaning together. At operational level, replicating best practices across the company efficiently can lead to save costs and give competitive advantage to the firm.

The discussion thus far has tended toward identifying an organizationally constructed CoP as not as effective as grass roots one. It has been observed that grass roots CoPs tend to evolve and self-organize in positive ways, whereas neglect of social factors put organizationally constructed CoPs on the wrong footing right away. Our recommendations, based upon the research presented here, is that as a general rule, organizations should encourage the formation of CoPs and participation in them, but not overtly develop them and run them. This will insure that the CoP emerges in a natural way without artificial rules and concentrations of memberships that distort the learning process they are created to encourage. It might even turn out that the best practices advocated by the experienced leaders of constructed CoPs are obsolete or not based upon tacit knowledge at all. If this is the case, there is more of a chance to cull the good from the bad in a grass-roots CoP than in a constructed one which tends to propagate the hierarchy of the organization into the CoP. CoPs are emerging as important social structure within the formal organization. The CoP role should not be limited to knowledge sharing or community participation. The CoP should build the knowledge and social capital for sustained professional and personal advantage for its members. The knowledge and social capital has tremendous value for the organization to sustain the long-term competitive advantage.

CoPs should not be left alone in silos. An organization believes that people know how to collaborate but they don't do enough. It is responsibility of the organization to keep a check on the CoPs to keep them alive and encourage people for cross-functional collaboration. Once the employees get comfortable in collaboration and participation, they will ascertain the benefits of active cooperation. Effective teamwork would translate to greater success for employees, their colleagues and the organization. After all, *Teamwork Works.*

References

- Allee, V. (2000). Knowledge networks and communities of practice. *OD Practitioner Online*, 32(4), 1–15.
- Barton, A. C., & Drake, C. (2011). Collective Cultural Relevancy through Hybrid Communities of Practice. *Culture, Relevance, and Schooling: Exploring Uncommon Ground*, 11.
- Bolisani, E., & Scarso, E. (2014). The place of communities of practice in knowledge management studies: a critical review. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 18(2), 366–381. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JKM-07-2013-0277>
- Brown, J. S., & Duguid, P. (1991). Organizational learning and communities-of-practice: Toward a unified view of working, learning, and innovation. *Organization Science*, 2(1), 40–57. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2.1.40>
- Coakes, E. (2004). Knowledge Management—A Primer. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, 14(2004), 406–489.
- Coakes, E., & Smith, P. (2007). Developing communities of innovation by identifying innovation champions. *Learning Organization, The*, 14(1), 74–85. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09696470710718366>
- Collins, H. (2010). *Tacit and explicit knowledge*. University of Chicago Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226113821.001.0001>
- Douglas, J. D. (1985). Creative interviewing. *Sage Library of Social Research*, vol. 159, Sage.
- Eckert, P., & McConnell-Ginet, S. (2006). Communities of practice. *ELL*, 2, 683–685. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/b0-08-044854-2/01276-1>
- Farrell, L. (2004). Workplace education and corporate control in global networks of interaction. *Journal of Education and Work*, 17(4), 479–493. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1363908042000292056>
- Fichter, K., & Beucker, S. (2012). Managing Innovation Communities: Best Practice Reports. In *Innovation Communities* (pp. 227–267). Springer. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-22128-6_4
- Gongla, P., & Rizzuto, C. R. (2001). Evolving communities of practice: IBM Global Services experience. *IBM Systems Journal*, 40(4), 842–862. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1147/sj.404.0842>
- Greenwood, R., & Hinings, C. R. (1996). Understanding radical organizational change: Bringing together the old and the new institutionalism. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(4), 1022–1054.
- Harvey, J.-F., Cohendet, P., Simon, L., & Dubois, L.-E. (2013). Another cog in the machine: Designing communities of practice in professional bureaucracies. *European Management Journal*, 31(1), 27–40. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2012.07.008>
- Hernández-Martí, R. (2005). Forming a visionary core at Schlumberger: Evolving support technology through communities of practice. *Knowledge Management Review*, 7(6), 16–19.
- Hildreth, P. M., & Kimble, C. (2004). *Knowledge networks: Innovation through communities of practice*. Idea Group Publishing. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4018/978-1-59140-200-8>
- Hislop, D. (2003). The complex relations between communities of practice and the implementation of technological innovations. *International Journal of Innovation Management*, 7(02), 163–188. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1142/S1363919603000775>
- Hoadley, C. M., & Kilner, P. G. (2005). Using technology to transform communities of practice into knowledge-building communities. *ACM SIGGROUP Bulletin*, 25(1), 31–40. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/1067699.1067705>
- Jagasia, J., Baul, U., & Mallik, D. (2015). A framework for communities of practice in learning organizations. *Business Perspectives and Research*, 3(1), 1–20. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/2278533714551861>
- Kondra, A. Z., & Hurst, D. C. (2009). Institutional processes of organizational culture. *Culture and Organization*, 15(1), 39–58. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14759550802709541>
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge university press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511815355>
- Leonard, D., & Sensiper, S. (1998). The role of tacit knowledge in group innovation. *California Management Review*, 40(3). <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/41165946>
- Lesser, E. L., & Storck, J. (2001). Communities of practice and organizational performance. *IBM Systems Journal*,

- 40(4), 831–841. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1147/sj.404.0831>
- McDermott, R., & Consulting, M. (2004). How to avoid a mid-life crisis in your CoPs. *Knowledge Management Review*, 7, 10–13.
- Millen, D. R., Fontaine, M. A., & Muller, M. J. (2002). Understanding the benefit and costs of communities of practice. *Communications of the ACM*, 45(4), 69–73. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/505248.505276>
- Oliver, C. (1991). Strategic responses to institutional processes. *Academy of Management Review*, 16(1), 145–179. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AMR.1991.4279002>
- Powers, V. (2004). Virtual communities at Caterpillar foster knowledge sharing. *TAND D*, 58, 40.
- Ray, D. (2006). Life cycle of communities of practice. *Communities of Practice in Information and Knowledge Management (Edited)*, Idea Group, 323–325. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4018/978-1-59140-556-6.ch055>
- Saint-Onge, H., & Wallace, D. (2012). *Leveraging communities of practice for strategic advantage*. Routledge.
- Schwen, T. M., & Hara, N. (2003). Community of practice: a metaphor for online design? *The Information Society*, 19(3), 257–270. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01972240309462>
- Senge, P. M. (2014). *The dance of change: The challenges to sustaining momentum in a learning organization*. Random House LLC.
- Smith, E. A. (2001). The role of tacit and explicit knowledge in the workplace. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 5(4), 311–321. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/13673270110411733>
- Tolbert, P. S., & Zucker, L. G. (1999). The institutionalization of institutional theory. *Studying Organization. Theory & Method*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi, 169–184. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781446218556.n6>
- Vail, P. J., & Agarwal, N. (2007). Disruptive innovation offers far-reaching solutions. *Ieee Potentials*, 26(April), 25–30. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/MP.2007.343054>
- Vestal, W. (2003). Ten traits for a successful community of practice. *KM Review*, 5(6), 6.
- Walsham, G. (1995). Interpretive case studies in IS research: nature and method. *Society*, (1973), 74–81. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/ejis.1995.9>
- Walsham, G. (2006). Doing interpretive research. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 15(3), 320–330. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.ejis.3000589>
- Wenger, E., McDermott, R. A., & Snyder, W. (2002). *Cultivating communities of practice: A guide to managing knowledge*. Harvard Business Press.
- Whittington, R. (2003). The work of strategizing and organizing: for a practice perspective. *Strategic Organization*, 1(1), 117–126. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1476127003001001221>

Notes

Note 1. Whats App is a popular mobile app used on android, blackberry and iphone platform for free messaging over Internet. Whats App users have an option to create a group to broadcast their message to other group members.

Note 2. The case is adopted from the interviews feedback. The names and places are fictional, meant for illustration purpose only.

Note 3. Corporate entrepreneurship is sometimes referred as Intrapreneurship.

Note 4. See 5 case studies in: Darcy Lemons, *Using Communities of Practice to Drive Organizational Performance and Innovation*, (APQC Publication, 2005)