

A Study on Knowledge Management of Employees' sloping Vocational Dynamics

Sadhna Chauhan

Research Scholar, Haryana School of Business,
Guru Jambheshwar University of Science & Technology, Hisar-125 001

B.K.Punia

Vice Chancellor, MDU, Rohtak (on Deputation)
Professor & Former Dean, Haryana School of Business & Director, HRD Centre,
Guru Jambheshwar University of Science & Technology, Hisar-125 001.

ABSTRACT

As a consequence of increasing global competition, every organization is trying to find techniques from which they can enrich their own valuation. At present the most vital & modest resource that a business can have is knowledge. One of the most considerable aspects of knowledge is knowledge management amongst the employees of an organization. Increasingly it is well known that the organizations who are developing strategies to create a knowledge based culture will only last for the long run which is clearly evident in IT industry, consulting firms and in medical field. The current research is based on the best practices (knowledge sharing knowledge acquisition knowledge creation and knowledge re use) in knowledge management and scrutinises the relation with respect to individual and institutional factors. The main aim study is to examine the concept of knowledge management and examine the belongings of individual and institutional variables on employees' knowledge management practices in the Indian context. The data has been placid from employees with the help of questionnaire.

Keywords: Knowledge management, Employee, individual, institutional, environment.

Introduction:

The broadly notorious statistic for today's business organization is deeply dependent upon exploiting its resources to meet the business goals. Consequently, in a rapidly growing global economy knowledge alone has become a source of economic advantage. The personnel of any organization, with their knowledge, expertise, and skills, are a valuable source of firms. Organizations, who admirably leverage the knowledge and skills rooted in one's minds will be able to create more value and achieve competitive advantage than the other organizations. Knowledge is an organised combination of concepts, rubrics, processes and information. At one hand for an individual it's his knowledge that leads him to performance and on the other hand it becomes an information for the other individual. Therefore, knowledge can be termed as an evidence, feelings or experiences known and shared by people or group of people.

Knowledge obtainable in the organisations is frequently characterized into two types: knowledge which is explicit and the other one is implicit knowledge. Explicit knowledge is regarded as which can be captured and printed down in documents or databases. The examples of explicit knowledge are company's manual, reports, memos, journals, document and codified books. Implicit knowledge is the knowledge that people carry in their heads, "know-how" typically unwritten. Experiences and expertise gained over time. Insights and observations resulting from discussion and collaboration. Knowledge management is the structured management of an organization's knowledge assets to create value and achieving tactical & intended requirements. It outlays the developments, policies, and systems that can sustain and boost the application, acquisition, creation, and sharing of knowledge. When we see people working in any organisation are unwilling or unable to share their knowledge with others because of self-interests and lack of trust. Knowledge management is an act in regard to competition because knowledge is possessed by organisation and its employees. It is apparent from most of the studies that knowledge is toppling the traditional methods with

respect to globalisation and strategy design. With the changing wind, the base of commercial industries has lifted from natural possessions to intellectual belongings. For an organization, knowledge management is acquiring, organizing, reusing and transferring experience-based knowledge that resides within the organization and making available to others in the business. Organisations who are able to encumber the knowledge rooted in their business would definitely seem to own the forthcoming events. Therefore, knowledge management (KM) symbolises a strong bond to organizational success and strategy. It contains the organization of knowledge which is useful for business and creates value for the competitive advantage. Now a days it becomes very important for organizations to control the participation and involvement of employees through knowledge management. We can define knowledge management as: A multitasking approach to achieving organisational objectives by making the best use of knowledge. Knowledge management is the art of creating profitable value from intangible assets

Therefore it is not a destination but it paves way for future implication and innovation. The concept of knowledge management in organisations and its relation to employees has enlarged in the new era which can be frequently perceive by the progression in the number of experts, literatures, notions which all emphasize the value of knowledge embedded in one's job, and how business can get an advantage from knowledge based workers. Certainly, organisations who detach knowledge management from their business and employees trailing from inexpensive advantage. In response, many managers and management thinkers have proclaimed an era of knowledge management. This has compelled researchers, practitioners to look for the new and upcoming opportunities in this field. The present study lies on the fact of individual and institutional differences with respect to knowledge management practices.

Literature Review knowledge management:

Knowledge management, which has been materialised as a cognisant discipline seem to be somewhere between five and fifteen years old. The

progression has come out from the intellectual thinking of academics and pioneers such as Drucker (1970) Sveiby (1980) and Nonaka and Takeuchi in the (1990). The word Knowledge management here can be defined as “the competences through which individuals working in an organisation capture the knowledge which is precarious to them, persistently improve their knowledge, and make it accessible in the most effective manner for those people who are lagging behind, which further can be exploit creatively to supplement new values in their routine decisive work. When Globalisation emerged, it fetched new possibilities and increased competition for the organisations. Duffy (1999) demarcated knowledge management as “the identification of organisational critical knowledge, its incessant growth and effective application to achieve objectives”. In organizations knowledge management initiatives primarily aimed to build high organizational intelligence and achieving enhanced performance and superior levels of productivity. Damodaran and Olphart (2000) mentioned that due to rapid technological evolution over the last decade has made knowledge-based systems (including information systems, expert systems, organizational memory systems, and other advanced information technology solutions) an imperative part of every organization’s effort to manage its knowledge assets effectively. Maertensson (2000) discussed KM as a management tool which is desirable for organisation’s survival and to maintain its competitive strength. It act as an information handling tool through collecting the obtainable information, storing information, making information available and then use the information. Knowledge management also preferred as a strategic tool for the organisations by the means of communication, sharing of knowledge, creation of new approaches and evaluation of the system. Nielsen (2006) pointed how we can get the understanding of dynamic capabilities by using KM activities like knowledge creation, acquisition, capture, assembly, sharing, integration, leverage, and exploitation. These activities are assembled into the three dynamic capabilities of knowledge progress, knowledge combination, and knowledge application. In the organisation dynamic capabilities plays a role to create drifts within and from the organisation knowledge which further helps in

creation of value in the organisation. The senior personnel and managers should make effort in order to make a balance between KM activities as well as dynamic capabilities. Gao, Li and Clarke (2008) recited the meaning of knowledge management (KM) in business organisations starting from managing the activities of knowledge workers, which further achieved through facilitating, motivating, leading, and supporting knowledge workers then fostering a suitable working environment. Singh and Soltani (2010) investigated how we can make aware people regarding KM and its implementation through principles and practices among the Indian information Technology (IT) companies. The study publicised that individuals are not evidently rewarded for knowledge sharing. So, if we want to achieve business goals KM practices is to be given importance in the performance appraisal system so that its profits can be distributed throughout the organisation.

Arora (2011) studied the effect of implementation of KM in public sector in Indian industry. She concluded that public sector is lagging behind while implementation of KM programme but if it is successfully applied it can generate unexpected outcomes like in private sector resulting in better, improved and more consistent public service quality, more accessible services associated with customer preferences, more streamlined and efficient customer service process, relief to the skilled personnel from routine customer service work so, it helps in enabling them to focus on more value-added activities, It also gives opportunity to outsource specific customer service functions. KM has to be considered an important building block in the improvement of public services.

OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY

The key objective of this research was to investigate the knowledge management of the employees according to vocational environment. Vocational environment here include the factors like type of the organisation, category of organisation and total work experience. The accompanying objectives which contributed to the prime objective have been given as under:

- 1 To study the difference in employees' knowledge management and its dimensions according to vocational environment.
- 2 To examine the relationship between the dimensions of knowledge management and vocational environment factors.

In this study a descriptive-cum- exploratory research design has been followed and the study is based upon primary data collected through a well-structured questionnaire that measured the overall knowledge management vis-à-vis its dimensions consists of 25 statements and characterise four dimensions of knowledge management based on factor analysis i.e. organisation, acquisition, creation, and re use. The data has been collected with a mix of simple random and purposive sampling techniques from 429 employees which consist of 309 male and 120 female respondents from different organisations as detailed in Table-1. Discriminating respondents on the basis of type of the organisations and category of the organisations, 154 respondents were from public organisations and 275 from private organisations while 228 respondents were from Indian organisations and 201 respondents were from multinational organisations. On the basis of total work experience, 210 respondents were found having work experience below 5 years, 131 respondents had 6-10 years of work experience and 88 respondents had the experience in the range above 10 years.

Collected data was analysed by applying relevant statistical techniques like mean score and standard deviation t-test and F-test to determine whether significant difference exists among the level of knowledge management according to professional environment of employees. Correlation analysis is done in order to determine the relationship between the aspects of employees like of their organisations and level of knowledge management.

Demographics		Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Age	Below 25	135	31.5	31.5
	25-34	196	45.7	77.2
	Above 34	98	22.8	100.0
	Total	429	100.0	
Gender	Male	309	72	72.0
	Female	120	28.0	100.0
	Total	429	100.0	
Type of the organization	Public	154	35.9	35.9
	Private	275	64.1	100.0
	Total	429	100.0	
Category of the organization	Indian	228	53.1	53.1
	Multinational	201	46.9	100.0
	Total	429	100.0	
Work experience	Below 5	210	49.0	49.0
	6-10 years	131	30.5	79.5
	Above 10 years	88	20.5	100.0
	Total	429	100.0	

Table1: Respondent profile sheet

Statistical Analysis and Results

The study of individual differences is of utmost importance as it helps to categorize different sets of employee together. Now these categorized groups could be subjected to different treatment depending on their needs and aspirations. Here also employees are categorized on the basis of gender, type of the organisation category of the organisation and experience. A brief description of gender based knowledge management is given herewith.

Dimensions	Mean (Gender)		T value	Significant*
	Male	Female		
Organizing	3.91	4.02	2.3	.022
Acquisition	3.82	3.80	.329	.742
Creation	3.92	3.94	.459	.646*
Reuse	3.51	3.58	1.37	.172
Overall KM	3.79	3.84	1.19	.233*

Table2: Gender based description of variables of Knowledge management.

Table 2 explains the differences among male and female employees. Overall knowledge management of male employees (mean=3.79) is slightly lower than that of female employees (mean=3.84). The corresponding T value and significance value states that the differences are significant. Present study highlights deeper dimensions of gender based differences. Although variation is little significant but still, it exists. The table suggests that the differences may be due to variations among the constructs of the employee management. Gender based differences are significant for knowledge creation practices i.e. career development, Work-life balance and Workplace wellbeing.

Dimensions	Mean (Type of the Organisation)		T value	Significant*
	Public	Private		
Organizing	3.97	3.93	.86	.389
Acquisition	3.97	3.73	4.83	.000*
Creation	4.04	3.85	4.13	.000*
Reuse	3.47	3.57	2.13	.033*
Overall KM	3.86	3.77	2.61	.009*

Table3: Type of the organisation based description of variables of Knowledge management

Table 3 explains the description of variables of Knowledge management based upon type of the organisation. Overall knowledge management of public organisations (mean=3.86) is slightly higher than that of private organisations (mean=3.77). The corresponding T value and significance value states that the differences are significant.

Dimensions	Mean (Category of the Organisation)		T value	Significant*
	Indian	Multinational		
Organizing	3.91	3.98	1.64	.101
Acquisition	3.78	3.86	1.59	.110
Creation	3.88	3.97	2.05	.040*
Reuse	3.50	3.57	1.45	.146*
Overall KM	3.77	3.84	2.25	.025*

Table4: Category of the organisation based description of variables of Knowledge management

Table 4 explains the description of variables of Knowledge management based upon category of the organisation. Overall knowledge management of Indian organisations (mean=3.77) is slightly lower than that of multinational organisations (mean=3.84). The corresponding T value and significance value states that the differences are significant. On the basis of mean score this results clearly shows that employees working in Indian organisations are less involved in knowledge management practices as compared to the employees working in multinational organisations.

Dimensions	Mean (Exp. of the employees)			F value	Significant*
	>5	5-10	10>		
Organisation	3.95	3.87	4.01	3.05	.049
Acquisition	3.75	3.87	3.86	3.17	.043
Creation	3.87	3.93	3.91	.643	.526*
Reuse	3.56	3.57	3.45	2.346	.098*
Overall KM	3.78	3.81	3.81	.282	.755

Table5: Experience based description of variables of Knowledge management

Table 5 explains the description of variables of Knowledge management based upon experience of the employees. Significance value of overall knowledge management comes out to be .755 (more than 0.05), it means experience of the employees doesn't play a significant role in determining employees' knowledge management.

Table-6: Correlation between Employees' professional environment factors and knowledge management

Correlations		GE	TO	CO	WE	OG	AQ	CS
OG	PC	.107	-.042	.080	.001			
	Sig.	.027	.389	.098	.980			
AQ.	PC	.016	-.228	.077	.266	.402		
	Sig.	.743.	.000	.110	.000	.000		
CS	PC	.026	-.193	.107	.204.	.430	.530	
	Sig.	.598	.000	.027	.000	.000	.000	
RS	PC	.067	.103	.070	-.159	.517	.179	.417
	Sig.	.167	-.033	.146	.001	.000	.000	.000

Note: OG.= organizing, AQ.= Acquisition, CS.= Creation and Sharing, RS.= Reuse, **GE**= Gender, **TO**= Type of the organisation, **CO**= Category of the Organisation, **WE**= Total Work Experience, **IT**

can be gauged from the Table-6 the PC value and significant value of .000 signifies the extent of relationship which means that through the independent and dependent variable are correlated to each other.

This part is related with the correlation analysis between knowledge management practices and employees' vocational factors. Table-6 portrays the correlation between dimensions of knowledge management and vocational factors of employees working in the organizations. After deep analysis of the data collected from the sample of 429 respondents, the 'Pearson correlation' between organizing and gender comes out to be positive i.e. .107 and the significance value comes out to be 0.027, it means there is a positive and significant relationship between organization and gender of the employees. The correlation value between organizing and type of the organization comes out to be negative i.e. -0.042 and significance value comes out to be .389 which implies that organizing and type of the organization are negatively and not significantly related with each other. The correlation value based upon category of the organization and work experience comes out be .080 and .001 and significant value comes out .098 and .980 with respect to organizing i.e. there is no significant correlation found in above mentioned two dimensions of vocational factors of employees. 'Pearson correlation' between acquisition and gender comes out to be .016 and significant value is .743 which means there is no significant correlation between knowledge acquisition and gender of the employees. The correlation value between acquisition and type of the organization comes out to be negative i.e. -0.228 and significance value comes out to be .000 which implies that organizing and type of the organization are negatively and significantly related with each other. The correlation value between acquisition and category of the organization comes out .077 and significance value is .110 i. e. there is no significance association. The correlation value based upon work experience and organizing with respect to acquisition is .266 and .402 and significance value is .000 and .000 respectively i. e. there is positive correlation between acquisition and organizing and acquisition and work experience of the employees.

Further, the correlation value between creation and sharing and gender of the employees is .026 and significance value is .598 which stands for no association between these two variables. The correlation value based upon type of the organization and category of the organization is -.193 and .107 and significance value is .000 and .027 respectively in regard to creation and sharing which bestows that there is negative and significant correlation between creation and sharing and type of the organization and later one stands for positive and significant association between creation and sharing and category of the organization. The correlation value based upon work experience, organizing and acquisition arises .204, .430 and .530 and significance value is .000, .000 and .000 in each case which indicates that there is positive and significant correlation in these variables of knowledge management and vocational factors of employees. In case of knowledge re use and gender of the employees the correlation value is .067 and significance value is .67 that is there is no correlation between these two variables.

The correlation value between knowledge re use and type of the organization is .103 and significance value is .033 which stands out for a positive and significant association. Next, when we look upon the correlation value and significance value of knowledge reuse and category of the organization it is .070 and .146 respectively which stands out for no association between these two variables. The correlation value based upon the organizing, acquisition and creation & sharing is .517, .179 and .417 and significance value comes out .000, .000 and .000 respectively which indicates a positive and significance correlation between these variables. Lastly, the correlation value of knowledge re use and work experience is -.159 and significance value is .001 which indicates there is negative and significant correlation between knowledge re use and work experience of the employees.

Conclusion and Implications

The findings of this study, while not being great in their amount, do contribute to our understanding of knowledge management. The contribution is in pointing out several concepts that need further attention in future researches as gender is the

particular factor which showed contrary results through different statistical tests. There is definitely a need for more researches on this construct in its relationship to knowledge management in a variety of personal and professional environment. This study also indicated that employees of multinational organisations are more promised in adopting knowledge management practices rather than Indian organisations.

The value of the paper lies in representing a systematic and practically important difference in knowledge management of employees on their work place and according to their vocational environment.

Organisations who try to promote appropriate knowledge management practices must be concerned with the professional factors like nature of the organisational, and openness to experience. They should also use intervention strategies to influence employees' pre-training behaviour to change their attitude.

References:

- Ahmad, H., Sharomb ,N. and Abdullah, C.S.(2005). "Knowledge Sharing Behaviour in the Public Sector: the Business Process Management Perspectives", *Information Resources Management Journal*, Vol. 15, No. 2, pp. 14-21.
- Alam, S.S., Abdullah, Z. ,Ishak, A. N. and Zain, M.Z. (2009). "Assessing Knowledge Sharing Behaviour among Employees in SMEs: An Empirical Study", *International Business Research*, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 115-122.
- Argote, L., Ingram, P., Levine, J.M., and Moreland, R.L. (2000). "Knowledge Transfer in Organizations: Learning from the Experience of Others," *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 82, No. 1, pp. 1-8.
- Arora, E. (2011). "Knowledge Management in Public Sector", *Researchers World-Journal of Art and Science*, Vol. 2, No.1, pp. 1-7.
- Arthur, J. and Kim, O.D., (2005). "Gain Sharing and Knowledge Sharing: The Effects of Labour Management Corporation", *International Journal of Human Resource Management*. Vol.19, No.1, pp. 1564-1582.
- Bakhuisen, N. (2012). *Knowledge Sharing using Social Media in the Workplace: A chance to Expand the Organizations Memory, Utilizes Weak Ties, and Share Tacit Information*, Amsterdam: VU University, (Unpublished Master's thesis).
- Bhattacharya, I. and Sharma, K. (2007). "India in the Knowledge Economy – An Electronic Paradigm", *International Journal of Educational Management*, Vol.

- Birkinshaw, J. (2001). "Why is Knowledge Management So Difficult", *Business Strategy Review*, Vol. 12, No.1, pp. 11-18.
- Bohn, R. (2000). "Stop Fighting Fires". *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 78, No. 17 pp. 83-91.
- Call, D. (2005), "Knowledge Management – Not Rocket Science", *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 9, No. 2, pp. 19-30.
- Cheng, C.M., and Chen, L.J. (2007). "A Study on the Knowledge Sharing of Health Technology for Technological College Students' Mobile Learning," *International Journal of Education and Information Technologies* Vol.1, No. 1, pp. 24-29
- Chennamaneni, A. (2006). *Determinants of Knowledge Sharing Behaviours: Developing and Testing an Integrated Theoretical Model*, The University of Texas: Arlington. (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation).
- Christensen, H.P. (2007). "Knowledge Sharing: Moving away from the Obsession with Best Practices", *Journal of Knowledge Management*", Vol. 11, No. 1, pp. 36-47.
- Damodaran, L. and Olphert, W. (2000). "Barriers and Facilitators to the Use of Knowledge Management Systems", *Behavior and Information Technology*, Vol.19, No.6, pp. 405-413.
- Duffy, J. (1999). "Harvesting experience: reaping the benefits of knowledge", *Kansas: ARMA International*, Vol.5, No.2, pp.121-14
- Fullan, M. (2002). "The Role of Leadership in the Promotion of Knowledge Management in Schools", *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practices*, Vol. 8, No. 3-4, pp. 409-419.
- Gao, F., Li, M. and Clarke, S. (2008). "Knowledge, Management and Knowledge Management in Business Operations", *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 12, No. 2, pp. 3-17.
- Ghosh, M., Ghosh, I. (2009). "ICT and Information Strategies for a Knowledge Economy: the Indian Experience", *Electronic Library and Information Systems*, Vol.43, No. 2, pp. 187-201.
- Goel, K.A., Rana, S. G. and Rastogi, R. (2010). "Knowledge Management Implementation in NTPC: an Indian PSU", *Management Decision*, Vol.48, No. 3, pp. 383-395.
- Gupta, B. (2008). "Role of Personality in Knowledge Sharing and Knowledge Acquisition Behaviour" *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*,

- Guptara, P. (1999). "Why Knowledge Management Fails: How to Avoid the Common Pitfalls", *Knowledge Management Review*, Vol. 2, No. 9, pp. 26-29.
- Hakim, A. Y. A. L. and Hassan, S. (2011). "The Role of Middle Managers in Knowledge Management Implementation for Innovation and Enhancement", *International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology*, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 86-94.
- Javier, D.M. and Guadamillas, F. (2011). "Organizational Factors to Support Knowledge Management and Innovation" *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 15, No. 6, pp. 890-914.
- Kwakye, O. E. and Nor, M.K., (2011). "Individual Factors and Knowledge Sharing", *American Journal of Economics and Business Administration*, Vol. 3, No.1, pp. 166-72.
- Lees, M., Beng, O.C.H., Williams, A. (2006). "Stimulating Demand for Knowledge Exchange between Industry and Universities in the United Kingdom", *ASC Proceedings of the 42nd Annual Conference* held at Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado on April 20 - 22, 2006.
- Li Yueh Chen, F. Barry Barnes, (2006), "Relationship between Leadership Behaviours and Knowledge Sharing in Professional Service Firms Engaged in Strategic Alliances", *Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 11, No. 2, pp. 1-20.
- Martensson M. (2000). "A Critical Review of Knowledge Management as a Management Tool", *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 4, No. 3, pp. 204-216.
- Mcinerney, C. (2009). "Knowledge Management and the Dynamic Nature of Knowledge", *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, Vol. 53, No. 12,
- Nielsen A. P. (2006). "Understanding Dynamic Capabilities through Knowledge Management", *Journal of knowledge Management*, Vol. 10, No. 4, pp. 59-71.
- Nissen, M.E., (2007). "Knowledge Management and Global Cultures: Elucidation through an Institutional Knowledge-flow Perspective", *Knowledge and Process Management*, Vol. 14, No. 3, pp. 211-25.
- Oye, N.D., Salleh, M. Noorminshah, A. (2011). "Knowledge Sharing in Workplace: Motivators and Demotivators", *International Journal of Managing Information Technology*, Vol. 3, No. 4, pp. 28-47.
- Plessis, D.M. (2007). "The Role of Knowledge Management in Innovation", *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 11, No. 4, pp. 20-29.

- Punia, B.K., and Sadhna (2013) "Knowledge Sharing Behaviour and Knowledge Management: An Interactive Analysis through Literature Review", *Journal of Management & Technology*, Vol.9, No.1, pp. 86-95.
- Rehman, M., Rehman, A.M. and Salleh R., and Amin, A. (2011). "Review of Factors Affecting Knowledge Sharing Behaviour", *International Conference on E-business, Management and Economics*, Vol. 3, No.1 pp. 223-227.
- Saaristo, J. (2012). *Knowledge Management and Sharing in Multicultural SME companies*, Finland, Piippukatu 2: JAMK University of Applied Science, School of Business and Service Management (Unpublished Bachelors Thesis).
- Sheng, X. and Sun, L. (2006). "Developing a Knowledge Innovation Culture of Libraries", *Library Management*, Vol. 28, No.1, pp. 36-52.
- Singh, A. and Soltani, E. (2010). "Knowledge management practices in Indian information technology companies," *Total Quality Management*, Vol. 21, No. 2, pp. 145–157.
- Torres, Z. T., Pierozzi, I., Pereira, R.N., Castro, d.A. (2010). "Knowledge Management and Communication in Brazilian Agricultural Research: An Integrated Procedural Approach", *International Journal of Information Management*, Vol.31, No. 8, pp. 121-127.
- Wang, S. and Noe, A. R., (2010). "Knowledge Sharing: A Review and Directions for Future Research", *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 20, No. 6, pp. 115–131.
- Zahidul, I.M., Maheen A.S., Hasan, I. and Uddin, A.S. (2011). "Organizational Culture and Knowledge Sharing: Empirical Evidence from Service Organizations", *African Journal of Business Management*, Vol. 5, No.14, pp. 5900-5909.
- Zhang, D.J. and Zhao, L. (2006). "Knowledge Management in Organizations", *Journal of Database Management*, Vol. 17, No. 1, pp. 1-9.