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Abstract - Although knowledge management is a fairly new concept, there has been a rise of its application in the private sector, public sector and even NGO. In this paper we present the premises and promises of knowledge management. We focus on the various definitions of knowledge management, the different knowledge management models and processes, the application of knowledge management in the private sector, public sector and NGO.

I INTRODUCTION

Over the previous decades there has been major improvement in business philosophies and approaches. This has led to the emergence of many sub fields such as Business Process Re-engineering (BPR), Total Quality Management (TQM) and Organizational Learning (OL) among others. Although Knowledge Management (KM) is a relatively nascent field of study, its body of knowledge has grown substantially over the past few years. During the mid nineties the KM movement started gaining momentum with a rapid increase in its body of knowledge (McAdam and McCreedy, 1999). Matennson (2000) is of the opinion that the growth of knowledge management occurred as a direct result of two major shifts. First, the impact of downsizing strategies of the 1980’s and the subsequent loss of human capital as people walked out the door with their knowledge. Second, the explosion in information and related technologies led organisations to search for ways to cope with the complexity and volumes of information. This paper attempts to synthesize the premises and promises of KM and goes further to categorise the areas of KM applications. In order to attain our objectives: section 2 provides various definitions of KM as per the theoretical literature, discuss the different KM models and KM processes; section 3 considers KM applications; section 4 considers the critiques of KM and we conclude in section 5.

II KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT: DEFINITION, MODELS, PROCESSES

In this section we provide the various definitions of KM which is very vast in the literature, we survey the various KM models and we provide the KM processes as per Alavi (2000).

A. Definition of Knowledge Management

The literature on knowledge management indicates the existence of multiple definitions of knowledge management. Alavi and Leidner (1999) define knowledge management as a 'systematic and organizationally specified process for acquiring, organizing, and communicating both tacit and explicit knowledge of employees so that other employees may make use of it to be more effective and productive in their work'. Beckman (1999) defines knowledge management as ‘the formalization of and access to experience, knowledge and expertise that create new capabilities, enable superior performance, encourage innovation and enhance customer value.’ Malhotra (2001) asserts that ‘knowledge management caters to the critical issues of organizational adaptation, survival and competence in face of increasingly discontinuous environmental change. Essentially it embodies organizational processes that seek synergistic combination of data and information processing capacity of information technologies and the creative and innovative capacity of human beings.

The American Productivity and Quality Centre (APQC) define knowledge management as ‘the strategies and processes of identifying, capturing and leveraging knowledge’ (Atefeh et al., 1999). APQC concluded that many companies mostly valued the transfer of knowledge and best practices in order to improve internal operations or to embed such knowledge in products and services. In this context, the emphasis is on teams, relationships and networks by which knowledge can be transferred. Specific benefits cited from the introduction of knowledge management projects include operational improvements, money saved or earned (Atefeh et al., 1999).

Despite the rapid growth of KM and the euphoria that is apparent when one considers the above findings by the APQC, Wainwright (2001) notes that there is no single definition to adequately describe knowledge management. The next discussion is aimed at reviewing some of the definitions, including those by both “classical” and contemporary KM authors.
In fact, knowledge management is a set of things involving various activities. It encompasses theories, models, processes and technologies that support the protection and development and exploitation of knowledge assets. By managing intellectual capital that exists in both explicit and tacit forms, knowledge management enhances an organisation’s ability to learn from its environment and to incorporate knowledge into business processes.

To clarify the scope of knowledge management and understand its premises, Mc Adam and McCreedy (1999) evaluated several definitions and classifications relating to knowledge. They argued that the various definitions and classifications reflect a wide spectrum of viewpoints; from mechanistic type orientations (knowledge as an asset) to approaches that reflect the notion that knowledge is constructed through social relationships. There are various common aspects in the definitions. First, IT is regarded as a useful enabler, but is not regarded as the essence of KM. Second, people and learning issues are central to KM. Third, KM has strong multi-disciplinary influences with practitioners holding a wide array of perspectives. Fourth, KM and Intellectual Capital (IC) are used interchangeably and there are traces of confusion regarding the two concepts.

Similarly, Firestone and McElroy (2003) analyse what they describe as typical definitions by various contemporary KM authors. Firestone and McElroy (2003) assert that the definitions exhibit the following weaknesses. First, failure to distinguish between knowledge and information. Second, failure to reflect the notion of validation of knowledge claim. Third, failure to demonstrate how knowledge could be managed. Fourth, failure to define activities that comprise KM and fifth, the failure to adequately treat the concept of “management” in knowledge” in KM Firestone and McElroy (2003) after firstly, examining information management and knowledge management and secondly, drawing a distinction between information processes and knowledge processes, offer their own definition: ‘KM is a management discipline that seeks to enhance organizational knowledge processing’

Firestone and McElroy (2003) in fact, argued that KM is an ongoing persistent, purposeful interaction among human-based agents through which the participating agents manage (handle, direct, govern, control, coordinate, plan, organise, facilitate, enable and empower) other agents, components, and activities participating in basic knowledge processing (knowledge production and knowledge integration), with the purpose of contributing to the creation and maintenance of an organic, unified whole system, producing, maintaining, enhancing, acquiring and transmitting the enterprise’s knowledge base.

According to Stewart et al (2000), there are four basic assumptions that underline KM. First, knowledge is worth managing. This assumption recognises the importance of a knowledge economy. In this context, there are many knowledge management initiatives in various organisations.

However, while much effort has been put in managing explicit knowledge, tacit knowledge has been ignored. Second, organisations benefit from managing knowledge. In this context, effective data mining is crucial. Third, knowledge can be managed. Many companies have appointed knowledge officer in their organization. However, the fact that many organisations have embarked on KM projects does not indicate whether knowledge is worth managing. Fourth, little risk is associated with managing knowledge. In this context, many companies have set up organizational structures for knowledge management. However, tacit knowledge may contain incorrect assumptions.

Martensson (2000), having surveyed a number of literature sources concerning the goals and expected outcomes of KM, lists a number of such outcomes (1) a way to improve an organisation’s performance, productivity, competitiveness (2) acquiring, sharing and usage of information (3) a tool for improved decision making (4) a way to capture best practices (5) a way to reduce research costs and delays (6) a way to become more innovative.

The various nature of the definitions of knowledge management is evidence that KM is a body of knowledge which is still not stabilised and that it is an area of growth which will attract research to inform practice about knowledge in the years to come.

B. Knowledge Management Models

This sub-section investigate the current understandings of the theory and practice of the some of the existing knowledge management models

i. Boisot’s Knowledge Category Models

In the Boisot’s Knowledge Category models, knowledge is considered as either ‘codified’ or ‘uncodified’ and as ‘diffused’ or ‘undiffused’ within an organization or institution.

Thus, there are six types of knowledge. First, ‘codified’ knowledge, it refers to knowledge that can be easily to knowledge that can be easily prepared for transmission mechanism such as economic data. Second, ‘uncodified’ knowledge is knowledge that cannot be easily transmitted such as experience. Third, the combination of codified and diffused knowledge is referred to as public knowledge; examples include library, journals, books, newspapers etc. The fourth type of knowledge is a combination of codified and undiffused knowledge which is referred to as propriety knowledge. This ‘codified undiffused’ deliberately transmitted to a small group of people on a ‘need to know’ basis. The fifth type of knowledge which is the combination of uncodified and undiffused knowledge is known as common sense, normally gathered through the process of socialization and externalization. Lastly, personal knowledge is a combination of uncodified and undiffused knowledge.

---

ii. Nonaka’s Knowledge Management Model

According to Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995), knowledge consists of tacit and explicit elements. Like Boisot’s Knowledge Category models, this model consist of a 2 x 2 matrix with four elements. First, tacit knowledge can be transferred into tacit knowledge in others through socialization. Second, tacit knowledge can be transferred into explicit knowledge by forming a body of knowledge or through externalization process. Third, explicit knowledge can be transferred into tacit knowledge in others by translating theory into practice, a process of internalization. Fourth, explicit knowledge can be transferred into explicit knowledge in others by combining various theories, a process known as combination.

iii. Demerest’s Knowledge Management Model

Demerest’s knowledge management model emphasise on the construction of knowledge within an organization. This construction is limited to scientific inputs but is seen as including the social construction of knowledge. The model assumes that constructed knowledge is then embodied within the organization, not just through explicit programs but through a process of social interchange (McAdam and McCready, 1999).

Figure 1: Demerest’s Knowledge Management Model

Source: McAdam and McCready, 1999
Figure 1 presents the Demerest’s knowledge management model. It shows that there is a process of dissemination of the espoused knowledge throughout the organization and its surrounding. Ultimately, the knowledge is seen as being of economic use in regard to organization outputs. The solid arrows in figure 1 show the primary flow direction while the plain arrows show the more recursive flows. The model does not assume any given definition of knowledge. Instead it invites a more holistic approach while, in reality, the flows of knowledge transfer may be extremely rapid and circulatory, as in the case for some forms of action learning. Demerest’s model has been slightly modified and seeks to address these limitations by explicitly showing the influence of both social and scientific paradigms of knowledge construction (see Figure 2).

Figure 2: Modified version of Demerest’s KM Model

This model emphasises the creation of knowledge within the organization. This construction is not only dependent on scientific input, but also includes the social construction of knowledge. This constructed knowledge is then embodied within the organization by explicit means, e.g. codification, and through social interchange. Once the knowledge is embodied in the organization, it must be disseminated throughout it. The disseminated knowledge is then used in the production of organizational outputs.

The solid arrows in Figure 2 indicate the primary flow direction, while the plain arrows indicate recursive flows. The recursive arrows show that the flow of knowledge in the organization is more complex than a simple sequential process (McAdam and McCreedy, 1999). The model shows that knowledge construction is influenced by both scientific (older, rule-based) and social (newer, people-based) paradigms. The “use” element of the model is expanded upon in order to address both business and employee benefits. These issues should be seen as complementary rather than mutually exclusive.
The intellectual capital school of thought (particularly prevalent in the Scandinavian countries) equates knowledge with intellectual capital. According to this model knowledge management is not seen as the transfer of tacit and explicit knowledge but also consists of intellectual capital. Intellectual capital is made up of two main components, namely human capital and structural/organizational capital (McAdam and McCreedy, 1999). The model focuses on the importance of equity, human, customer and innovation in managing the flow of knowledge within and externally across the networks of partners. The intellectual capital school of thought takes a scientific approach to the management of knowledge with a strong emphasis on measuring each intellectual asset in the organization. However, this intellectual view of knowledge management ignores the political and social aspects of knowledge management.

**Frid’s Knowledge Management Model**
Frid (2003) divided the knowledge management maturity assessment and knowledge management implementation into five levels.

**Level 1 – Knowledge Chaotic**
Knowledge chaotic suggests that organizations at this level are in the process of understanding and implementation of Frid framework for knowledge management which includes knowledge management vision, knowledge management objectives and knowledge management indices.

**Level 2 – Knowledge Aware**
Organisations at this level are a step higher than those at knowledge chaotic. Also, to understand and implement Frid’s framework for knowledge management; advocating and adopting departmental knowledge management vision and goals; and performing Frid framework maturity assessment. Organisations at this point should focus on developing a knowledge management road map and working collaboratively with knowledge management office.

**Level 3 – Knowledge Focused**
Knowledge focused indicates that organizations should have covered the implementation aspects as in the lower two levels and start focusing on five new activities namely (1) process engineering (2) providing initial knowledge management infrastructure, services and training (3) support early adopters and knowledge community (4) monitor and report on management indices and (5) knowledge management in budgets.

**Level 4 – Knowledge Managed**
Knowledge Managed adopt the fundamental activities in level one, two and three other than organizations should attempt to embed knowledge management in performance reviews and also in business plans apart.

**Level 5 – Knowledge Centric**
This is the highest of all knowledge management implementation maturity level based on Frid’s model. The distinctive and differentiating activities that organisations should focus on are institutionalizing successful initiatives and valuing intellectual assets. These activities differentiate knowledge from other levels. Moreover, all knowledge management activities should be given equal emphasis at this level.
C. The Knowledge Management Process

Alavi (2000) notes that organisations continuously engage in certain knowledge management processes. Alavi (2000) identifies four processes that are depicted in Figure 3.

Figure 3: Generic Knowledge Management Processes by Alavi

![Diagram showing the processes of Knowledge Creation, Knowledge Storage and Retrieval, Knowledge Distribution, and Knowledge Application.]

(Source: Alavi, 2000)

i. Knowledge Creation

A discussion of knowledge creation will be lacking if it does not consider the contribution of Nonaka. Alavi (2000) draws special attention to the emphasis that Nonaka places on appropriate organizational mechanisms to support and nurture each of the modes of knowledge creation discussed earlier. For the sake of convenience, Nonaka’s modes of knowledge conversion are again listed: they are socialisation, externalization, combination and internalization. Davenport and Prusak (1998) propose five options available to organisations through which knowledge is created:

- Acquisition: refers to knowledge acquired by the organization from external sources including knowledge internally generated. This is not necessarily new. It includes knowledge copied from competitors or other industries as well as also knowledge bought via mergers. Rental: for instance through an external research unit or hiring a consultant with specific expertise.
- Dedicated resources: utilising resources exclusively for this purpose like for instance R&D units. Fusion: the deliberate introduction of complexity, diversity, and conflict to create new synergy.
- Adaptation: external changes causes organization to “adapt or die”; warns against the complacency, “core rigidities” or the tendency to stay on well-known paths. Some organization sometimes generate a crisis in order to stimulate creativity.
- Networks: informal, self-organizing networks of people that might become formalized, e.g. Community of Practice (COP)

Davenport and Prusak do not explicitly refer to learning as a result of the knowledge creation process. Liebowitz and Beckman (1998) regard learning of the individual, the team and the organization as an integral part of knowledge creation. The two authors cite Kolb’s learning cycle as a framework to understand the effects of participation in new experiences, reflective activity, concept formulation and the development of hypotheses (Kolb, 1983). Liebowitz and Beckman’s arguments show glimpses of second-generation KM thinking when they cite Couger’s work on the Creative Problem Solving (CPS) method (Couger, 1996). The six problem solving steps proposed by Couger are: define the problem, analyse the problem, generate solution ideas, evaluate and select the solution test and implement the solution and lastly, document and share the results (Couger, 1996).

All the above refer to the different perspectives on the way knowledge may be created in and for an organization.

ii. Knowledge Storage and Retrieval

Alavi (2000) asserts that to create new knowledge is not enough; people and organisations simply forget and mechanisms are needed to store acquired knowledge and to retrieve it when needed. One such mechanism identified by the knowledge management community is “organizational memory” (Alavi, 2000). Organizational memory includes individual memory (individual experiences) as well as shared knowledge and interpretations resulting from social interactions, including organizational culture, work processes and procedures, structure, ecology and archives (Alavi, 2000). It is fair to assume that the organization that keeps track of its experiences, e.g. by recording and retrieving knowledge about best practices, internal and external to the organization, stands to benefit as opposed to one that keeps on reinventing the wheel. However, citing the work of Argyris and Schon (1978), Alavi (2000) warns about the negative effects associated with organisational
memory. Organisations have to constantly guard against rigidity in terms of structure, capabilities, outlook and current knowledge. A complacent attitude can prevent the organization from engaging in continuous learning and innovation as a result of inability to adapt to change. This above phase of KM has traditionally been a fertile ground for proponents of codification strategies, which include, amongst others, efforts to extract tacit knowledge from experts using a combination of elicitation methods and technology systems and to make that knowledge available to the organisation in some form.

iii. Knowledge Distribution

Alavi (2000) is of the opinion that the knowledge distribution process, despite its importance, is under-studied. Alavi (2000) postulates that the knowledge distribution process is subject to the same influences as the communication process that is often neglected in organisations. The communication process involve the following: source; of crucial importance is the perceived value of source unit’s knowledge stock as well as the motivational disposition of source; message-the nature of the message can be either tactiness or explicitness; receiver- of crucial importance is the perceived value of source unit’s knowledge stock as well as the motivational disposition of receiver; channel, the existence and effective transmission channels should exist for knowledge distribution; coding/decoding, this relates to the absorptive capacity of the receiver.

The distribution of knowledge is arguably where most of the knowledge management activities occur. It is also in this sphere that technology is playing a significant role, referring to the use of intelligent agents to customise information delivery, email, data mining, Intranets, and Web portals (Liebowitz, 2000).

III KNOWLEDGE APPLICATION AND USE

Having critically reviewed various models of KM, the next section deals with areas of KM applications

According to the knowledge- based theory of the firm, knowledge itself does not constitute a competitive advantage; it is the application and integration thereof with business processes that makes a difference (Alavi, 2000). Grant (1996) identified three following mechanisms for integrating knowledge into the organisation:

i. Directives; sets of rules, standards, procedures and instructions converted from tacitly held specialist knowledge into explicit forms for communication to non- specialists.

ii. Organisational routines; relate to patterns for task performance and coordination, interaction protocols and process specializations

iii. Self-contained task teams; refer to the creation of teams to attend to tasks where a high degree of uncertainty exists and where group synergy can be exploited. Group problem solving often requires coordination and facilitation of frequent interaction and intense collaboration

Liebowitz and Beckman (1998) state that “knowledge can be applied by people or machines to perform work” The researchers disagree with the notion that a computer or some type of machine is able to apply (directly or indirectly) knowledge in a business activity.

Gauging from an analysis of various knowledge management approaches followed in Europe, the European KM Forum – EKMF (2001), concluded that with few exceptions (Davenport and Nonaka), most approaches have the same basic structure and identifiable modules, stages or phases. Most approaches considered by the EKMF include the phases identifiable modules, stages or phases. Most approaches considered by the EKMF include the phases identified by Alavi above. Notably, Davenport and Prusak do not describe a knowledge management process (EKMF, 2001). Davenport and Prusak (1998) provide a detailed discussion of knowledge markets, compelling the reader to view knowledge markets as a framework for understanding and improving the transfer of knowledge. Knowledge Managements, according to authors, is an effort to improve the efficiency of such knowledge markets.

For Davenport and Prusak (1998), as the organization interacts with its environment, it absorbs information, turn it into knowledge and takes action based on experiences, values and internal rules. Davenport and Prusak (1998 cited in EKMF, 2001) highlight knowledge generation, knowledge codification and coordination and knowledge transfer as key focus areas in a knowledge management initiative.

Nonaka, who did not adopt Knowledge Management as an approach in the first place, focuses solely on knowledge creation. However, certain concepts used by Nonaka in his popular SECI model, correspond with some of the knowledge management phases identified by the various other KM approaches in the EKMF study. Martensson’s (2000) research, referred to earlier, revealed results that are consistent with those found by the EKFM study. He identified the following four stages: knowledge acquisition, storage, providing access, and knowledge use

A. Knowledge Management and Corporate Sector

Many organizations look at knowledge management as a solution to challenges due to the information age. In the information age, traditional methods of accounting and monitoring systems design to deal with tangible inputs and outputs are no longer adequate. Firms have to share knowledge internally more efficiently and learn to adapt more quickly to the changing external environment in order to retain their competitive edge. According to McElroy (2000), the first generation of knowledge management aimed to improve knowledge sharing within organizations. Thus, the focus was on the use of information technology.

The second generation of knowledge management emphasizes more on the use of organizational processes and creation of knowledge. This helps organizations to have an upper hand on their competitors. Savage (2000) argued that
successful organizations are shifting from strategies based on prediction to strategies based on anticipation of surprises. They are also shifting from utilization of already known knowledge to the creation of new knowledge, from pure ‘technology’ KM applications to also include ‘process’ applications.

When and how these shifts should be undertaken depends on the type of organizations in questions. Four types of organizations can be identified namely - ‘process’, ‘systems’, ‘network’ and ‘competence’- based on the different levels of interdependence and complexity that are required in different work situations. The ‘competence’ model describes a workplace that is highly reliant on individual’s expertise in order to carry out evaluation and judgment-oriented work. The ‘network’ model denotes a workplace that depends on the fluid deployment of flexible teams in order to improvise and meet new challenges as they arise. Thus, the ‘competence’ model concentrate on low level of interdependence and high level of interpretation while the ‘network’ model concentrate on high level of interdependence and high level of interpretation. Levitt and March (1988) doubted the capacity of organisations to manage knowledge effectively and to learn from past experience. There are many constraints in an organization that impede learning. These includes: organisational complexity, human habits, hierarchal structure, routines and differing interpretations by sub groups within an organization. However, Schein (1992) argued that such constraints can be avoided if there is presence of good leadership. Good leadership implies the ability of the leader to guide the organization in the right in the face of changing environment; to contain anxiety and to influence the organisation’s structure in a positive way.

B. Knowledge Management and NGOs

i. Northern NGOs

A parallel development occurred with the emergence of the information age in the nineties, the rise of NGOs. The role of Northern NGOs has change in considerable ways. Fowler (1992) argued that the legitimacy of NGOs is no longer guaranteed; in fact they have to prove legitimacy. Thus, they have to build credible relationship with Southern partners. Edwards (1994) postulated that Northern NGOs are taking the role of information broker and advocate in the interface between Southern communities and national/international policy processes. According to Keeble (2002) another role of NGOs to build the capacity of Southern civil society organizations to process knowledge and engage effectively in national/international development debates and decision-making processes. All this requires NGOs to have high quality internal learning and information processing systems. In addition, calls for knowledge-based aid and the globalization of knowledge require NGOs to reflect on how their internal KM and learning systems interact with external KM and learning systems interact with external information flows and policy trends.

Hailey and James (2002) build on the case studies of nine successful South Asian NGOs in order to comment on how NGOs learn. They conclude that the single most important factor affecting organisational learning is a learning leader. The most important features of learning leaders in South Asia was their ability to understand and work within a complex and changing environment. Uphoff (1992) examined the success of a large-scale irrigation system and argues that it worked well because it was not planned according to a predictable and fixed model but rather evolved organically as farmers gradually engaged in flexible systems of cooperation.

ICT projects in Southern institutions frequently fail or remain functional for only a brief period of time. Heeks (2002) attributes this gap between the design of Northern IT systems and the reality of Southern institutions, which on the whole do not have same level of technological infrastructure.

C. Knowledge Management, Public Sector and Public Administration

Viability and success of any society is largely a function of how its resources can be leveraged. They include natural resources, geographic location, capability of people, and resources like intellectual capital (IC). Public Administration (PA) in any society is important and complex. It affects most aspects of society. Its approach and effectiveness determine the society’s culture, quality of life, success, and viability. It also acts as pace setter, planner, implementer, educator, peacemaker, and disciplinarian, all with different emphases depending on the society’s culture and agendas. A competent PA with sufficient capacity and influence can provide for a great society. An incompetent or dysfunctional one can lead the society into severe decline, even ruin. To be successful in fulfilling its functions in a democracy, the citizenry must cooperate in many ways and have confidence in the society’s capabilities, directions, and actions. Successful citizen participation and confidence depend largely on broad understanding of, and agreement with actions by public entities and acceptance of implications of those actions. An ignorant citizenry is a poor public policy partner. A vital aspect of the society’s success is the knowledge that its citizens possesses, is made available to its public servants, and is embedded in structural and other intellectual capital assets that can be leveraged internally and in the global market.

PA shares responsibility to assure that its society provides the quality of life intended for its citizens. From a societal knowledge or IC perspective, this implies participation in building and leveraging society’s IC to obtain the necessary economic foundation. It also implies long-term responsibilities to foster development of a competitive work force that can compete in regional and global economies. These issues are well known to public administrators (PAs). However, the past has not offered opportunities to address them with powerful and systematic approaches. This is
changing. The broad field of knowledge management introduces new options, capabilities, and practices to assist PA to great advantage. It becomes a new responsibility to manage knowledge to strengthen public service effectiveness and improve the society it serves. The goals of knowledge management are to improve the effectiveness and sustained viability of any enterprise – be it a commercial corporation, a part of society, a country, or a single individual. KM must be fully aligned to the enterprise’s central objectives. The KM objectives for PA in a democracy may be expressed as the intent to provide:

i. Effective PA services and functions to implement the public agenda. Public services must address issues and requirements relevantly, competently, and timely and consume minimal resources. They should also deal appropriately and expeditiously with unexpected challenges and disasters.

ii. A stable, just, orderly, and secure society. This includes preparing citizens, organizations, and public agencies to be effective policy partners – to create sound public opinions – to engage in public debates and policy formation – to participate in processes to conceptualize, plan, decide, and implement public actions – to observe society policies – and to provide support for the administration.

iii. Acceptable level of quality of life, particularly through building, maintaining, and leveraging commercial and public intellectual capital.

iv. A prosperous society by developing its citizens to become competent knowledge workers and its institutions to be competitive.

IV CONCLUSION

This paper presents the promises and premises of knowledge management. Knowledge management is becoming crucial in almost every sectors of an economy. We present the various definitions of knowledge management. Some are complements to each other while others competing. The various models of knowledge management show knowledge are created within organization and institution. The knowledge management process by Alavi (2000) concentrate on knowledge creation, knowledge storage and retrieval, knowledge distribution and knowledge application. Over the years knowledge management has been applied in many organizations and institutions whether private, private or NGO. In the age of technology, we reckon that the application of knowledge management in various organizations will continue to rise.

V REFERENCES


