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Abstract: Knowledge management (KM) is a procedure of capturing, developing, sharing, and effectively using organizational knowledge. The operational origins of KM, as the term is understood in the present day, arise within the consulting commune and from there the principles of KM started spreading rapidly by the consulting organizations to other discipline. The consulting firms quickly realized the prospective of the Intranet flavor of the Internet for connecting together their own geographically dispersed and knowledge-based organizations. Corporate need KM to serve clientele well and remain in business corporate must: reduce their cycle times, operate with bare minimum fixed assets and overhead (people, inventory and facilities), cut down product development time, improve client service, authorize employees, innovate and deliver high quality products, enhance flexibility in addition to adoption, capture information, build knowledge bank, share and learn. None of this is possible devoided of continual focus on the creation, availability, updating, quality and use of knowledge via all employees and teams, at work as well as in the marketplace.

Few knowledge management models studied are: Boisot’s Knowledge Category Models, Nonaka’s Knowledge Management Model(1995), Demerest’s Model of Knowledge Management, Frid’s Knowledge Management Model
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1. Introduction:

Knowledge management (KM) is a procedure of capturing, developing, sharing, and effectively using organizational knowledge. It refers to a multi-disciplinary move towards achieving organizational objectives by making the best use of knowledge.

Knowledge Management, (KM) is a perception and a term that arose approximately two decades ago, roughly in 1990. It may be termed as organizing an organization's information and knowledge holistically, but that sounds a bit unclear, and surprisingly enough, even though it sounds overbroad, it is not the whole picture. Exceptionally early on in the KM movement, Davenport (1994) presented and still widely quoted definition: "Knowledge management is the process of capturing, distributing, as well as effectively using knowledge.”

This definition has the virtue of being simple, bleak, and to the point. Couple of years later, the Gartner Group created another second definition of KM, which is conceivably the most recurrently cited one (Duhon, 1998): “Knowledge management is one of the discipline that promotes an integrated approach of identifying, capturing, evaluating, retrieving, in addition to sharing all of an enterprise's information assets. These assets possibly will include databases, documents, policies, procedures, and beforehand uncaptured proficiency and experience in individual workers.”

Both definitions share an enormously organizational and a very corporate orientation. KM, historically at least, is first and foremost about managing the knowledge of and in organizations.

The operational origins of KM, as the term is understood in the present day, arise within the consulting commune and from there the principles of KM started spreading rapidly by the consulting organizations to other discipline. The consulting firms quickly realized the prospective of the Intranet flavour of the Internet for connecting together their own geographically dispersed and knowledge-based organizations. Once having gained capability in how to take benefit of intranets to connect across their organizations in addition to share along with managing the information and the knowledge, they subsequently understood that the expertise they had gained was an invention that could be sold to other organizations. A new product always needs a name, and the name chosen was Knowledge Management.

Timing was also propitious, as the keenness for intellectual capital in the 1980s, had primed the pump for the acknowledgment of information and knowledge as indispensable assets for any organization.

Perhaps the fundamental thrust in KM was to capture and make it accessible, so it can be used by others within the organization, the knowledge and information, which have been gained with experience as it was, and which had never been explicitly set down.
2. **Basic Goals of Knowledge Management:**

A greater perceptive of KM can be gained by defining its goals.

1. The Most cognoscente writing on the subject highlighted the principal purpose of KM as competence and efficiency achieved through the reuse along with sharing of experience and know-how. Often disregarded is the potentially more significant goal of promoting superiority of work product and practitioner education that can be shown to increase the worth of the client service. In fact, knowledge management can serve a wide variety of purposes. As per Petter Gottschalk, of Norwegian School of Management, "effective management of knowledge pays off in fewer mistakes, less redundancy, quicker problem solving, enhanced decision making, reduced research development costs, increased worker independence, in addition to improved customer relations, along with improved service."

2. Amongst the many possibilities, law firms may consider the following:
- Productivity plus efficiency
- Knowledge sharing, skill development, and training
- Competitive advantage, including market visibility as a high-tech firm
- Ability to direct work to skilled specialists
- Consistency of work product across offices or practice areas
- Faster delivery times
- Quality control
- Reduced frustration searching for documents
- Client collaboration

Every firm have to determine the precise goals for its knowledge management program, because unless the goals will be defined, it is impossible to assess success.

3. **Why do Corporate’s Need’s Knowledge Management:**

Knowledge management solutions are now the main important strategic technologies for large companies, according to a new report plus survey of European executives of the Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU.com, 2003), Tata Consultancy Services were the sponsors. In the survey, about 67% of companies quoted knowledge management/business intelligence solutions to be most important for achieving their strategic goals over the next three years.

To serve clientele well and remain in business corporate must: reduce their cycle times, operate with bare minimum fixed assets and overhead (people, inventory and facilities), cut down product development time, improve client service, authorize employees, innovate and deliver high quality products, enhance flexibility in addition to adoption, capture information, build knowledge bank, share and learn. None of this is possible devoided of continual focus on the creation, availability, updating, quality and use of knowledge via all employees and teams, at work as well as in the marketplace.

4. **Knowledge Management and Its Components:**

Based on actual experiences of the leading global Knowledge Management case studies, the components can broadly be classified in to three classes - People, Processes, as well as Technology (Figure 1). Even as all three are critical to build an organisation and get business results from KM, a majority of organisations around the globe are implementing KM have found it comparatively easier to put technology and processes in position, whereas the "people" component has posed greater challenges.

5. **Few Knowledge Management Models:**

5.1 **Boisot’s Knowledge Category Models:**

In 1987, Boisot gave a model developed by him, that considers knowledge as either codified or un-codified and as diffused or un-diffused, within an organization. Primarily, the term “codified” in this case refers to knowledge that can be readily organized and prepared for transmission purposes such as financial data. In this model, codified un-diffused knowledge is referred to as propriety knowledge and is intentionally transmitted to a little group of people, on a “need to know” basis. Second, “un-codified” referred on the way to as knowledge that cannot be easily prepared meant for transmission purposes such as experiences. The model recommends that un-codified and un-diffused knowledge is referred to as individual knowledge (e.g. experiences, views, perceptions, ideas). Third, the left quantrant of the model covers public knowledge and common intelligence knowledge.
Knowledge of public is codified and diffused (e.g. library, books, journals, newspapers, etc.). Ultimately, common sense knowledge which is comparatively diffused and un-codified can steadily develop through the process of socialization and internationalization (Boisot, 1987). Without a doubt, this model suggests so as to, there is a spread or diffusion of knowledge from corner to corner organization as reflected in the horizontal aspect of the model. However, the codified as well as un-codified categories in the model are discrete categories of knowledge. In addition, the idea of mellowed knowledge is rather general and lack clearness if it includes knowledge gathering within the organization or the idea of spreading it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Propriety Knowledge</th>
<th>Public Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uncodified</td>
<td>Personal Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undiffused</td>
<td>Diffused</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2: Boisot’s Knowledge Category Model**

### 5.2 Nonaka’s Knowledge Management Model (1995):

It presumes so as to knowledge consists of tacit along with explicit elements. Within this aspect, tacit knowledge is defined as non-verbalised, intuitive and unspoken, whilst, explicit knowledge is articulated furthermore can be specified in writing, drawings, computer programming along with others. This model believes tacit knowledge is capable to be transferred into tacit knowledge in others by socialization as well as tacit knowledge is able to be transferred into explicit knowledge by formalizing a body of knowledge or from side to side externalization process. The model as well as believe that explicit knowledge can be transferred hooked on tacit knowledge within others by translating theory into practice also known as a process of internalization and explicit knowledge can be transferred to precise knowledge in others by combining various existing theories – known as combination process. This uncomplicated matrix model assume that knowledge transfer in organizations is simple and straightforward but it was argued that it may be problematical and complex than it seems (McAdam & McCreedy, 1999). Even though each of these modes may autonomously create knowledge, the organizational knowledge creation processes only occur when all the four modes are organizationally managed as well as enthusiastically interacted. This process which is highly iterative constitutes ‘knowledge spiral’ which happens mostly through unceremonious networks of relations in the organization starting from the individual level, then moves up and about to the group (collective) level and eventually to the organizational level. It creates a ‘spiraling effect’ of knowledge addition and growth which promotes organization innovation and learning (Nonaka, 1994; Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1995).

There are quite a lot of similarities between Nonaka’s and Boisot’s knowledge management models. First, Boisot’s codified and un-codified knowledge has a number of degree of similarity with Nonaka’s category of tacit as well as explicit knowledge. Second, both the models presume that there is a spread or diffusion of knowledge across the organizations as indicated via horizontal dimension of the model. Ultimately, in correspondence with Boisot’s model, Nonaka’s tacit in addition to explicit knowledge are two separate categories of knowledge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tacit Knowledge</th>
<th>Explicit Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socialization</td>
<td>Externalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>Combination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3: Nonaka’s Knowledge Management Model**

### 5.3 Demerest’s Model of Knowledge Management

Demerest’s knowledge management model emphasizes on the construction of knowledge inside an organization. This construction be not limited to scientific inputs but is seen as including the social creation of knowledge. The model assumes that constructed knowledge is then embodied within the organization, not just through the explicit programs but through a process of social interchange (McAdam and McCreedy, 1999) As shown in Figure 4, there is a process of dissemination of the espoused knowledge all through the organization and its surrounding. Finally the knowledge is seen as being of economic use in regard to organizational outputs.

**Figure 4: Demerest’s Knowledge management Model (McAdam and McCreedy, 1999)**
5.4 Frid’s Knowledge Management Model

According to Frid’s (2003) knowledge management structure, the knowledge management maturity assessment levels and implementation of knowledge management can be separated into five levels. The five maturity levels are knowledge chaotic, knowledge aware, knowledge focused, knowledge managed, along with knowledge centric. The first level - Knowledge Chaotic recommends that organizations at this level are within the process of understanding along with implementation of Frid framework for knowledge management which encompasses knowledge management visualization, knowledge management objectives and knowledge management index. Organization must focus on advocating in addition to adapting departmental knowledge management vision in addition to goals as well as performing Frid’s framework knowledge management maturity evaluation. Whereas level two - Knowledge Aware recommends that organizations at this level be a step higher than those at knowledge chaotic. Also, to understand and put into operation Frid’s framework intended for knowledge management; advocating and adopting departmental knowledge management vision and goals; as well as performing Frid framework maturity assessment, organization at this point should focus on developing a knowledge management road map along with work in collaboration with the knowledge management office.

At the third level - Knowledge Focused indicated with the intention of organizations should have covered the implantation aspects as in the lower two levels and start off focusing on five new activities. Organizations at this point should embed knowledge management into process engineering; provide preliminary knowledge management infrastructure, services and training; support early adopters alongside with knowledge community; supervise and report on management indices and finally include knowledge management within budgets. However, fourth level termed as Knowledge Managed adopt the elementary activities suggested in level one, two and three other than organizations must attempt to entrench knowledge management in performance reviews and also in separate business plans.

Finally, Knowledge Centric as the last point is the highest of all knowledge management implementation maturity level as per Frid’s model. The distinctive and differentiating activities that organizations need to focus on, institutionalizing successful initiatives in addition to valuing intellectual possessions. These activities distinguish knowledge from other levels. Moreover, all knowledge management activities must be given equal emphasis at this level.

6.0 Conclusion:

Knowledge Management is an organisational approach that is not easily implemented. On top of one hand, knowledge-sharing activities depend on the voluntary participation of employees. Therefore, management should be perceptive to the knowledge activities that are already going on within the company along with seeking mean to support them. On the other hand, management desires to implement some organisational change in order to change the corporate culture. The reassess of existing knowledge management models has seen a wide spectrum of perspectives. Knowledge management have been seen as of the categorical vision in which knowledge are categorized into discrete elements as seen in Boisot and Nonaka models to the more complicated and complex perspective of knowledge that is mechanistic plus socially constructed orientation. Nonetheless, the models have its own way of placing the major knowledge management activities as well as enablers with the aim to produce a dynamic system to reinforce the organization’s core competencies.
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