

Knowledge Management: A Challenge for The Company

Aida Arjoun

Doctor of Management, FSEG of Sfax (Tunisia)

Aydaar64@gmail.com

Sami Boudabbous

Professor of Management, FSEG of Sfax (Tunisia)

Samiboudabbous2002@yahoo.fr

Citation: Arjoun A. and Boudabbous S. (2024) Knowledge Management: A Challenge for The Company, *International Journal of Business and Management Review*, Vol.12, No.1, pp.81-95

ABSTRACT: *In our complex and rapidly changing environment, personal knowledge is enriched and more effective in the collective bargaining process, thereby creating social capital. Combining individual knowledge into collective wisdom is the key to innovation, which is considered a major social and human phenomenon. By delving deeper into our reasoning, this social and human dimension gives sustainability to any business. This organizational capacity is crucial because having knowledge confers a substantial advantage. It is the ability to mobilize and deploy them that will produce value. The growing recognition of the importance of knowledge management, as a source of organizational competitiveness, has pushed many organizations to overcome obstacles through the use of knowledge in different ways. Indeed, our objective is to offer a theoretical perspective on knowledge management, its issues and its capabilities.*

KEYWORDS: information, knowledge management system, knowledge management processes, knowledge management effectiveness.

INTRODUCTION

The reality of the evolution of new information and communication technologies ((N)TIC) in recent decades has had a profound influence on the progression and modes of organization. A number of researchers from the social world have presented this period at the end of the millennium as the information society. This period is indicated as: "a period of history in which information and information technologies played a primordial role, precursor of a new order, of a major upheaval on the social, economic, cultural levels ". (Source: Great Terminological Dictionary, GDT). As a result, in the face of this unpredictable and uncertain environment, businesses are increasingly facing severe challenges in the global environment. This evolution of economies has transformed the real wealth of companies from the tangible to the intangible (Velsquez et al, 2021). According to Ricardo et al (2021), it is important to improve the

efficiency and sustainability of the organization in order to acquire skills and capabilities of rare and non-imitable value. Mostafa Al- Emran et al (2020) considered organizations as dynamic processes supported by the interactions of their members for the creation, accumulation and use of knowledge for the improvement of organizational performance.

Marques and Simon (2006) assert that knowledge is the main wealth of an organization which is observed as capital with a recoverable and evaluable economic value. The loss of this knowledge or its poor exploitation potentially leads to organizational failure. This is why knowledge management in companies has become a major issue. For many organizations, achieving a better level of performance depends not only on the successful deployment of tangible assets and natural resources, but also on the effectiveness of knowledge management (Lee and Sukoco , 2007). Thus, among the main reasons why companies invest in knowledge management is the construction of a knowledge base to facilitate the flow of information and knowledge within the company.

The concept of “knowledge management” finds its first traces in Taylor’s words. From 1911, through scientific management, in other words the need to capture and pool all of employees' knowledge so that it benefits the company in the long term, the goal was to minimize dependence on a company towards its employees. The notions of capitalization, sharing and circulation of knowledge within the company have already been addressed in order to create new knowledge to be able to innovate while considering the broadest possible way of circulating knowledge. Besides the dependence of a company on its employees, the objective is how knowledge and practices are realized and implemented efficiently. Thus, the knowledge management approach mobilizes methods and approaches for capitalizing and disseminating knowledge (Ermine, 2003; Nonaka , Takeuchi , 1995).

The objective of this chapter is to provide a perspective on knowledge management, its challenges and its capabilities. The first part is to identify the knowledge and present these types. On the other hand, we will discuss the definition, tools and capabilities of knowledge management. Finally, we will present the knowledge-based theory.

Knowledge, a challenge for the company

What is knowledge?

In the modern economy, the exploitation of knowledge is a competitive advantage of the organization. This advantage is achieved through the use of information, data, skills, commitments and motivation of people that lead to the creation of new ideas. Since the classical Greek era, philosophers have differed in defining knowledge, which has been the source of several debates (Alavi and E. Leidner 2001).

According to Prax (2012), knowledge is real raw material that makes it possible to solve both internal and external problems. They are considered the drivers of organizational dynamics that

lead to sustainable performance (Prax , 2012). Furthermore, knowledge is not simple information that we process. In fact, it is distributed, classified and stored like an object. It is a reappropriation by a human being, through their culture, their socio-professional environment, their personal representation and their affectivity (Prax , 2007). According to Darroch (2005), knowledge corresponds to the structured set of information assimilated and integrated into the frame of reference. Later, the holistic approach encompassed all types of content extending from data to information and then to knowledge. Prax (2012) focused on the distinctions between data, information and knowledge.

- ❖ **Data** : are indices of everyday human events and activities. They have little value as such, but they are easy to handle and store. They can be qualitative and also quantitative. So that collective work can be done based on data, it is necessary to ensure a format unit and a standard of measurement. It is difficult to add meters with feet, for example. The metric system offers us a unique standard that allows us to objectify measurements and be effective collectively.
- ❖ **Information** : For Bateson (1984), “information produces a new point of view on events or objects, which makes visible what was invisible”. For collective work to be carried out based on the exchange of information, the actors must share the same semantic unit. Semantics assumes that people assign the same meaning to words. Of course, this necessarily presupposes linguistic unity.
- ❖ **Knowledge**: it is the set of experiences, values, information, which are inside the human brain which can develop through the exchange of information and its capitalization. For collective work to lead to an exchange of knowledge, without going through formalization in the form of language instructions, the actors must share the same unity of action.

Nonaka matrix , the creation of collective tacit knowledge occurs through socialization. Tutoring, companionship and learning are methods of transmitting knowledge through action. Knowledge is therefore described as the emergence of a coupling, of an equilibrium between the cognitive being (individual) and its environment (society). From a socio-cognitive perspective, a society cannot emerge without the flow of knowledge. The exchange of information and knowledge is the glue that builds a society. Social systems are based on meaningful communication between their agents. Language becomes the tool for developing and sharing a common vision of the environment, of balance, within the community and with the outside world.

In the context of a business, knowledge is the systematic reasoning applied to organizational data and information. It is the learning outcome that provides the organization's only sustainable competitive advantage. Such knowledge is an essential asset that has become more important than land, labor or capital in today's economy.

Knowledge typology

According to Chen and Huang (2014), there are two types of knowledge: tacit knowledge and explicit knowledge. Tacit knowledge is stored in a person's brain, but explicit knowledge is available in documents or other forms of storage. Explicit knowledge can be stored or embedded in facilities, products, processes, services and systems. Both types of knowledge can be the result of relationships or alliances. They integrate the daily functioning of the organization and contribute to the achievement of their objectives. Tacit as well as explicit knowledge allows organizations to respond to new situations and emerging challenges. According to Polanyi: "We can know more than we can express."

Tacit knowledge

Nonaka and Takeuchi (1998) argue that tacit knowledge is individual. This knowledge represents the spirit of the people which is accumulated through study and experience. It is developed by the interaction of several individuals. Tacit knowledge grows through the practice of trial and error, and the experience of success and failure (Ziadi , 2014).

According to Choi et al (2002), tacit knowledge is context specific. Chen (2014) considers that tacit knowledge is difficult to formalize, record, articulate or communicate. It includes insight, intuitions and subjective conjectures. Since tacit knowledge is highly individualized, sharing depends on the ability and willingness of the person who possesses that knowledge to transmit it to other individuals. Sharing tacit knowledge is a great challenge for organizations.

Tacit knowledge can be shared and communicated through various activities and mechanisms. Activities include conversations and training. Also, the mechanisms include the use of information technology tools such as electronic mail, group work software, instant messaging and related technologies. In the same vein, Hung (2013) suggests that tacit knowledge is a good that lends itself difficult to many operations:

- ✓ The exchange, dissemination and learning of tacit knowledge which supposes the mobility and voluntary demonstration of the people who hold it.
- ✓ The storage and memorization of tacit knowledge are conditioned by the renewal from generation to generation of the people who hold this knowledge.
- ✓ The search for knowledge elements is greatly limited by their tacit nature. Tacit knowledge cannot be classified or cataloged systematically.

In managing tacit knowledge, the obstacle for most organizations is identifying tacit knowledge that is useful to the organization. Once the relevant tacit knowledge is identified, its value becomes extremely important to the organization and it is necessary to possess it because it is the unique asset and it is difficult for other organizations to replicate it. Indeed, tacit knowledge is a basis of the organization's competitive advantage. Furthermore, it is essential for an organization to discover, propagate and use the tacit knowledge of its employees for the optimization of its own intellectual capital. In any organization, tacit knowledge is indeed the

essential prerequisite for making the right decisions. Tacit knowledge is therefore crucial for creating value for the organization.

Explicit knowledge

Explicit knowledge is codified. It is stored in documents, databases, websites, emails, etc. It is explicit knowledge that can be transmitted or shared to other people in the form of formal and systematic languages. Ubeda (2005) defined explicit knowledge as “knowledge that can be transmitted by means of a formal language with a systematic language and code.” Explicit knowledge includes anything that is codified, documented and archived. These include knowledge assets like reports, notes, development plans, drawings, patents, trademarks, customer lists, methodologies, etc. This knowledge represents an accumulation of the organization's experiences that is preserved in a form that can be easily accessed by interested parties.

Many organizations have a knowledge asset that is stored using computers and this thanks to information technology. Explicit knowledge is not separate from tacit knowledge. On the other hand, the two are mutually complementary. However, without tacit knowledge it would be difficult to understand explicit knowledge. Unless we try to convert tacit knowledge into explicit knowledge.

Methods of creating knowledge

Based on the work of Nonaka (1998), individual knowledge becomes organizational knowledge through the interaction between tacit knowledge and explicit knowledge. This dynamic process is the essence of creating new knowledge in the organization. This interaction between the two types of knowledge causes four modes of conversion. The knowledge creation process is based on a double spiral movement between tacit and explicit knowledge.

- ✓ Socialization: from tacit knowledge to tacit knowledge
- ✓ Externalization: from tacit knowledge to explicit knowledge
- ✓ The combination: from explicit knowledge to explicit knowledge
- ✓ Internalization: from explicit knowledge to tacit knowledge

- ❖ Socialization is a process of creating tacit knowledge common to all through the sharing of experiences. In the socialization process, a domain of interaction is constructed in which individuals share experiences and space at the same time. Through this process of unarticulated shared beliefs, skills are created and developed. In socialization, one person's tacit knowledge is shared and transmitted to another person.
- ❖ Externalization is a process of articulating tacit knowledge into such explicit knowledge as concepts and/or diagrams. The process often uses metaphors, analogies, and/or sketches. This mode is triggered by a dialogue that aims to create concepts of tacit knowledge. A good example of outsourcing is the creation of a new product concept or the development of an

innovative production process. Tacit knowledge is expressed as concepts or designs, becoming explicit knowledge that can be newly studied and refined.

- ❖ Combination : For example, an engineer can combine available drawings and design specifications to produce a new process design or piece of equipment. That is, combining a newly created concept with existing knowledge can produce something tangible (e.g., a new product model).
- ❖ Internalization is a process that includes explicit knowledge in an individual's tacit knowledge or know-how or operational knowledge. Explicit knowledge that is available as text, audio, or video; facilitates the internalization process. For example, we can cite the use of operating manuals for various machines or equipment. Instructions are learned and some of the person's knowledge has become tacit.

The challenges of knowledge management

Knowledge management: a multidisciplinary branch

Knowledge management is a new discipline which was developed in the 1970s by Peter Drucker, Karl- Eriik Sveiby at the end of the 1980s and by Nonaka Takeuchi in the 1990s. Furthermore, knowledge management does not have a universally accepted definition (Hlupic et al 2002), but there are several definitions held by experts. According to Zaim (2007), knowledge management is the identification, acquisition, optimization of intellectual assets in the form of explicit or tacit knowledge by individuals or by communities.

Generally, knowledge management is the conversion of tacit knowledge to explicit knowledge so that it can be shared within the organization. Ibrahim and Reid (2009) suggested that knowledge management is essential for organizations to create sustainable competitive advantage. According to Marques and Simon (2006) , knowledge management initiatives make it possible to improve business processes. Ibrahim and Reid (2009) noted that knowledge management practices enable the minimization of delays and costs for the organization. Consequently, knowledge management allows the improvement of organizational culture (Ibrahim and Reid, 2009). Beveren (2002) suggests that knowledge management focuses on intellectual capital that stimulates employee creativity. Indeed, knowledge management involves a wide range of activities, designed to facilitate the creation and improvement of intellectual assets within the organization (Halawi et al 2005). Thus, knowledge management contributes to the development of individual competence to ensure the effectiveness of organizational performance (Lee et al, 2014). According to Yeongjun Yeo et al (2020), the term knowledge management means careful planning to achieve a better result from the realization of ideas, plans, actions to manage knowledge within the organization more effectively.

In the organizational context, the three dimensions that explain knowledge management initiatives are: creation, dissemination and use of knowledge. This is not possible without continuously managing the four basic modes of knowledge creation (socialization,

combination, internalization, externalization) (Nonaka 1998); and without the application of the two bases of organizational strategy (codification and personalization) for knowledge transfer:

- ❖ Codification relies on the use of employee knowledge bases that connect with reusable and codified knowledge.
- ❖ Personalization relies on collaboration between groups of people. Jaroslow (2015) highlights the importance of socialization, cooperation and interaction between individuals for the acquisition, sharing, and application of knowledge to achieve the same collaborative work objective. It is necessary to ensure that ideas, thoughts and experiences are shared (A. Meysam , 2016) through dialogue and discussion for the creation of new ideas and thus to contribute to the improvement of the management of the knowledge. It is therefore the key to organizational learning (Robertson et al, 2004). As a result, ideas, arguments and research suggest that knowledge management is part of organizational learning and vice versa (I. Arpaci et al, 2020).

In a broader context, there are various definitions of knowledge management that allude to the same idea but each definition focuses on a particular aspect of knowledge management.

- A results-oriented definition states that knowledge management must have “The right knowledge in the right place; at the right time and in the right format” (O’Dell et al, 1998).
- A definition focused on processes, namely knowledge management, brings together the processes of systematic management which are: identification, creation, collection, sharing and application.
- A technology-focused definition that introduces business intelligence, collaboration, search engines, etc.

The effectiveness of knowledge management

The learning process makes it possible to improve the stock of knowledge available to the organization and to amplify the value of its intellectual assets, such as the innovation capital which ensures the application and acquisition of knowledge. If an organization demonstrates competence in knowledge management, it is considered to have a knowledge management orientation (Darroch and McNaughton , 2002). Knowledge management is widely defined from different perspectives. Wade (2004) considered knowledge management as the set of activities that lead the organization to acquire knowledge both internally and externally. According to Ricardo et al (2021), knowledge management is defined as the deployment of a complete system that promotes the growth of an organization's knowledge. In the effort to develop the discipline of knowledge management, Darroch and McNaughton (2001) defined it as the management functions that encompass knowledge creation, management of knowledge flow, and knowledge utilization in an effective and efficient manner within the organization.

Therefore, knowledge management effectiveness is considered a management discipline focused on developing knowledge to support the achievement of strategic business objectives.

According to Yue-Yang et al (2014), the effectiveness of knowledge management is analyzed from a process perspective. In general, knowledge management effectiveness is seen as the effectiveness of the organization in managing the knowledge acquired, shared and applied by its employees. In summary, knowledge management effectiveness is conceived as improving the process of applying knowledge to achieve organizational innovation and to improve business performance.

Organizations that effectively manage their knowledge within the organization will be more likely to choose organizational innovation to achieve breakthrough competitive advantage. In other words, knowledge is a vital organizational resource in a competitive and dynamic economy that helps provide sustainable competitive advantage (Di Vaio , 2021). In this regard, knowledge-based theory presents knowledge as a valuable enterprise resource (Chen and Huang, 2014). Knowledge management is defined as the deployment of a large system that improves the growth of an organization's knowledge (G.Castro , 2015).

Knowledge management is also an integrated and systematic approach that contains databases, documents, policies and procedures, including current expertise from experience. The latter is related to the determination, management and sharing of all information assets of the company (Çakar and Yıldız , 2016). Furthermore, knowledge management is defined as the management function that includes the creation of knowledge, management of the flow of knowledge within the organization and the effective and efficient use of the same in the long term (Darroch et McNaughton , 2002).

In general terms, knowledge management effectiveness is considered as the effectiveness of an organization in managing the knowledge acquired, shared and applied by its employees (Ling Tan and Nasurdin , 2011). Based on these definitions, we can say that knowledge management represents processes. Knowledge management processes vary from one study to another.

For example, Davenport and Laurence (2000) define knowledge management as knowledge production, information coding, coordination and information transfer. Gold and Malhotra (2001) presented knowledge management (KM) as awareness of information, determination of knowledge goals, implementation, dissemination, improvement and storage. Agarwala and colleagues (2003) revealed that firms' knowledge management capability consists of obtaining, sharing, implementing and evaluating processes. Gold and colleagues (2001) also discussed knowledge management processes in four stages; the collection, conversion, implementation, and storage of information.

Aspects can be said to refer to processes regarding the acquisition, sharing and implementation of information (Chen and Huang, 2009). In this study, knowledge management capability is

examined in the context of these three aspects. It can be said that the process of acquiring information is carried out with two different points of view. The first is the mastery of knowledge management, including exploitation through available knowledge. Essential information is taken from the factors in the organization's environment, including its customers, competitors, suppliers, and others that influence and are influenced by the company's performance. The second is the mastery of knowledge management, including the recycling of exploration through sharing and synthesis of knowledge. Firms have the opportunity to recombine existing knowledge and generate new knowledge through the acquisition of external and internal market knowledge (Zheng et al, 2005). The generation of collective information is intended to stimulate employee knowledge within the framework of information sharing. When knowledge sharing and exchange is desired, it is possible for individuals to foster collective learning and the synergistic benefits of exchange processes and knowledge resources (Nonaka and Konno , 1998).

Knowledge application is therefore a crucial element for the knowledge management process. According to Nonaka et al (1998), the value of individual and organizational knowledge depends mainly on its application due to its rigidity and tacit nature. Effective application of knowledge allows individuals to make fewer errors or improve efficiency and reduce redundancy (Chen and Huang, 2009).

Knowledge management capabilities

Technology

Technology represents the crucial element of the structural dimension that is necessary for the mobilization of social capital behind the creation of new knowledge. According to Teece (1998), information and communication technology allows the integration of knowledge into the organization. These techniques also help eliminate barriers to communication between employees of the organization. Since technology has multiple facets, the organization must invest in an overall infrastructure that essentially supports the various types of knowledge. Technology dimensions are part of effective knowledge management which include business intelligence, collaboration, learning, knowledge discovery, knowledge mapping, opportunity generation, as well as security.

Business intelligence technologies also allow a company to monitor information about their competitors and the broader economic environment. According to Gold (2001), technology facilitates the collaboration of individuals in the organization as well as eliminating structural and geographic barriers that may prevent such interaction. Knowledge discovery technologies enable society to find new internal or external knowledge. In the same sense, knowledge mapping technology allows the company to effectively track the knowledge sources of customers, partners, employees, or suppliers.

The structure

Organizational structure has an important influence in technology architecture. This is because organizational structure aims to streamline individual functions or units within an organization. It should be noted that structural elements have an unintended consequence that hinders collaboration and knowledge sharing across internal organizational boundaries. However, structures can prevent effective knowledge management in the organization. In a broader context, optimizing knowledge sharing within the company makes it possible to improve distribution across a supply chain. In essence, it is important for organizational structures to consider flexibility as it encourages sharing and collaboration across boundaries within the organization and the supply chain.

In the systems approach, Schulz and Martin (2001) suggest that modular organizational structure combined with a modular product structure can reduce coordination costs and adaptation. Nonaka and Takeuchi (1998) developed a new organizational structure that allows their five-step process to create knowledge and disseminate it effectively throughout the organization. In general, it is the combination of a formal and non-hierarchical organizational structure. However, a similar effect is achieved by maintaining the formal hierarchical structure and adding the dimension of flexibility. In the same context, incentive systems should be structured so that workers are motivated and rewarded for creating new knowledge (i.e., learning) and for sharing their knowledge and helping others. others in their own divisions or functions. An organization's formal organizational structure and incentive systems make up the overall knowledge management structure of an organization.

Culture

Culture is shaped by a society's ability to manage its knowledge more effectively. According to O'Dell et al (1998), employee interaction should be encouraged in a more formal than informal manner so that relationships, contacts and perspectives are shared by people. This type of interaction is important for transmitting tacit knowledge between individuals or converting this knowledge into explicit knowledge. Furthermore, employees have the capacity to self-organize their own knowledge to find solutions to new or existing problems and to produce or share knowledge. According to many researchers and practitioners, the important component of culture is the company's vision. Through an articulated and communicated vision, it is important to arouse feelings of participation, commitment, and contribution among employees. According to Nonaka (1998), creating a vision and organizational enhancement are not enough: they must be effectively communicated throughout the organization (Nonaka and takeuchi , 1995).

From resource-based theory to knowledge-based theory

Organizational theories are the conceptualizations and models of businesses that explain and predict their structures and behaviors. As a result, there are many business theories that compete by giving rival explanations of the same phenomena or complementary phenomena to explain different phenomena. A theory of business is the knowledge-based theory. In this perspective, the company is conceptualized as an institution for the integration of knowledge (Grant, 1996).

Knowledge-based theory posits that knowledge is strategically the most important resource of the firm. The ability to offer unique or low-cost products and services is possible through superior knowledge. Knowledge businesses become more efficient with the use of scarce resources. This view has attracted increasing attention due to rapid movements toward knowledge-based economies. The knowledge-based theory of the firm is an outgrowth of the resource-based theory of the firm. Barney (1991) suggests that resource-based theory perceives the firm as the unique set of resources where the primary task of management is to maximize value through the optimal deployment of existing resources and capabilities, while developing the company resource base for the future. Knowledge-based theory predicts the maximization of value from firm resources that are built from better knowledge.

Grant (1996) considers that knowledge resides in the mind of the individual and that the primary role of the organization is the application of knowledge rather than its creation. Other authors argue that knowledge-based theory focuses on the role of the firm as the acquisition and creation of organizational knowledge (Nonaka , 1998; Spender , 1996). These two views are incompatible with each other. Grant (1996) suggests the concept of organizational knowledge while emphasizing the role of the individual in knowledge creation.

Whyte (2009) noted that knowledge creation occurs in the mind of the individual. Additionally, the organizational processes by which individuals engage in cognitive activities may be obscured by their visualization of the organization as an entity that creates, stores, and deploys knowledge (Darroch , 2005). Drucker (1988), Grant (1996), and Spender (2003) suggest that knowledge is the only true source of competitive advantage. However, Carlsson (2003) claims that storing a company's knowledge in an information system does not create a competitive advantage. Rather, it is the ability of companies to effectively create new knowledge and use existing knowledge to solve problems, make decisions and decide on actions to achieve competitive advantage. According to Grant (1996), competitive advantage comes from firms that integrate the specialized knowledge of their members. He proposes that this effectiveness depends on the efficiency and flexibility of knowledge integration.

Furthermore, integration effectiveness concerns the costs of combining multiple types of knowledge into goods and services. For example, if individuals share common knowledge (e.g., chemical engineering specialists), they will be more effective in integrating their knowledge. If they have entirely separate knowledge bases, integration cannot occur except at a very basic level. Scope refers to the different types of specialized knowledge, this is integrated into a broader scope of knowledge being integrated. This would make it more difficult for competitors to replicate.

Integration flexibility reflects the extension of existing capabilities through silos-breaking activities to access and reconfigure additional knowledge through both internal and external integration. Furthermore, Grant (1996) suggests that organizational capacity depends more on the integration mechanism than on the specialized knowledge of employees. Thus, research

should focus on difficulties in coordinating knowledge between individuals instead of encouraging cooperation. Leonard (1998) relates knowledge-based theory to innovation. He also asserts that innovators must manage knowledge effectively to achieve goals. They are the most enthusiastic about pursuing knowledge and the most likely to harness the power of innovation. Leonard illustrates the core capability dimensions that all organizations must innovate: physical systems, management systems, skills, and behavioral standards. It views organizations as a site of learning and information transfer rather than physical locations or financial entities. Employees must be able to process and manipulate knowledge and possess specific skills. Management should encourage creative chaos between disciplines within the organization and benchmarking with competitors. Several companies have chosen to implement the strategy of knowledge management in the knowledge-based economy despite the fact that the realization of this knowledge remains an intangible resource (Skrzypek , 2004). Indeed, they consider that the creation of knowledge management processes play an important role in the overall management system (Bitkowska , 2010).

As previously discussed, Probst, Raub , and Romhardt (2002) proposed eight knowledge management processes: localization, acquisition, development, sharing, dissemination, application, optimization, and knowledge storage. They emphasize the link between internal and external processes and they assume that managers know where knowledge resources are located in the organization and that every employee should be engaged in knowledge management processes. Employees serve as transmitters of knowledge. To facilitate information sharing, it is also necessary to adopt a better organizational culture and structure.

Knowledge management processes are intended to harness workforce expertise and add new value to enable staff to collaborate and gain access to new information to extract vital data and process organizational needs appropriately.

Process and intelligence systems help predict future trends, anticipate possible scenarios, reduce uncertainty, learn new skills and streamline daily activities. With potential benefits in mind, companies are willing to experiment with new approaches to knowledge management, such as design thinking (Bachnik , 2011; Bitkowska , Nowacki, and Zaleśna , 2012).

CONCLUSION

Today, the company is becoming more and more aware of the immense power of knowledge, the stakes of which are becoming more and more crucial. However, acquiring, developing and maintaining competitive advantage from internal resources and skills remains the overarching goal for every organization. It is for this reason that it is necessary to put in place a strategic knowledge management plan which is based on the three main axes: acquire, share , and apply.

This research focuses on the efforts made by companies in terms of knowledge management processes in order to implement innovative solutions. In response to this research objective,

innovative knowledge management is defined as a company's willingness to introduce innovative knowledge and the ability to execute this strategy.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

- Alavi, M., Yoo, Y., and Vogel, D.R,1997,Using information technology to add value to management education. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40 (6), 1310-1333.
- Alavi, M., & Leidner, D. E. 2001 Review: Knowledge management and knowledge management systems: Conceptual foundations and research issues. *MIS Quarterly*, 25(1), 107-136.
- Alavi, M., Kayworth, T., & Leidner, D. 2006, An empirical examination of the influence of organizational culture on knowledge management practices. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 22(3), 191-224.
- Alavi, M. and Leider, D. (2001) Knowledge Management and knowledge management systems: Conceptual foundations and research issues. *MIS Quarterly*, 25(1): 107-136.
- Chen, C. and Huang, J. (2009) Strategic human resource practices and innovation performance — The mediating role of knowledge management capacity, *Journal of Business Research*, 62: 104–114
- Chen, F., K. A. Bollen, P., Paxton, P. Curran, and J. Kirby (2001). Improper solutions in structural equation models: Causes, consequences, and strategies. *Sociological Methods and Research* 29: 468-508.
- Chawla, D. and Joshi, H. (2011) Impact of knowledge management on learning organization practices in India: An exploratory analysis, *The Learning Organization*, 18 (6): 501 – 516.
- Darroch, J. (2003). Developing a measure of knowledge management behaviors and practices. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 7(5), 41-54.
- Darroch, J., & McNaughton, R. (2002). Examining the link between knowledge management practices and types of innovation. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 3(3), 210-222.
- Damanpour, F. and Evan, W.M. (1984). 'Organizational Innovation and Performance: The Problem of Organizational Lag'. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 29: 392-402.
- Damanpour, F. (1996). 'Organizational Complexity and Innovation: Developing and Testing Multiple Contingency Models'. *Management Science*, 42/5: 693-716.
- ERMINE, J.-L. (2003), *La gestion des connaissances*. Hermes Science publications
- Gold, A.H., Malhotra, A. and Segars, A.H. (2001), ‘‘Knowledge management: an organizational capabilities perspective’’, *Journal of Management Information Systems*, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp. 185-214.
- Grant, R.M, 1996, Prospering in dynamically competitive environments: Organizational capability as knowledge integration. *Organizational Science*, 7 (4), 375-387.
- Lee,S; Kim, B and Kim, H (2012) An integrated view of knowledge management for performance. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 16(2): 183-203.

- Lee, W.; Hung, S.; Chau, P. (2011) Influence of Knowledge Management Infrastructure on Innovative Business Processes and Market-Interrelationship Performance: An Empirical Study of Hospitals in Taiwan, *Journal of Global Information Management*, 19(2):67-89.
- Lee, H. and Choi, B. (2003) Knowledge management practices, processes and organisational performance: An integrative view and empirical examination, *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 20(1):179-228.
- Lee, C. and Yang, J. (2000) Knowledge value chain, *The Journal of Management Development*, 19(9): 783-94.
- Lee, C.C., Yang, J. and Yu, L.M. (2001) The knowledge value of customers and employees in product quality, *Journal of Management Development*, 20(8): 691-704.
- O'Dell, C. (1996). *A current review of knowledge management best practices*. Conference of Knowledge Management and the Transfer of Best Practices, Business Intelligence, London.
- O'Dell, C., & Grayson, C. J. (1998). If only we know what we know: Identification and transfer of internal best practices. *California Management Review*, 40(3), 154-174.
- O'Dell, C., Wiig, K., & Odem, P. (1999). Benchmarking unveils emerging knowledge management strategies. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 6(3), 202-211.
- RicardoManuelAriasVelasquez, JenniferVanessaMejíaLara (2021), Knowledge management in two universities before and during the COVID-19 effect in Peru “technology in society 64 (2021) 101479”
- M. Al-Emran, Vitaliy Mezhujev, Adzhar Kamaludin, Towards a conceptual model for examining the impact of knowledge management factors on mobile learning acceptance, *Technol. Soc.* 61 (2020) 101247.
- Nonaka, I (1994) A dynamic theory of organisational knowledge creation. *Organisational Sciences*. 5(1):14-37.
- Nonaka, I. (1998), The knowledge-creating company, *Harvard Business Review on Knowledge Management*, Harvard Business School Publishing, Boston, MA, pp. 21-45.
- Nonaka, I and Takeuchi, H (1995) *The Knowledge-creating company: How Japanese Companies Create the Dynamics of Innovation*, Oxford University Press, NY.
- Nonaka, I and Toyama, R (2003) The knowledge-creating theory revisited: Knowledge creation as a synthesizing process. *Knowledge Management Research and Practice*, 1: 2-10.
- Nonaka, I ; Toyama, R , Nagata, A (2000) Firm knowledge-creating entity: A new perspective on the theory of the firm. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 9(1): 1-10.
- Noordin, M. F., Othman, R., & Zakaria, N. A. (2013). Investigating key success factors in adopting knowledge management system. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 21(2), 221–229.
- Nystrom, P. C., Ramamurthy, K., & Wilson, A. L. (2002). Organizational context, climate and innovativeness: adoption of imaging technology. *Journal of Engineering and Technology Management*, 19(3-4), 221–247. doi:10.1016/s0923-4748(02)00019-x
- Rim Maâlej Ben Zaid, Habib Affes, Lubica Hikkerova, (2015); SOURCES EXTERNES DE CONNAISSANCES, INNOVATION ORGANISATIONNELLE ET

PERFORMANCE ORGANISATIONNELLE ; Association de Recherches et Publications en Management | « Gestion 2000 » 2015/5 Volume 32 | pages 81 à 98 ISSN 0773-0543

- Rhodes, J.; Hung, R ; Lok, P ; Ya-Hui Lien,B and Wu,C (2008) Factors influencing organisational knowledge transfer: implication for corporate performance, *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 12(3): 84-100.
- Robertson, J, 2004, Developing a knowledge management strategy. *KM Column*, Retrieved in July 10, 2011, http://www.steptwo.com.au/papers/kmc_kmstrategy/index.html.
- Rogers , E. M . (2003). Diff usion of innovations (5th ed .). New York : Free Press .
- Roehrich (2004), Consumer innovativeness: Concepts and measurements, *Journal of Business Research*, 2004, vol. 57, issue 6, 671-677
- Ubda mercedes,vano fracisco, La création de connaissance dans l’entreprise : l’intégration de modèles et le blocage dans le processus d’apprentissage » *revue des sciences de gestion, direction et gestion n*188-189 pp 69-82*
- Yeongjun Yeo, Jeong-Dong Lee, Revitalizing the race between technology and education: investigating the growth strategy for the knowledge-based economy based on a CGE analysis, *Technol. Soc.* 62 (2020) 101295.
- Yli-Renko, H., Autio, E., & Sapienza, H. J. (2001). Social capital, knowledge acquisition, and knowledge exploitation in young technology-based firms. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22(6-7), 587–613. doi:10.1002/smj.183
- Yue-Yang Chen, Hui-Ling Huang (2014), STRATEGIC ORIENTATION OF KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND THEIR EFFECTS ON PERFORMANCE
- Zaim, H., Tatoglu, E. and Zaim, S. (2007), ‘Performance of knowledge management practices: a causal analysis’, *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 13 No. 6, pp. 392-409.
- Ziadi Jameleddine, 2014 ‘ la gestion des connaissances « ISBN : 978-9973-05-0311 »
- Zhang, X. (2008) Understanding the Conceptual Framework of Knowledge Management in Government, Presentation on UN Capacity-building Workshop on Back. Office Management for e/m-Government in Asia and the Pacific Region. Shanghai, People’s Republic of China, 27-28 May.
- Zheng, W. ; Yang, B. and McLean, G. (2010) Linking organizational culture, structure, strategy, and organizational effectiveness: Mediating role of knowledge management, *Journal of Business Research*, 63:763–771.