

REVIEW OF STUDIES AS TO KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT TRENDS IN CHINA, MALAYSIA & INDIA

Dr. G S Batra
Tamana Anand

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to explore dimensions of Knowledge Management (KM) and research trends in KM in Malaysia, China & India. China has relatively newly developed KM awareness, unique Chinese culture environment requires the Chinese research models, two major challenges of China economy, i.e. reforming in the process of development and the privatization as well as the regional difference need to be reflected in China KM research. Findings revealed that Malaysian Government and private companies should find solution of difficulties associated with sharing knowledge, which are: lack of incentives; knowledge is an individual property; knowledge hoarding; competitive tensions; concern over information leakage; fear of criticism; time pressure; and employee apathy. The literature on India are not very encouraging as they reveal that there is a lack of organizational culture for knowledge creation, sharing and dissemination which has serious implications for the competitiveness of the firms, industry and the country.

Keywords – China, India, Knowledge Management, Knowledge Worker, Malaysia, National culture

JEL Code -- M1

Introduction

In today's globalized economy knowledge has gained great importance. Current economy is more knowledge intensive than of the past. The knowledge has become as an asset to be maximized, managed and developed for achieving competitive advantage. Due to global competition, advancement in information technology (IT), changing and dynamic environments, organizations are employing people of diverse talents and expertise to enter new markets and technologies. The "information age" in 1990s has evolved as "knowledge age" of new century (Maureen & Elaine, p 125). KIF (Knowledge intensive firms) is organization where exclusive expertise and knowledge is the most important input. According to Stevens (1998, as cited in Withey, 2003) there are two different types of knowledge that are important to an organization, one is explicit which can be

codified and made into a marketable product which can be sold. Other is tacit knowledge which cannot be coded and transmitted as easily, it involves human capabilities such as intuition, insight, creativity and judgment. Globalizations, advancement of technology, workforce diversity, and knowledge society have sparked a wave of learning, training and workforce education in organizations from all sectors (Sauve, 2007, as cited in Carleton, 2011). It is tacit knowledge that resides in "knowledge worker" which makes them essential for the modern organization. Peter Drucker (1959, as cited in Marcia Zidle, 2005, para. 1) defines, "knowledge workers are those whose work primarily requires the use of mental power rather than muscle power". Their main activities are absorbing, creating and moving knowledge. According to Vogt (1995, as cited in Horwitz & Heng & Quazi, 2003, p.23) - "knowledge workers as a person with the motivation and capacity

to co create new insights and the capability to communicate, coach and facilitate the implementation of new ideas. Reed (1996, as cited in, May & Korczynski & Frenkel, 2002) argued that knowledge workers as an expert group adopt a marketization power strategy to build up and maintain their expertise status. If an organization is to excel then the top management has to give equal importance to the management of explicit as well as tacit forms of knowledge being created by its workforces while working on different tasks or assignments (Sanjay Singh, 2008)

By above definitions, examples of knowledge workers include: managers, accountants, engineers, architects, lawyers, information technology experts, advertising experts, consultants, health specialists, teachers, and media and entertainment professionals. Unlike traditional professionals, knowledge workers do not rely on conventional occupational or organizational credential systems. Knowledge workers do not like to be specifically told what to do and how to do it. Their work is non-repetitive and result oriented, using both traditional & scientific methods and need for continuous learning, intuition, new mindsets, imagination.

Knowledge management is a process that facilitates knowledge sharing and establishes learning as continuous process within an organization. Davenport (1998) defines knowledge management as a process of collection, distribution, and efficient use of the knowledge resource throughout an organization. O'Dell and Grayson (1998) believe knowledge management is a strategy to be developed in a firm to ensure that knowledge reaches the right people at the right time, and that these people should share and use information to improve upon the organization's functioning. In the same way, Bounfour (2003) defines knowledge management as a set of procedures, infrastructures, technical and managerial tools, designed toward creating, sharing and leveraging information and knowledge within and around organizations (Sanjay Singh, 2008). Organizations who are successful in leveraging knowledge, normally witness increased efficiencies in operations, higher rates of successful innovations, increased levels of customer service,

and an ability to have foresight on trends and patterns emerging in the marketplace (Ajay Singh & Sharma, 2011)

Dimensions of Knowledge Management

KMAT –KM Assessment Tool

Knowledge Management Assessment Tool (KMAT) was developed by The American Productivity and Quality Centre and Arthur Anderson to help organizations self-assess where their strengths and opportunities lie in managing knowledge (Chawla & Joshi, 2011). The purpose of administering KMAT is to make an assessment of how well this organisation is managing its knowledge practices to achieve their organisational goals. The KMAT, as based on an organisational KM model, proposes ways that four enablers (leadership, culture, technology and measurement) can be used to foster KM process (Arthur Andersen and The American Productivity and Quality Center, 1997). Descriptions of the KMAT factors are as follows (Knowledge Report, 1996): KM process – The KM process embraces the action steps that the company uses to identify the information it needs and the manner in which it collects, adapts and transfers that information across the organisation. (Pandey & Dutta, 2012) the capability of a knowledge process is to transform the knowledge that is stored in the form of standard operating procedures and routines throughout the firm into valuable organizational knowledge, experience and expertise (Paisittanand, 2007, as cited in Pandey & Dutta, 2012). Knowledge management can be defined as the process for acquiring, storing/sharing, diffusing and implementing both tacit and explicit knowledge inside and outside the organization's boundaries with the purpose of achieving corporate objectives in the most efficient manner (Magnier-Watanabe and Senoo, 2008). (Nair & Vohra, 2010) explains Knowledge acquisition is the process of gaining new knowledge, from either inside or outside the organization. Knowledge storage/sharing is especially relevant since, in general, firms are systems of cooperative behaviours where the issue of coordination remains; cooperation is the sharing of common goals, and coordination is the process of

informing each worker as to the planned behaviours of the others (Simon, 1976). Knowledge diffusion deals with efficient knowledge flows. Knowledge application can be viewed in terms of the type or amount of learning in the difference between knowledge exploration and exploitation (Gupta, 2006). Knowledge management processes are integrated with business processes to help individual and organizational learning, and provide a platform for training new people. As such, knowledge management processes in a knowledge enterprise are meant to support knowledge creation and flow of knowledge between people, among business processes and operations, organizational units, and strategic partners external to the organization. One of the important goals of a knowledge management process is to convert tacit knowledge into organizational explicit knowledge and make it available in the right format and context to facilitate learning at individual and organizational levels.

KM leadership – Leadership practices encompass broad issues of strategy and how the organisation defines its business and uses its knowledge assets to reinforce its core competencies. (Jain & Jeppesen, 2012) People management practices play a critical role in KM practices. Recent studies show that recruitment and selection, team work, training and development and performance appraisal have a positive association with KM practices (Fong, 2011, as cited in Jain & Jeppesen, 2012). According to Nonaka (1988, as cited in Chawala & Joshi, 2011), “top management creates a vision or dream, and middle management creates and implements concrete steps to solve and transcend the contradictions arising from gaps between what exist at the moment and what management hopes to create.” Lack of direction and support from top management can result in ambiguous and incomplete information flow across levels. Among other factors, leaders have an important impact in nurturing and developing human capital in organisations (Mayo, 2001). Senior managers are responsible for the implementation of management systems regarding the definition and establishment of visions, strategies, business policies, organisational structures, teams,

measurement and communication systems, etc., to guarantee the long-term success of the enterprise (Jain & Jeppesen, 2012)

The role of leadership in managing knowledge in organization has been lucidly highlighted by Cleveland (1985) in his book, *The Knowledge Executive*. He has stressed the need for use of teams, communities of people, and other such networks as the role of leaders in managing information and knowledge. This role of leader in managing information and knowledge is accomplished through the two broad routes evidently, through technology and through social network (Marjaan Laal, 2011). The enthusiasm, drive, and energy of the knowledge leaders play a major role in building commitment from others around. Moreover, if knowledge management does not permeate to all levels in the organization, beginning at the top, it is unlikely that knowledge management programs will ever catch on or be effective (DeTienne, 2004). Such observations about leadership at the top in making knowledge management programs in the organization a success is true, but the role of leaders in middle management positions are also equally important. (Sanjay Singh, 2008)

KM culture – Culture practices reflect how the organisation views and facilitates both learning and innovation, including how it encourages employees to build the organisational knowledge base in ways that enhance value for the customer. Organization culture can be defined as shared beliefs, values, and practices of a group or groups within the organization. These beliefs and values often influence norms and behaviour of both individuals and groups within the organization. (Vittal Anantatmula, 2010). Organizational culture is crucial for successful KM initiatives. Lack of focus on the cultural issues involved has led to the failure of many KM initiatives. It's quite difficult to create the right kind of organizational culture. Successful organizations don't change their culture altogether for KM, instead, they use practical ways to incorporate it. Communities of Practice are very useful in creating a knowledge sharing culture. The organization's core values, trust and the vision and commitment of leadership are crucial for creating the

right kind of culture (Rajesh Pillaina, 2006)

KM technology – Technology practices focus on how the organisation equips its members to communicate easily with one another, as well as the systems it uses to collect, store and disseminate information. Many authors have noted that technological capability removes the barriers to communication and sharing, and also helps in the integration of knowledge across departments, project teams and units (Davenport & Prusak, 1998; Holsapple & Joshi, 2001; Leonard, 1995, as cited in Panday & Dutta, 2012)

KM measurement – Measurement practices include not only how the organisation quantifies its knowledge capital, but also how resources are allocated to fuel its growth (Jain & Jeppesen, 2012) According to Jager (1999), three types of comparisons reports can be generated using KMAT: 1. External benchmarking (compares an organization with overall KMAT database). 2. Internal benchmarking (compares an individual or division within an organization with peers). 3. Average benchmarking (average of group or individual within an organization with overall KMAT database)

It appears that the rate of change is accelerating rapidly as new knowledge, idea generation and global diffusion is increasing (Kim and Mauborgne, 1999; Senge, 1999 as cited in Jyothi, Gupta & Kotwal, 2013). The nature of global economic growth has been changed by the speed of Innovation, which has been made possible by rapidly evolving technology, shorter product life cycles and a higher rate of new product development. Knowledge management has frequently been identified as an important antecedent of innovation (Darroch and McNaughton, 2002) because a firm with a knowledge management capability will use resources more efficiently and will be more innovative and perform better (Darroch, 2005).

Soliman and Spooner (2000, as cited in Theriou & D. Chatzoglou, 2007) HRM practices play an important role in facilitating employees' absorption, transfer, sharing and creation of knowledge. More specific, compensation, training and performance management programs are significantly affect

employees' motives and behaviours in participating in KM activities (Greengard, 1998). Similarly, Scarbrough (2003) identified that HRM practices as selection methods, compensation strategies and career systems seem to "have an influence on the flows of knowledge which KM is seeking to maximize". Moreover, Soliman and Spooner (2000) pinpoint the importance that HRM plays in identifying where the tacit knowledge resides, and how best it may be utilised, negotiating with employees on selecting an appropriate KM programme, harnessing a know-how strategy, creating a supportive environment for KM programmes, enabling technologies for a KM programme and creating a KM team.

KM practices in Countries

The influence of national culture on KM implies that the management of knowledge may not only depend on the organizational characteristics of the firm and its deliberate and explicit procedures and guidelines, but may also be constrained by the mental models of its practitioners drawn from national culture. Different people from different cultures use different metaphors to conceptualize knowledge. They may be using the same word; however, this word can refer to totally different understandings of the concept of knowledge. In other words, knowledge and related terms mean different to different cultures.

Schmittlein (2006) from Wharton suggests that it goes without saying that different countries have different management models. Countries vary greatly in how they build those internal corporate human relationships as well as those outside relationships with consumers. Andriessen & Boom (2007) present an interesting analysis of cultural difference among various societies with respect to how they value knowledge. They argue that the dominant way to conceptualize knowledge in western society is to make it like a thing or a substance. In Asian philosophy in general, strong emphasis is laid on the basic subjective nature of knowledge. Knowledge is not a thing or substance; knowledge is far more part of a process. Also, in Asia, rational thought is not disconnected from the

emotional activity of the mind.

Good performance differs from country to country. Project managers dealing with international projects should be trained to develop sensitivity to cultural differences. Grosse (2002) and Dodson (1998) conclude that speaking the language, knowing the culture, and being sensitive to cultural differences could help communication. The main issue between cultures seems to be the role of trust. In order to manage a global project successfully, organizations need to understand the global business environment and different relevant cultures (Anantatmula and Thomas, 2010).

Trends of KM in Malaysia

Malaysia is one of the leading countries in Asia that are at the forefront in the development of a knowledge-based economy (KBE). The Malaysian government has been making substantial investments in both physical and technological infrastructure to facilitate knowledge-intensive economic activities. Foreign and local firms in Malaysia are encouraged to take advantage of the opportunities brought by the emerging KBE. On a societal level, the drive towards a knowledge-based society in Malaysia was initiated in 1996, a move that was marked by the establishment of the Multimedia Super Corridor (MSC), which is managed by the Multimedia Development Corporation or MDec (Ida, 2008). This drive resulted in a substantial investment in physical and technological infrastructure to facilitate knowledge-intensive economic activities. On an organizational level, a 2003 survey of Malaysian organizations indicated that they performed well in knowledge utilization, moderately well for knowledge sharing and knowledge acquisition, but were generally weak in knowledge generation actions (Ida, 2008, as cited in Barbara, Skadiang and Roxas, 2012)

To meet the targets outlined in the 9th Malaysia Plan, Malaysian administrators have established a number of strategies to increase government performance, particularly in the second term. One strategy includes introducing the concept of enhancing knowledge capabilities, being more creative and

having the country equipped with 'first class human capital' (Government of Malaysia [GOM], 2008). It is believed that to be successful, one must have easy access to knowledge, and it must be feasible enough to derive benefit from the knowledge (Abdullah, 2005, as cited in Manaf & Marzuki, 2014)

Malaysia intends to become a knowledge based economy and with this in mind innovation need to exist in all sectors of the economy (Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation, Malaysia (MOSTI), 2006). Nevertheless, MOSTI had reported that there are still short of innovations in many sectors of the economy even though a lot of efforts have been carried out thus resulted in slow development of the right environment for innovation to flourish in Malaysia (Tan & Nasurdin, 2010). In line with this global knowledge economy, one particular subset of services sector namely knowledge-intensive business services (KIBS) has come into the fore of Malaysia with great potential to be tapped. KIBS in Malaysia constitute a niche sector like IT consulting, outsourcing, system integrations, creative services, project management, environmental engineering, civil and mechanical engineering, medical services and accounting services (Economic Planning Unit, 2009). By undertaking KIBS as a strategic and innovative service industry, it will help cement the formation of Malaysia's national innovation ecosystem, as well as the new realm of research in Malaysian higher education (Yeoh Khar Kheng, Sethela June & Rosli Mahmood, 2013)

Malaysian managers acknowledge KM to be a core part of their organizational strategy, recognize the purposeful identification of goals that improve organizational performance and affirm the establishment of priorities for goals that improve organizational performance. A respect for authority in the Malaysian culture of high power distance (Skadiang, 2009) tends to make employees reluctant to highlight what could be perceived as the shortcomings of their superiors or leaders. In general, however, these Malaysian managers seem to be concerned that organizations do not regularly assess the employees' contribution to knowledge resources or conduct quality reviews of knowledge

resources. . It seems as if Malaysian management have successfully impressed upon employees the critical role of KM into enhancing business performance, and that they have instilled a KM culture among employees to an appreciable degree. It is necessary to promote KM on a national level by KM institutional champions. This implies that the government of Malaysia could continue with its effort. Furthermore, it is recommended that Malaysian organizations can identify external best practices– this may be achieved through the organization’s adherence to and certification by an internationally acclaimed standards body such as the ISO (Sharma, 2008, as cited in Barbara, Skadiang and Banjo Roxas, 2012)

KM in Education in Malaysia

In Malaysia higher learning institutions serve as a reservoir of knowledge and are no longer just providing knowledge to students. Information practices and learning strategies known as knowledge management are gaining acceptance in the field of education (Petrides and Nodine, 2003). This is evident by the fact that several higher learning institutions, particularly in the developed world have been receiving grants to implement knowledge management practices.

However, quality concerns, accountability mechanisms, relevance and graduate unemployment problems led to the necessity of academic programs having to go through a rigorous process of approval. To address these concerns, Malaysia Qualifications Agency (MQA) was established to monitor quality in both public as well as private institutions. These well-developed units have been instrumental in promoting systematic reviews of programs and courses based on specific criteria and standards (World Bank Report, 2007). The strategy of the government has been to place a high priority on increasing accessibility to higher education to create a critical mass of trained, skilled, and knowledgeable workforce that would sustain economic growth, increase competitiveness, and support a knowledge-based economy. The Ninth Plan (2006-2010) provides for a series of measures to

improve the quality of education, mainly through increased coverage and utilisation of ICT, the introduction of a quality assurance system, and improvement in infrastructure facilities (World Bank Report, 2007). With Malaysia’s transition to a knowledge-based economy, policy makers have linked more specifically the development of the university sector to the requirements of economic growth. The aim has been to articulate a complementary policy objective of establishing a world-class university system to make Malaysia a regional education hub, and transforming it into a knowledge-based economy (M. Sadiq Sohail, Salina Daud, 2009)

Trends of KM practices in China

Many developing countries, like China started this progress relatively late. With rapid economic development over the past 25 years, most Chinese manufacturing organisations are at the stage at which massive fundamental (lower level of) knowledge has not been effectively managed (Tong & Mitra, 2009)

The Chinese have “situation accepting” tendency rather than the “problem-solving” orientation which prevails in Western societies (Adler, 1991). They see little value in trying to influence external events or significantly change their surroundings, their proclivity is to accept their environment and focus on adapting to it (Westwood, 1992; Yau, 1988, as cited in Peng, Moffett, McAdam, 2010)

Confucianism is at the root of Chinese culture, the key element of which is “hierarchy”. Pun et al. (2000) summarised that “people focus and relationship building” is one of the most outstanding characteristics of Chinese enterprise management as the consequence of Confucianism (see Bond, 1991). It emphasises that the individual does not exist independently but in a network of relationships, which is called “Guanxi”. Park and Luo (2001, p. 455) believe that “Guanxi is a critical factor in firm performance in China”. Traditional Chinese cultural values pervasively influencing on the management mode and organisation is one of the outstanding characteristics of Chinese organisations (Pun et al.,

2000; Bond, 1991; Lo, 1997; Su et al., 1998; Watt, 1999, as cited in Tong & Mitra, 2009).

Management practices in China are, in many ways, different from that of the West. The basic challenges of China economy in the future as emerging and transforming economy require development and reform at the same time. Having the world's biggest population and the only really large country with only one coastline translate into big regional disparity (Engardio, 2005). These factors explain some of the distinctive business environment in China

The Chinese approach, is "moderation" approach that combines codification and personalization. When China companies apply KM, the "actual usability" of KM is a predominant factor, and short-term actual return from KM investment is a key concern of the management team. That explains why there are numbers of Chinese companies keen to invest IT systems. Chinese traditional history and culture, Chinese are fond of informal and inexplicit communications. Knowledge is therefore more likely to be transferred by interpersonal links via oral communication. Thirdly, in a recent research, indicates that companies that succeeded in China emphasized eight factors, i.e. knowledge, speed, action, results, relationships, quality, passion and legacy.

China KM, in research and practice, is comparatively new. The lack of literature on China KM research has been noticed by researchers (Lihua, 2004). A China-based China KM centre claims to be committed to the progress and development of KM in Chinese community. The research and practice of this centre including KM, competitive intelligence, content management, business intelligence, learning organization, and digital library, etc. This centre, according to its web site, first emerged in 1998 to "promote KM and the web site" and to provide "KM consulting services" to clients in China (ChinaKM.com). In May 2008, the Knowledge Management Centre in China launched a "KM ten years forum" in China (Sohu IT, 2008). After ten years of development, according to this forum, KM application in China has made significant development and progress, yet difficulties and problems remain with the need for research to seek

solutions (Peng, Moffett, McAdam, 2010)

KM in Education in China

Chinese universities are actively contributing knowledge via research output and knowledge transfer, which are usually measured by R&D activities and output. The state continuously generates financial and symbolic incentives and supporting mechanisms to accelerate knowledge production and transfer in the university. Although it is unlikely to rival the impact with the R&D in the business, Chinese universities make a significant contribution in the basic and applied research. In the new century and with the increasing awareness of the importance of knowledge in global competition, the Chinese government started to invest strategically in research universities with numerous revenue streams. In addition to financial resources allocated to research projects and researchers in universities, various awards have been created to support and encourage significant knowledge production, for example National Research Projects, National Key Laboratories, National Key Projects of Basic Research, National Research Bases of Humanities and Social Sciences, and National Awards of University Science and Technology. The titles and awards drove universities and academics to submit competitive applications and evaluations for securing their reputations and recognition from the state (Chen 2006)

An important policy was issued in 2001 by multiple ministries concerning returnees, aimed at encouraging overseas Chinese to come back to help China's knowledge economy. Universities can use a special fund to invite overseas Chinese academics to exchange or work regularly in China. A series of named projects were created to attract globally established academics using financial incentives and honours. (Shuang-Ye Chen, 2012)

KM practices in India

The Indian economy comprises three sectors, primary (agriculture), secondary and tertiary. The secondary (manufacturing) sector has been the backbone of Indian economy providing growth, productivity, employment, and strengthening agriculture and

service sector. The growth of tertiary (services) sector in India has been broad and rapid in areas like communications, financial services, information technology (IT) and IT-enabled services (ITES), etc. The Indian economy has undergone a structural change from an agrarian economy to transforming into a manufacturing one before eventually, becoming a service or knowledge-driven economy (Chawla & Joshi, 2011). Knowledge is being developed and applied in new ways. There is optimism around the possibility of India becoming a leader in the global knowledge economy, as there are certain positive factors to its credit (Jacob 2006). However, there is an urgent need for India to look into the efforts it needs to put in to make this happen. It is necessary to identify the shortcomings in India, such as the bureaucracy, unemployable graduates, diversity of languages and culture, the large unwieldy population base, the large segment of the population still below the poverty line, low farming productivity and poor peasants. In this knowledge-driven, services-led global economy, knowledge is the most critical resource and if Indians are not able to create a culture of knowledge creation, sharing and dissemination, then the competitiveness of our firms, our industry and country is at stake.

Indian economy is a mixed economy where both public and private enterprises have played an important role in its development. Private enterprise runs for profits, Similarly KM is aimed at enhancing efficiency, productivity etc. resulting in profitability. It is therefore natural to expect that private sector would have gone a long way to adapt knowledge management (KM) practices as compared with their public sector counterparts. Singh and Soltani (2010) found that knowledge awareness level and commitment was high in Indian IT companies (Chawla and Joshi, 2011). The awarded organizations score higher than the non-awarded organizations on the dimensions like Knowledge Management Process, Knowledge Management Culture and Knowledge Management Measurement. Knowledge Management is a critical determinant of organizational success and improved performance. Singh et al. (2006) found that in the Indian context, people do not share knowledge because they

perceive that it may have an adverse impact on their job security. This is because the organizations' environment lacks adequate understanding of the importance of human and cultural aspects. (Chawla & Joshi, 2011)

There is a strong case for change in the mind-set of the people. The prevailing notion is that knowledge management is the task of a few designated ones and there is no need for sharing knowledge. Indian organizations do not actively create and support communities of Practice. The public sector, in particular, needs to take a serious look at its organizational culture in the present time of privatization and liberalization. Organizations have not included knowledge sharing behaviour in performance appraisal system. Communities of practice are not very common in organization except in case of software sector. Lack of reward/recognition for knowledge sharing is the single largest cultural barrier in KM. The overall scenario is worse in public sector as compared to private sector (Rajesh K. Pillania, 2007)

In a culture that is primarily collectivistic such as India (Kanungo and Mendonca, 1996; Sinha, 1990, as cited in Nair and Vohra, 2010), it is to be expected that the nature of work relationships would be important for the members of a team or department. Organizations employing knowledge workers cannot risk alienating them, owing to their tacit knowledge and high mobility. The findings of this research indicate that one in every five knowledge workers is likely to be alienated. For the HR practitioner this would be an alarming number to contend with, given the implications for retention and productivity. In India, previous studies in the manufacturing sector (Ganguli, 1994, p. 62) have shown that about 34 percent of industrial workers are either dissatisfied or highly dissatisfied with their work in the engineering industry. Comparing the number of dissatisfied workers, the results of our study indicating 20 percent alienated knowledge workers in the Indian IT industry (Nair and Vohra, 2010)

Most IT companies in India provide solutions to companies all over the world for their work-related

problems (Kumar, 2005). The solutions can range from very simple but repetitive (for example, a simple problem could be the provision of maintenance or support services to a client) through to fairly complex (such as delivering an ERP solution or developing the IT infrastructure for a new business). Since there are so many knowledge workers working on a problem it is important that work output is standardized. These might be the reasons why meaningfulness and self-expression are so influential in explaining alienation among IT workers. Another variable that influences alienation significantly is the nature of work that followers are influenced by the nature of the exchange they have with their leader (Dansereau et al., 1975; Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995). It says that software professionals to a greater extent practice directive style of leadership followed by consulting, supportive, and delegating mode of leadership styles (find citation)

The World Bank report (2005) titled 'India and the Knowledge Economy: Leveraging Strengths and Opportunities' argues that when supported by the right kind of government policy incentives, the country can increase its economic productivity and the well-being of its population by making more effective use of knowledge. In the entire concept of the knowledge economy and knowledge society, universities and other higher educational institutes play a pivotal role. It is important to see how we can establish strong relationships between universities and the knowledge needs of a post-industrial society by focusing on the increased importance of knowledge generation and organisation for economic and social wellbeing (Lindenstein, 1995, as cited in panduranganarasimharao, 2009)

It can be suggested that the adoption of adaptor styles and the avoidance of radical or innovator-collaborator styles can facilitate the growth of KM practices in a public sector organisation in a developing economic work context. In order to explain the positive impact of adaptor style of leaders on KM process, the reasons may be explored from the characteristics of public sector organisations in an Indian work context. In a public sector organisation, obedience and conformity to rules and regulations are important aspects of the organisational structure

and culture. Senior managers are obliged to follow all the instructions given to them by multiple authorities in management and government (Golembiewski, 1985). In this scenario, the adaptor style was found to be more appropriate compared to the radical style. So it might be possible that managers feel a sense of security by adopting the adaptor style and thereby facilitate KM practices, since KM practices are the results of cognitive thinking, which may be activated in a safe and secure work environment. Thus, Furthermore, job security and career stability are comparatively high in Indian public sector organisations as compared to the private sector. Therefore, senior managers seem to be more accommodative and adaptive to internal and external pressures (in context of learning for India)

Discussions

The findings explain the future trend of China KM research and assists practitioner to reimpose the KM practice. This paper suggests important areas that researchers need to address as new challenges and opportunities in the China KM trends. According to many researches, developed knowledge economies were looking to gain experience and processes from practice in more developed knowledge economies. This may sound contrary to the established leadership behaviours in knowledge producing companies of the western world where knowledge workers are given a free hand to act and think on their assigned tasks. Authors have found that the Australian organizations were focusing less on the measurement and reward and incentive issues, but were paying more attention to training and developing employees to increase organizational knowledge.

After focusing on KM practice in Malaysia, China & India it can be found that in Malaysia top executives play a major role in KM strategies in the organisation as they are responsible for building relationships, assisting knowledge transfer, and having a broad range of interpersonal and organisational development skills. Findings revealed that Malaysian Government and private companies should find solution of difficulties associated with

sharing knowledge, which are : lack of incentives; knowledge is an individual property; knowledge hoarding; competitive tensions; concern over information leakage; fear of criticism; time pressure; and employee apathy (Donnelly, 2008, as cited in Najib Razali, Juanil, 2010). Also in a study by Chong (2006) suggests that in service based companies as their nature of the business is knowledge-intensive which involves employees working in teams; and therefore importance is given to factors like top management support and leadership, training, knowledge-friendly culture, team-working, employee involvement and empowerment, performance measurement, knowledge structure and information systems infrastructure.

China- It is very important to recognize national cultural values in China and KM and OL (organisational learning) research must incorporate the concept of Guanxi ideals for social hierarchy into any evaluation mechanisms. KM practice in China should be based on culture approaches i.e. personalization. The key factor of this approach is people. Expertise and tacit knowledge are important to be part of the socialization process in achieving high standard and productivity.

India-In other words, it is the task-orientation rather than people-orientation mode of leadership behaviours which are in great use for achieving excellence at workplace in software organization in India. Though significant change has taken place in terms of people's work behaviours as people were having more laid back attitude. There is no significant difference in perception between male and female software professionals with regard to leadership behaviours at the work place. It may be interpreted that both the genders have more or less similar perceptions towards practicing the art of leadership at the work place.

Indian organizations are not too far behind. Tata Steel Limited developed Knowledge Manthan Index to measure the effectiveness of its initiative by capturing aspects like involvement of people, sharing of ideas, quality of implementation etc. Similarly Wipro Technologies Limited developed a KM engagement and effectiveness (KMEE) index

that gives the top management a clear view both at the organizational level as well as at each of the business unit levels. Another Indian IT giant, Infosys Technologies Limited has created an internal metric known as the Knowledge Maturity Model (KMM) for tracking its progression on KM initiatives. Other Indian organizations like Patni Computer Systems Limited and Bharti Cellular Limited have made significant investment towards knowledge driven exploration, exploitation and competency development. Today, India is among the few Asian countries that have adopted a national KM roadmap or policy towards a knowledge based economy. As a result, a number of knowledge intensive service organizations in India have won the prestigious Most Admired Knowledge Enterprise (MAKE) award (Talisayon, 2008).

KM practices in India, China & Malaysia found that the main reasons why these countries should focus on KM is to gain competitive advantage, creating new knowledge and managing resources effectively. The competitive priorities for using KM include quality, cost reduction, improved efficiency, improved delivery, flexibility and innovation .

Bibliography

1. M.N. Ravishankara, M.N, Shan L. Pan, S.L, (2008), the influence of organizational identification on organizational knowledge management (KM). *Omega International Journal of Management Science*, Omega 36, 221 – 234.
2. Pillania, R.K, (2006), State of Organizational Culture for Knowledge Management in Indian Industry, *global business review*, 7:1.
3. Nair, N and Vohra, N, (2010), An exploration of factors predicting work alienation of knowledge workers, *Management Decision*, Vol. 48 No. 4, pp. 600-615.
4. Chawla, D and Joshi, H, (2011), Impact of knowledge management dimensions on learning organization across hierarchies in India, *VINE: The journal of information and knowledge management systems*, Vol. 41 No.

- 3, pp. 334-357.
5. Jain, A.K and Hans,J.J, (2013), Knowledge management practices in a public sector organisation: the role of leaders' cognitive styles, *journal of knowledge management*, vol. 17 no. 3, pp. 347-362,
 6. Marjan Laal, (2011), Knowledge management in higher education, *Procedia Computer Science*, Vol.3, 544–549.
 7. Chawla,D, Joshi, H, (2011), A Comparative Study of Knowledge Management Assessment in Business Excellence Awarded and Non-awarded Organizations in India, *Global Business Review*, Vol.12(2) 279–295.
 8. Singh, S.K, (2008), Role of leadership in knowledge management: a study, *journal of knowledge management*, vol. 12 no. 4 2008, pp. 3-15.
 9. Chawla,D and Joshi,H, (2010), Knowledge management initiatives in Indian public and private sector Organizations, *journal of knowledge management*, vol. 14 no. 6 , pp. 811-827.
 10. Chawla, D and Joshi, H, (2011),Impact of knowledge management on learning organization practices in India, *The Learning Organization*, Vol. 18No. 6, pp. 501-516.
 11. Pandey,S.C and Dutta, A, (2013), Role of knowledge infrastructure capabilities in knowledge management, *journal of knowledge management*, vol. 17 no. 3 , pp. 435-453.
 12. Narasimharao,B.P, (2009), Knowledge Economy and Knowledge Society—Role of University Outreach Programmes in India, *Science, Technology & Society* 14:1: 119–151.
 13. Chawla, D and Joshi,H, (2012), An Approach to KM Implementation in Indian Manufacturing and Service Sector Organizations: An Exploratory Study, *Vision*, vol.16(1) 13–25.
 14. Jyoti, J, Gupta, P, Kotwal, S, Impact of Knowledge Management Practices on Innovative Capacity, *Vision*, vol.15(4) 315–330.
 15. Goel,A.K, Sharma, G.R and Renu Rastogi, (2010), Knowledge management implementation in NTPC: an Indian PSU, *Management Decision*, Vol. 48 No. 3, pp. 383-395.
 16. Singh, A.K & Sharma, V, (2011), Knowledge management antecedents and its impact on employee satisfaction- A study on Indian telecommunication industries, *The Learning Organization*, Vol. 18No. 2, pp. 115-130.
 17. Bhusry,M, Garg, A.K , Ranjan,J, (2012), Enhancing the teaching-learning process: a knowledge management approach, *International Journal of Educational Management*, Vol. 26No. 3,pp. 313-329.
 18. Garud, R, Kumaraswamy, A, (2005),Vicious and Virtuous Circles in the Management of Knowledge: The Case of Infosys Technologies , *MIS Quarterly* Vol. 29No. 1, pp. 9-33.
 19. Jayasingam,S, Ansari,M.A Jantan,M, (2010) Influencing knowledge workers: the power of top management, *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, Vol. 110No. 1, pp. 134-151
 20. Ismail1,R.D & Sulong, Z,(2013), Knowledge Management: A Case Study on Employees Knowledge-Oriented Behaviour in the Electricity Distribution Company, *Asian Social Science*; Vol. 9, No. 7
 21. Peng,J, Li-Hua,R, Moffett,S,(2007), Trend of knowledge management in China: challenges and opportunities, *Journal of Technology Management in China*, Vol. 2 No. 3, pp. 198-211.
 22. Peng,J, McAdam,R, Moffett,S,(2010), Knowledge management in China: a review, *Journal of Technology Management in China*, Vol. 5 No. 2, pp. 158-175
 23. Tong,J and Mitra,A,(2009), Chinese cultural influences on knowledge management practice, *journal of knowledge management*, vol. 13 no. 2, pp. 49-62

24. Hutchings,K, Michailova,S,(2006), The impact of group membership on knowledge sharing in Russia and China, *International Journal of Emerging Markets*,Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 21-34.
25. Chen,S.Y,(2012) Contributing knowledge and knowledge workers: the role of Chinese universities in the knowledge economy, *London Review of Education*, Vol. 10, No. 1, 101–112.
26. Liu,E, Porter,T,(2010), Culture and KM in China, *VINE: The journal of information and knowledge management systems*, Vol. 40 No. 3/4, pp. 326-33.
27. Liu,E, Porter, T,(2010), Culture and KM in China, *VINE: The journal of information and knowledge management systems*, Vol. 40 No. 3/4, pp. 326-333
28. Peng,J, Li-Hua,R, Moffett,S,(2007), Trend of knowledge management in China: challenges and opportunities, *Journal of Technology Management in China*, Vol. 2 No. 3, pp. 198-211.
29. Razali,M.N, Juanil,D.M, (2011),A study on knowledge management implementation in property management companies in Malaysia, *Facilities*,Vol. 29 No. 9/10, pp. 368-390
30. Manaf, H.A & Marzuki,N.A, (2014), The Roles of Personality in the Context of Knowledge Sharing: A Malaysian Perspective, *Asian Social Science*; Vol. 10, No. 1
31. Erwee,R, Skadiang,B Roxas,B,(2012), Knowledge management culture, strategy and process in Malaysian firms, *Knowledge Management Research & Practice* 10, 89–98
32. Rahman,B.A,(2004),Knowledge management initiatives:exploratory study in Malaysia,*journal of American academy of business*,Cambridge,Vol.41/2.
33. Azmi, I.M, (2010), Legal and ethical issues in knowledge management in Malaysia, *computer law & security review*,Vol.26, 61–71.
34. Kheng,Y.K, June.S & Mahmood,R,(2013), The Determinants of Innovative Work Behavior in the Knowledge Intensive Business Services Sector in Malaysia, *Asian Social Science*; Vol. 9, No.15.
35. Syed-Ikhsan, S.O.SRowland,F,(2004), Benchmarking knowledge management in a public organisation in Malaysia, *Benchmarking: An International Journal*,Vol. 11 No. 3, pp. 238-266
36. Sohail,M.S,Daud,S,(2009), Knowledge sharing in higher education institutions, Perspectives from Malaysia, *VINE: The journal of information and knowledge management systems*, Vol. 39 No. 2, pp. 125-142.
37. Gao,F ,Li.M , Clarke, S,(2008),Knowledge, management, and knowledge management in business operations, *journal of knowledge management*, VOL. 12 NO. 2 2008, pp. 3-17.
38. Daug lien .R, The Peculiarities of Knowledge Workers Migration in Europe and the World,(2007),*ENGINEERING ECONOMICS*. No3 (53)
39. Anantatmula,V.S, Impact of cultural differences on knowledge management in global projects, *VINE: The journal of information and knowledge management systems*, Vol. 40 No. 3/4, pp. 239-253.
40. Theriou,G.N, Chatzoglou,P.D,(2008), Enhancing performance through best HRM practices, organizational learning and knowledge management, A conceptual framework, *European Business Review*,Vol. 20 No. 3,pp. 185-207.
41. Re'my Magnier-Watanabe and Dai Senoo, Shaping knowledge management: organization and national culture, *journal of knowledge management*, vol. 14 no. 2 2010, pp. 214-227.
42. Kelly.C,(2007), Managing the relationship

- between knowledge and power in organisations, *Aslib Proceedings: New Information Perspectives*, Vol. 59 No. 2, pp. 125-138.
43. Gibney J, Copeland S, Murie A, (2009), *Toward a 'New' Strategic Leadership of Place for the Knowledge-based Economy*, SAGE Publications, Vol 5(1): 5-23.
 44. Ml?dkov?.L, *Leadership in management of knowledge workers*, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 41 (2012) 243-250.
 45. Yigitcanlar T, Velibeyoglu K and Martinez-Fernandez C, (2008), *Rising knowledge cities: the role of urban knowledge precincts*, *Journal of knowledge management*, vol. 12 no. 5 2008, pp. 8-20
 46. Bass B.M, (2002), *The Future of Leadership in Learning Organizations*, *the journal of leadership studies*, Vol.7, No.3.
 47. Walczak S, (2008), *Knowledge management and organizational learning, An international research perspective*, *The Learning Organization*, Vol. 15 No. 6, pp. 486-494.
 48. Kulkarni, u.r, ravindran, s, and freeze, r a *Knowledge Management Success Model: Theoretical Development and Empirical Validation*, *Journal of Management Information Systems/ Winter 2006-7*, Vol. 23, No. 3, pp. 309-347.
 49. Andreeva T, Kianto A, (2012), *Does knowledge management really matter? Linking knowledge management practices, competitiveness and economic performance*, *JOURNAL OF KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT*, VOL. 16 NO. 4, pp. 617-636,
 50. Kuei-Hsien Niu, (2010), *Knowledge management practices and organizational adaptation Evidences from high technology companies in China*, *Journal of Strategy and Management*, Vol. 3 No. 4, pp. 325-343



Dr. G S Batra: Professor and Head, School of Management Studies, Punjabi University, Patiala, India

Tamana Anand: Research Scholar, Management Studies, Uttarakhand Technical University, Dehra Dun, India