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Introduction

Previous chapter examines current theories and concepts that contribute to this understanding, resulting in a working definition for this research. KM’s link with other areas has been discussed. This chapter is about research problems, to commence, develop, enhance and evaluate the research proposed KM practices in B school. This chapter starts with an overview of the motives and problems in the KM domain and literature that encouraged conducting more subject-related research for KM implementation in B-schools. Then, the objectives of the research are detailed and related research questions are discussed. Finally, limitations that may affect the adoption and results of the research methodologies will be described. This chapter also highlights the importance and need to conduct more research to pinpoint and improve the application of KM in B schools in Delhi & NCR.

3.1 Statement of Research Problems

Knowledge has been recognised as an important resource that significantly contributes to the success of any organisation. Hence, effective KM has received an increasing level of attention from researchers, academics and managers alike. Some organisations have taken the bold step of implementing KM strategies and practices in their working environment. Knowledge management is gaining acceptance in the field of education. At the most basic level, KM can be described as a set of practices that helps to improve the use and sharing of data and information in decision making. Several educational institutions across the country have recently received grants to implement knowledge management practices. Depending on the motivation for these
implementations, organisations have focused on all or part of the components of KM to meet their specific organisational needs and objectives.

According to N.Shani and P Divyapriya(2013) Among all the problems related to knowledge, information over load was ranked first and reinventing the wheel and poor sharing of knowledge in the organization was ranked least. There is significant difference between mean ranks for the Problems Relating to Knowledge Management. Knowledge Management (KM) is essentially about facilitating the processes by which knowledge is created, shared and used in organizations. Business schools (B-schools) have been using information for years to improve the efficiency of academic services and effectiveness of academic programs. As more trustees, administrators, faculties, parents and students have begun to seek better outcomes, these schools, not surprisingly, are investing in technology-enabled knowledge resources. But B-schools are finding, that technology implementation neither necessarily improves decision making, nor does it necessarily improve outcomes. Knowledge is derived from information, but it is richer and more meaningful than information. It includes familiarity, awareness and understanding gained through experience or study, and the results from making comparisons, identifying consequences, and making connections. A comprehensive review of the general KM literature revealed that there are a variety of dimensions to KM barriers (Lehner & Haas 2010). However, not all of these dimensions are equally important, nor are all of these relevant for the government sector. This study focuses on three dimensions that are cited most frequently in the KM literature; and these will now be discussed. KM is essentially about people—how they create, share and use knowledge, and KM tool does not work effectively if it is not applied in a manner that is sensitive to the ways people think and behave.
Encyclopedia Britannica defines KM as a system which provides a means to assemble and act on the knowledge accumulated throughout an organization. Such knowledge may include the text and images contained in patents, design methods, best practices, competitor intelligence, and similar sources, with elaboration and commentary included. Wikipedia says KM comprises a range of strategies and practices used in an organization to identify, create, represent distribute and enable the adoption of insights and experiences. Such insights and experiences comprise knowledge, either embodied in individuals or embedded in organizations as processes or practices. It is evident that KM is more about processes and practices and involves people than anything else. Review of literature on KM indicates the existence of multiple definitions of KM. For instance, Alavi, M. and Leidner, D.E. (2001) define KM as “A systemic and organizationally specified process for acquiring, organizing, and communicating both tacit and explicit knowledge of employees so that other employees may make use of it to be more effective and productive in their work”. O’Dell et al. (1998) define KM as “a conscious strategy of getting the right knowledge to the right people at the right time and helping people share and put information into action in ways that strive to improve organizational performance”. Beckman (1999) defines KM as “the formalization of and access to experience, knowledge and expertise that create new capabilities, enable superior performance, encourage innovation and enhance customer value.” Davenport and Prusak (1998) define knowledge sharing as a process that involves exchanging knowledge between individuals and groups. Connell, N. A. D., Klein, J. H., & Powell, P. L. (2003) define knowledge sharing as “a set of behaviors that involves the exchange of information or assistance to other. It is separate from information sharing, which typically involves management making information in the organization available to employees whereas knowledge sharing contains an element of reciprocity, information sharing can be
unidirectional and unrequested”. KM system maybe defined as an integrated architecture of computers, systems, networks, and communication technology that supports KM Clarke, T. and Rollow, C. (2001)⁸. Examples include collaborative and application tools such as chat, broadcast, file transfer and distributed decision making Maki, P. (2004)⁹. Lyman and Lawrence (2001) describes a knowledge worker as a person who creates information and knowledge. The worker may be operating individually but is more often considered part of a group of individuals who share a common working practice, although they may not necessarily be part of a formal team but rather a Community of Practice (CoP) Wenger, E. McDermott, R. and Snyder, W. (2002)¹⁰. The present work is also largely motivated by past studies by Jain et al. (2006)¹¹, Jing et al. (2009)¹², and Vashisth et al. (2010)¹³, who explored the factors affecting KM framework in academia in different setups.

3.2 Research Problems and Related Research Questions

KM can also be used as an alternative strategy by Universities/ Institutes to improve competitive performance. It is generally agreed upon that knowledge gathering, creation and diffusion are crucial process. It depends on individual behavior, organization culture and technological environment of any university or institute. This study seeks to investigate difficulties faced by faculties and students in above mentioned three themes. The KM process is measured using the following three constructs: knowledge gathering (KG), knowledge creation (KC) and knowledge diffusion (KD) to investigate the impact of the various knowledge management practices adopted in Universities/B-Schools on individual, organizational and technological performance.
Knowledge gathering, creation and diffusion have become a necessary means for achieving the collective outcome as a part of the work requirements. This totally depend on individual, organizational and technological environment in institutes. In academia, it has been observed that many practitioners and academicians assume that since knowledge sharing is crucial for achieving the collective outcome, people will share knowledge as part of their work requirements. However, many universities and institutions have experienced that knowledge sharing does not always happen in practice, regardless whether a person-to person or a person-to-document strategy is followed (Hansen, et al., 1999).

The concept of gathering, creating, and diffusing knowledge in organizations is not new. The recent interest in knowledge management and knowledge management systems, in our view, has been fueled by the transition into the information age and the theories of knowledge. Parallel to research and theoretical developments, organizational and managerial practice has lately become more knowledge-focused. For example, benchmarking, knowledge audits, best practice transfer, and faculty development point to the realization of the importance of organizational knowledge and intangible assets in general (Grant, 1996; Spender, 1996). The emergent patterns of literature and research as well as practice in the field imply the central role of knowledge as the essence of the universities/institutes. Given the importance of organizational knowledge, it can synthesize the relevant information and knowledge-centered work from multiple disciplines. This in turn will contribute in understanding knowledge management and knowledge management systems in organizations.

It has been observed that faculties and students are not ready to adapt new technology. This study investigates role of technology in KM. The central role of technology within Knowledge
Management has received significant criticism: "Writing embedded in this perspective is typically saturated in an optimism about how either an organisation’s knowledge assets can be shared directly via information technology systems or that such processes can be supported and facilitated by information technology." (Hislop 2002)\textsuperscript{15}. Technology forms an important component of Knowledge Management interventions within organisations (Davenport and Prusak 1998) and remains central to the research agenda of the topic (Alavi and Leidner 2001). Knowledge Management’s growth as a topic of interest within organisations is closely aligned with the development of intranet / web technologies to which many Knowledge Management Programmes are closely linked (Cohen 2003)\textsuperscript{16}.

\section*{3.2-1 Research Questions}

The present study aims at exploring faculty’s perception of KM (Knowledge Gathering, Knowledge Creation and Knowledge Diffusion) in terms of individual behavior, organizational culture and technology environment in KM implementation.

Therefore, the research questions of the study are:

i) What are the factors effecting implementations of Knowledge Management?

ii) Is there any relationship between factors influencing Knowledge Gathering (KG), Knowledge Creation (KC), Knowledge Diffusion (KD)?

iii) Does individual attitude/ behavior affects KG, KC and KD?

iv) Does organisational culture has any role in KG,KC and KD?
v) How are concepts of Knowledge Management applied through the introduction of technology within organisational contexts with the aim of organisational improvement?

vi) What are the potential barriers and facilitators influencing Knowledge Management in selected Universities and institutes?

vii) What benefits do faculties and students anticipate from KM implementation?

3.2-2 Hypothesis

Hypothesis is a tentative statement about the relationship between two or more variables. A hypothesis is a specific, testable prediction about what expect to happen in study. Here are some hypothesis given below related to this study.

H1 : The factor chosen for KM do not have significant correlation.

H2 : There is no significant relationship between the selected factors for three dimensions of KM namely KG, KC and KD.

H3 : Individual attitude does not affects KG, KC and KD.

H4 : Organisational culture does not impact KG, KC and KD.

H5 : Technology does not play a significant role in KG, KC and KD.
3.3 Research theme and process

In the light of the importance of KM in organizations, particularly in continuously changing scenario, we seek to study how KM practices are relevant in the context of Indian Higher Educational Institutions (HEIs). India’s higher education system being the second largest in the world, only after the USA, is unique in the sense of structure, history, and magnitude. This study is an attempt to examine the factors affecting the efficiency and efficacy of the people in HEIs in India keeping our focus only on B-school context. The study has three themes.

3.3-1 Knowledge Gathering

Knowledge gathering usually is regarded as desirable; much of the growing literature on knowledge in organizations focuses on the social structures and technological systems that enable knowledge to be gathered more easily. Earlier, research done on organizational design drew attention on arrangements that increases exchange of information across internal boundaries. The first challenge in the knowledge-gathering process is simply deciding what kind of knowledge to gather. The problem lays in difficulty of reaching a useful and accurate definition of knowledge that could allow both to identify and to differentiate efficiently knowledge assets within an organisation. The definition of knowledge ought to fulfill certain requirements. It ought to be conceptually consistent and pragmatically useful; it should have no conceptual problems and should be of easy application in identifying real knowledge assets.

3.3-2 Knowledge Creation

Knowledge creating and innovation are linked. Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) state that innovation is a result of continuously creating knowledge, circulating and implementing it.
Further, in the process of employing knowledge to create an innovative environment, this knowledge must be linked to new products, technology, and existing systems. The ability to create new knowledge is often at the heart of the organization's competitive advantage. Sometimes this issue is not treated as a part of knowledge management since it borders and overlaps with innovation management (Wellman 2009). Knowledge is created through practice, collaboration, interaction, and education, as the different knowledge types are shared and converted. Beyond this, knowledge creation is also supported by relevant information and data which can improve decisions and serve as building blocks in the creation of new knowledge.

This has been observed that faculties and students are not ready sometimes to share knowledge with their colleagues and friends. Sometimes organizational culture and uses of technology could also be barrier and facilitator in knowledge creation.

### 3.3.3 Knowledge Diffusion

Knowledge diffusion is the adaptation of knowledge in a broad range of scientific and engineering research and development. Tracing knowledge diffusion between science and technology is a challenging issue due to the complexity of identifying emerging patterns in a diverse range of possible processes. Knowledge diffusion could be helpful in institutes to increase awareness, ability to make informed choices among alternatives; and the exchange of information; materials or perspectives.

“Knowledge management is the explicit and systematic management of vital knowledge and its associated processes of creating, gathering, organizing, diffusion, use and exploitation. It
requires turning personal knowledge into corporate knowledge that can be widely shared throughout an organization and appropriately applied.” Davis, R. and Buchanan, B. (1997) 18.

**Research Process**

The research structure of the present study is as follows:

![Research Process Diagram](image-url)

*Figure 3.1 Research Process*
3.4 Research Objectives

The scope of research is determined by what we want to achieve. The overall aim of this research is to make better use of knowledge in their Universities/institutes and to improve construction management performance. Due to the appearance of new knowledge producers in the education sector, more and more universities are looking into the possibility of applying knowledge management systems. Knowledge management can be defined as the task of developing and exploiting an organization’s tangible and intangible knowledge resources. Tangible assets includes the output of R&D teams, strategic information about customers, suppliers, products, competitors etc. Intangible assets includes the competency and knowledge resources of human capital within the organization. KM refers to the totality of organisational strategies aimed at creating an intelligent organisation, which is able to leverage upon its tangible and intangible assets, to learn from past experiences, whether successful or unsuccessful, and to create new knowledge. At the people level, KM centres on the competencies and learning abilities of individuals. At the organisational level, KM puts emphasis on the creation, utilization and development of an organisation’s collective intelligence. In terms of technology, effective KM requires an efficiently organized and relevant communication and information infrastructure (e.g. intranet).

Organizations progress from simple KM activities such as capturing existing knowledge to more sophisticated and complex ones such as the continuous creation of new knowledge. Knowledge processes of the KM event chain include (i) locating and capturing knowledge (Knowledge Gathering) (ii) sharing knowledge (Knowledge Creation) (iii) creating new knowledge from existing knowledge (Knowledge Diffusion). These KM events are dependent on three aspects: Individual behavior, Organisational culture and Tech savvy environment.
It is anticipated that this will aid the implementation and application of KM that may have an economic impact by eliminating wasteful time and resources of reinventing solutions that have already been invented elsewhere in the organization. It will also have a social impact, as KM will act as a catalyst for improving organizational culture, promoting sharing teamwork and a tech-savvy environment. Specific objectives have been formulated and methodologies have been followed in order to achieve the stated aim. The specific objectives of the research are as follows:

1. **To identify the knowledge elements and their measures:** Maximizing the effectiveness of KM process requires proper definition of the knowledge elements and measures so that knowledge created can be shared across institutions and can be delivered to all stakeholders over various networks such as the Internet, the Intranet, dedicated forums, and so on.

2. **To investigate the scope of effective implementation of knowledge management strategy:** Success of any KM process largely depends of its effective implementation which further helps devise strategies for knowledge integration on a large scale. Knowledge implementation and integration becomes even more critical in the context of the educational and research institutions in India where knowledge management is not-so-encouraged practice.

3. **To identify the key success factors in implementing knowledge management systems** and to analyze the type of Knowledge Management Systems which have greater impact on Knowledge-Intensive Processes in the Institutes and elaborate the
impact of Knowledge Management System in Institutions that are not knowledge-intensive.

4. To structure an analytical framework for adoption of KM principles in the sample educational institutions. The study aims to explore KM in Indian educational institution context that is used to improve efficiency and effectiveness of creation and sharing of knowledge among people.

5. To provide suggestions for the future development of KM implementation and application at both organizational and individual levels.

6. To develop a guidance that can help organisations to identify important KM resources, processes, IT tools and procedures for successful implementation and application of KMS.

7. The study will also help us in exploring those factors which act as the barriers and facilitators of Knowledge Management in Indian universities. The study also focuses on barriers and facilitators to knowledge gathering, creation and diffusion.

The KM process is measured using three dimensions: knowledge gathering, knowledge creation and knowledge diffusion. The objective of this study is to investigate the impact of the various knowledge management practices adopted in Universities/Institutions on individual, organizational and technological performance in these three dimensions of knowledge management.
3.5 Contributions of the Study

The study attempts to focus on factors such as individual, organizational and technological that determine the composition of knowledge management in universities and other HEIs. It aims to help in determining perception and understanding of employees working in different universities regarding the importance of different factors to compose, affect, ensure good flow of knowledge creation and sharing of this knowledge at different levels. It also provides valuable inputs to these academic institutions in understanding the factors that hinders the development process. The research primarily aims at identifying the awareness, presence, factors affecting and also to understand the significance of KM. Based on the above literature and role of different factors which play significant role in composing basic architecture of KM, the focus of study is to identify key drivers in KM framework in the Indian HEI setup. The study is an empirical analysis of knowledge gathering (KG), knowledge creation (KC) and knowledge diffusion (KD) in Indian HEIs and relies on the cognitive approach wherein a semi-structured survey of randomly selected faculties and staff members of the sample institutes is carried out. This study is intended to explore the individual behavior, organizational culture and technological environment of universities to promote an appreciation regarding the importance of Knowledge Management in B Schools in Delhi and NCR. Individual behavior and organizational culture are playing very important role in implementing knowledge management in with strong ties to the behavioral sciences – psychology, sociology, and anthropology, as well as to allied social sciences – such as economics and political science.

The success of any organization depends on how the employees are motivated to understand the problems given in the changing environment condition by maintaining their competitive advantage. To meet the new challenges and retaining good employees, the organization should
support their knowledge management practices in modernizing and upgrading their career development. Changes in technology are making educated and skilled employees more valuable. This is about enhancing the use of organizational knowledge through sound practices of Knowledge Management and Organizational learning. Thus, Knowledge Management is a combination of Information Management, Communication and Human Resources. The study gives a clear idea about how knowledge management systems are being used as a tool for innovative practices in Indian Universities. It also enlightens us on what are the initiatives and tools that are being used in the educational institutes to implement knowledge management. It also looks into various cases that give us an insight of knowledge management.

This study promotes and cultivates a knowledge-sharing culture amongst its members so as to enable and support the exchange of tacit knowledge between individuals and groups/teams, not just at the level of sharing of research results but also with regard to know how of producing desired end-results such as publications. Supportive knowledge-sharing culture will allow its members to share information and knowledge openly, to learn from each other and the past, to act as mentors and to grow professionally. Ideally, internal knowledge-sharing should be proclaimed as a corporate value by universities that is recognised by senior members of the university administration, including board members. The sharing of know-how plays a key role in many strategic activities and processes such as recruitment and training.

As the complexity of knowledge base increases, the need to cooperate, coordinate and share experience-based knowledge between organizational units will further increase. Eventually this might leads to transfer best practices quickly from one unit to another, a standard KM tool in large organisations.
The need to share know-how effectively is gaining importance in this era of globalization which brings about not only a vast increase of what we know, but an even greater amount of ignorance, i.e. of what we know that we don't know (Menkhoff 2002). While knowledge is rapidly increasing, the knowledge about what we do not know is increasing at an even faster pace. The social ability to co-operate and communicate with different kinds of people and experts to share and create knowledge through informal learning and mutual engagement will become a key in the fostering of a knowledge-sharing culture in universities and organizations. In many organisations a ‘need to know culture’ prevails that works against knowledge sharing and innovation.

Competition in academia has made works-in-progress confidential and often inaccessible. Researchers are not rewarded based on the extent of internal knowledge sharing activities but rather based on the number of publications in internationally refereed top journals. Often there are little incentives for university lecturers to share knowledge about effective research strategies and know how other than participating in research seminars and conferences. The knowledge of doing quality research is normally passed on via mentors/gurus/doctoral supervisors or within trusted informal groups (COI). One of the related challenges is to capture knowledge about best research practices (which usually comes in the form of tacit knowledge, learned through hours of painstaking efforts) and to share that amongst other organisational members. Overcoming such challenges requires appropriate incentives and recognition for knowledge sharing (e.g. during performance appraisals), mutual trust, suitable mechanisms (e.g. regular share fairs) and a caring organisation.

As knowledge no longer remains the domain of academia but increasingly is produced and co-produced by public organisations, industry and think tanks, universities are now confronted with
very smart competitors who can generate knowledge quickly as well as the challenge of how to participate and accommodate “different practices of creating and warranting knowledge in different domains” (Knorr-Cetina 1999). As university research becomes increasingly an outcome of collaborative dialogues between researchers and the researcher’s target audience and sponsors, there is a trend towards more participative research involving many actors and experts who move less according to the dynamics of their original disciplines and more according to problem and application interests (Gibbons 2000). Gibbons suggests that important intellectual problems are emerging in a ‘context of application’, and pursuing problem interests means that academics may be away from the university, working in teams, with experts from a wide range of intellectual backgrounds, in a variety of organisational settings.

Researchers must adopt a different set of research practices to participate in cross-industry collaborative knowledge sharing. Universities are major players in the knowledge business (Goddard 1998) and stand to benefit from knowledge management practices and solutions. An analysis of university mission statements, for example, shows that related aims and objectives are consistent with knowledge management principles: the discovery, acquisition or creation of knowledge (i.e. research), the transmission or dissemination of knowledge (teaching); the application of knowledge to human problems in the interests of public service; and the preservation of knowledge in libraries, museums and archives Allen, J. and Bresciai, M. J. (2003).

### 3.6 Significance of the Study

From an organizational learning point of view (Senge 1990; Franklin et. al. 1998), a university seems to be well suited to the adoption of knowledge management /organizational learning
practices as its environment puts a lot of emphasis on the exchange of ideas and knowledge sharing. The adoption of the scientific method of enquiry requires individuals within subject disciplines to be skeptical about one another’s approaches and findings. With the common adoption of falsification as the dominant methodology both in the sciences and social sciences, we see a constant quest for new discoveries and advancement of knowledge Fraenkel, J. R. and Wallen, N. E. (2006). The sharing of this knowledge in conferences and academic journals is part of the knowledge culture of universities, a feature much less pronounced or even absent in business corporations. The division of university research into disciplines creates, however, boundaries that are difficult to transcend. Though it is well known that new scientific discoveries are often made in areas between disciplines, interdisciplinary research is still difficult to institutionalize. The university’s research process represents a key area which can be enhanced through the application of knowledge management Kidwell, J.J., Vander Linde, K.M. and Johnson, S.L. (2000).

Creating and maintaining knowledge repositories. Data accumulated are mostly in the areas of student and faculty’s information. IT support services are centrally provided and are mostly operational. They are system driven rather than knowledge driven, something which has been highlighted by Rowley J (2000) as a common inadequacy of educational institutions dealing with large amounts of accumulated data. While information has been readily captured in documents and databases through the various IT systems available, there have been less ready efforts to capture and disseminate knowledge, i.e. information combined with experience and judgement (Nonaka & Takeuchi 1995).
**Proper Use of Individual and collective knowledge.** Knowledge can be individual or collective. Individual knowledge is a part of the tacit or explicit knowledge held by an actor in the organization. The collective knowledge is represented by the accumulation of organizational knowledge stored in rules, procedures, routines and shared norms that guide problem-solving activities and patterns of interaction between organizational agents. Among the collective knowledge, some are easily transmissible (explicit knowledge), others are more difficult to capture, clarify and disseminate within the organization (tacit knowledge). The collective knowledge builds and feed through individual knowledge flows circulating within or originating from outside the organization.

**Improving knowledge access.** There is also a fair amount of workspace freedom, where users are given a fair degree of control on what they can store on their PCs. Faculty, staff and students have the freedom to make use of any other tools they feel that will increase their personal and research productivity, with some more productive than others as it often depends on the tools they use for daily work. This study will provide importance of tools and software’s (e.g. Microsoft Office, Adobe Acrobat, SPSS, SAS, etc.) for effective and (inter)disciplinary research work. Faculty members can request for technical help and draw from a comprehensive and growing suite of research software that are relevant to their research needs.

**Enhancing the knowledge environment & valuing knowledge.** An effective knowledge culture is a key to knowledge management enabler. While technology is important in facilitating knowledge management, it is the people who, if they are willing to share and participate in various knowledge exchanges, can create an ideal environment and culture for knowledge and
innovation to thrive. Our survey on effective knowledge management practices within the university revealed that being engaged in knowledge sharing would help members to avoid costly mistakes, make innovation easier, save time by not ‘reinventing the wheel’, and make more informed decisions with the inputs from colleagues.

*Clear idea about prerequisites for implementing KM.* If the university or institute would like to implement KM, they should firstly change the perceptions or attitudes of people and the culture of the organization. Researchers have observed communication and interaction is always required to understand the benefits of KM, and they pointed out that the university needed to convince staff to be involved in KM. This study tries to develop a culture of willingness to share their own knowledge and trusting each other which is very important for implementing KM.

*Emphasis on importance of Leadership and support.* Management support is vital for implementation of KM, but not as important as other conditions. Many researchers pointed out that leadership and top management support would empower staff to implement KM actively. This belonged to the KM components of “Leadership and Support”.

### 3.6 Limitations and Delimitations of the Study

Each research deals with some limitations, either caused by limited resources, by imperfections or by rational choices. This section addresses the restraints of this research. Data collection has been done within Delhi & NCR, as it was not possible anymore to collect data. Sample size is not diversified. As only B schools are surveyed, result might be biased. Limited generalizability to different organizational settings are main limitations of this research. The focus of the study was delimited to departments with specific KM development, implementation or initiatives
within their department. Therefore, the finding may not be generalized to other departments. Due to scheduling considerations, multiple visits were utilized for this study. Generalization of these results to similar KM activities may be limited. The research is based on a data collected from a concentrated geographical region Delhi & NCR. More widespread and extensive study with larger sample of researchers from several academic and research institutions should be taken up and results will certainly offer deeper insights into the KM systems in Indian universities. This research did not consider the operational areas of researchers. Potential differences in the result are expected once researchers from different fields are considered. It is possible, for example, that the perceptions of researchers from the engineering field differ from those of education, natural science, or computing. In this study, no comparison was made between researchers whose sole job is research (a very uncommon situation in the Indian context), and those who conduct research and teaching simultaneously. Sub research question three aims at finding out how relational models underlying Knowledge gathering, knowledge creation & knowledge diffusion reveal themselves in different organizational setting. In this research several organizational settings were included within B Schools in Delhi & NCR. Therefore, one can question whether the variety in organizational settings is sufficient. While interpreting the findings of this research, one has to be rather modest about making generalizations to other organizational settings.

It is admitted that, because of the limitations of the interview, the results of this research might not be valid in other scenarios. However, the study contributed to new knowledge by examining perceptions of teachers as end users of KM implementation in academic environment. Since most other research has been performed to develop theoretical approaches, or has investigated
KM implementation on a larger scale involving a number of institutes, little research has been done concerning faculty’s perception in a designated school. The research is valuable as it deepens the understanding of KM in B-schools regarding preparation for its implementation for knowledge gathering, creation and diffusion. Survey research typically represents the perception of respondents about general practices and environmental conditions. Thus this method provides the researchers the freedom to compare knowledge management practices across groups. One potential limitation of this method is group scores can be added or averaged only if the correlation between responses from a group is high. If responses of a group do not correlate to decent level then it cannot be averaged for group. Some studies have taken existence of infrastructure and processes Malhotra, Y. (2003)\textsuperscript{24} as measures of knowledge management. This approach is misleading as it focuses on the facilitating factors (such as reward, openness etc) to measure knowledge management instead of precise knowledge management practices. This approach becomes particularly confusing because according to network view of knowledge management, knowledge is seen as highly contextual and dependent on relations. Therefore, studies may actually be reporting relationship aspect instead of actual knowledge management practices. Future studies may be initiated avoiding such limitations and better and more relevant results are expected.

**Summary**

This chapter starts with an overview of the motives and problems in the KM domain and literature that has encouraged conducting more subject-related research to develop a KM model for construction organisations. Then, the objectives of the research are detailed and the research contribution are described. Finally, limitations that may affect the adoption and results of the
research methodologies are described. The following chapters will be dedicated to describe the adoption and application of these methodologies in addition to a description of the research final developed KM model. The current interest in KM has also been motivated by the improvements achieved in data processing and communication capabilities (KLICON, 199925). This chapter also describes the shortcomings of other research on KM, the aim and objectives of the research, and the research methods to achieve desirable results.
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