



## INFLUENCE OF KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT PROCESS ON JOB PERFORMANCE AMONG PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYEES

K. Anbazhagan\*      Dr. M. Sivasubramanian\*\*

\*Assistant Professor, Dept. Business Administration, Annamalai University, Annamalai Nagar.

\*\*Professor and Wing Head in Business Administration, Directorate of Distance Education, Annamalai University, Annamalai Nagar.

### Abstract

The purpose of this research is to examine the influence of knowledge management process on job performance. Hence, this study used a descriptive research approach. Descriptive research, as a methodology, is particularly suited to explore questions regarding managers. A sample is stratified random sampling technique is applied to select the sample respondents. It is found that knowledge management practices are significantly influenced the job performance. When the employees are having higher level of knowledge management practices, their job performance is increased. But, knowledge transfer is found to least level of predictor the job performance.

### INTRODUCTION

Influence of knowledge management making more active and relevant for the firm in creating values on job performance. In general, knowledge needs to be employed into a company's products, processes, and services. If an organization does not find it easy to locate the right kind of knowledge in the right form, the firm may find it difficult to sustain its competitive advantage. When innovation and creativity are the hallmark of the present competitive arena, an organization should be swift in finding the right kind of knowledge in the right form from the organization. This process involves the mechanical, electronic, and interpersonal movement of information and knowledge both intentionally and unintentionally. In the organization job performance intentionally transfer knowledge by written communications, training; internal conferences, internal publications, job rotation and job transfer, and mentoring. Organizations unintentionally transfer knowledge as a function of unplanned human interaction, i.e. job rotation, stories, and myths, task forces, and informal networks.

Knowledge needs to be shared throughout the organization, before it can be exploited at the organizational level. The interactions between organizational technologies, techniques, and people can have direct bearing on knowledge sharing. However, in a survey of 60 Dutch Organizations, Van der Spek and Spijkervet (1997) report that hardly any structural attention is paid to knowledge management. That is, organizational structure, based on traditional command and control, minimizes the interactions between technologies, techniques, and people, and thus reduces the opportunities in knowledge sharing. What is often lacking is coordination between various activities and departments.

### RESEARCH PROBLEM

The problem addressed by this study is the apparent incomplete understanding, by scholars and management practitioners, influence of knowledge management process in job performance. For knowledge management scholars, one factor that may exacerbate this problem is a failure to adequately pursue a research style that is geared to the development of new theory and new insights that are useful to the practice of management (Worral, 2004). Management practitioners could benefit from scholarly research that generates models based on the human perspective and experience. Research in information and knowledge management taking a more human focus has been suggested by Breu and Peppard (2001), Hirscheim and Klein (2000), Hirscheim (1984), Nodoushani (1999), Prasad and Prasad (2002), Tsoukas (2002) and Wilson (2002). In a criticism of knowledge management practice, Elmholtz (2004) stated that despite the resources invested, the policy of knowledge management has proved difficult to accomplish in practice.

### OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

- To analyse the implementation of the knowledge management process on Job performance.

### METHODOLOGY ADOPTED FOR THIS STUDY

The purpose of this research is to examine the influence of knowledge management process on job performance. Hence, this study used a descriptive research approach. Descriptive research, as a methodology, is particularly suited to explore questions regarding managers. This descriptive research design allowed for exploration of relationship between variables. This is conducted in the public sector organization. A sample is stratified random sampling technique is applied to select the sample respondents. Knowledge management survey instrument is used to collect the information about the QKMP, In this research Knowledge Acquisition, Knowledge Creation, Knowledge Transfer, Knowledge Utilization, Knowledge Retention, Knowledge Accumulation, Knowledge Internalization and Knowledge Sharing are analyzed to know the influence of knowledge management process on job performance.

Greenhaus, et.al, (1990) tool is considered for measuring the job performance of the employees. This tool is having 20 statements. These 20 statements are measured the two factors of job performance namely task oriented job performance and relationship oriented performance. The respondents are asked to rate their opinion towards job performance in the five point scale. Where 5 stands for strongly agree, 4 agree, 3 neutral, 2 disagree, 1 strongly disagree. Correlation and regression used for this study.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

**Table 1: Job performance**

	Job performance				
	Task			Relationship	
		r-value	p-value	r-value	p-value
Knowledge management practices	KA	0.347	0.001*	0.419	0.001*
	KC	0.347	0.001*	0.473	0.001*
	KT	0.299	0.001*	0.372	0.001*
	KU	0.407	0.001*	0.428	0.001*
	KR	0.247	0.001*	0.384	0.001*
	KA	0.157	0.001*	0.378	0.001*
	KI	0.198	0.001*	0.325	0.001*
	KS	0.372	0.001*	0.411	0.001*

Source: primary data computed; \*significant at one percent level

Ho : Knowledge management practices are not related with job performance

Table 1 explains the relationship between knowledge management practices and job performance. In order to test the above stated hypothesis, Pearson correlation is applied. From the correlation test value, it is noted that the knowledge management practices are having relationship with job performance. Because, the calculated r – values for all the dimensions of the knowledge management practices and job performance are found to be significant. Hence, the stated hypothesis is rejected. From the r –values, it is inferred that the knowledge utilization (r=0.407) is having higher level of relationship with task oriented performance of the employees. Knowledge creation (r=0.473) is highly related with relationship oriented performance. It is found that the knowledge management practices are related with job performance of the employees. However, knowledge utilization and knowledge creation are having higher level of relationship with task and relationship oriented performance.

**Table 2 Knowledge management practices on job performance**

R - value	R - Square	Adjusted R – Square	F – value	P -value
0.820	0.687	0.672	24.997	0.001*

Model	B – value	Std. Error	Beta	t -value	P -value
Constant	4.32	0.19	-	22.05	0.001*
Knowledge Acquisition	0.06	0.04	0.07	1.29	0.195(NS)
Knowledge Creation	0.35	0.07	0.30	4.67	0.001*
Knowledge Transfer	-0.18	0.06	-0.19	-2.91	0.004**
Knowledge Utilization	0.26	0.07	0.24	3.38	0.001*
Knowledge Retention	0.08	0.06	0.08	1.35	0.175(NS)
Knowledge Accumulation	-0.01	0.05	-0.01	-0.23	0.811(NS)
Knowledge Internalization	-0.07	0.06	-0.09	-1.25	0.211(NS)
Knowledge Sharing	0.11	0.05	0.13	2.35	0.019**

$H_0$ : Knowledge management practice is not influencing the job performance

Table 2 explains the effect of knowledge management practices on the job performance. In order to examine the above stated hypothesis, multiple linear regressions is applied. Here, knowledge management practices namely knowledge acquisition,



knowledge creation, knowledge transfer, knowledge utilization, knowledge retention, knowledge accumulation, knowledge internalization and knowledge sharing are treated as independent variables. The total mean score of job performance is considered as dependent variable. From the regression analysis, the p-value is found to be 0.001, which is significant at one percent level. It is inferred that the knowledge management practices are significantly influenced the job performance. Hence, the stated hypothesis is rejected. Further, the adjusted r-square value is found to be 0.672. It is inferred that the independent variables such as, knowledge acquisition, knowledge creation, knowledge transfer, knowledge utilization, knowledge retention, knowledge accumulation, knowledge internalization and knowledge sharing are influenced the job performance at 67.2 percent level.

Further, in the regression model, the unstandardized beta value indicates the strength of relationship between independents variables and the dependent variable. The relationship is expressed by the following equation.

Job Performance = 4.32+0.35(knowledge creation) + 0.26 (knowledge utilization) + 0.11 (knowledge sharing) – 0.18 (knowledge transfer) From the regression equation, it is observed that the knowledge management practice is positively influenced the job performance. Further, the beta value indicates, to have one unit increases in job performance, knowledge creation is influenced at 0.35 levels on the job performance, when other factors remain constant. Similarly, knowledge utilization is influenced at 0.26 levels on the job performance, knowledge sharing is influenced at 0.11 levels on the job performance, But, knowledge transfer is negatively influenced at 0.18. levels on the job performance. It is found that knowledge management practices are significantly influenced the job performance. When the employees are having higher level of knowledge management practices, their job performance is increased. But, knowledge transfer is found to least level of predictor the job performance.

## CONCLUSION

Knowledge management practices implementation function is basically a logistic model in which the contribution of organizational knowledge accumulated by performing knowledge management for years starts with a slow down at some point in time to a mature level.

Power of knowledge management practices implementation to represent job performance of firms is tested statistically. It proved that correlation between knowledge management practices implementation and job performance are statistically significant.

Information technology has a strong impact on the effectiveness of five components of knowledge circulation process. Especially, the internet may become a crucial factor for making knowledge management practices implementation successful because the internet use in daily management activities render normal and essential. Based on this prospect, it is necessary to investigate the potential contribution of the internet and consider it in improving the knowledge management practices implementation. We hope that this study may trigger future researches in this challenging field of evaluation the knowledge management performance.

## REFERENCES

1. Amit R and Schoemaker, P. J. H (1993). Strategic Assets and Organizational Rents. *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol 14, 33-47.
2. Barney, J. B. (1991). Firm Resources and Sustained Competitive Advantage. *Journal of Management*, Vol. 17, 99-120.
3. Breu, K., & Peppard, J. (2001). The participatory paradigm for applied information systems research. Presented at Global Co-Operation in the New Millennium, *The 9th European Conference on Information Systems Bled*, Slovenia, 243-252.
4. Brown J. S. and P. Duguid (1991). Organizational Learning and Communities of Practice: Toward a Unified View of Working, Learning and Innovation. *Organization Science*, Vol. 2 (1), 40-57.
5. Chua, Alton (2002). Taxonomy of organizational knowledge. *Singapore Management Review*, 24 (2), 69-76.
6. Davenport, T. H., and Prusak, L. (1998). *Working Knowledge: How organizations manage what they know*. Harvard Business School Press.
7. Demarest, M. (1997). Understanding knowledge management. *Long Range Planning*, 30, 374-384.
8. Depaula, R., & Fischer, G. (2005) Knowledge management: Why learning from the past is not enough! In J. Davis, E. Subrahmanian, & A. Westerberg (Eds.), *Knowledge management: Organizational and technological dimensions*, Physica Verlag, Heidelberg, 21-54. Retrieved December 6, 2005.
9. Effects in Pharmaceutical Research. *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol 15, 63-84.



10. Elmholdt, C. (2004). Knowledge management and the practice of knowledge sharing and learning at work: A case study. *Studies in Continuing Education*, 26(2), 327-339.
11. Gupta, B., Iyer, L., & Aronson, J. (2000). Knowledge management: Practices and Challenges. *Industrial Management and Data Systems*, 100(1), 17-21.
12. Henderson R. M. and Clark, K. B. (1990). Architectural Innovation: The Reconfiguration of Existing Product Technologies and the Failure of Established Firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol 35, 9-30.
13. Henderson R. M. and Cockburn L. (1994). Measuring Competence? Exploring Firm.
14. Hildreth P., Wright P., & Kimble C. (1999) Knowledge management: Are we missing Something In Brooks L. & Kimble C. (Eds.) *Information systems - The next generation, Proceedings of the 4th UKAIS Conference*, York, 1999, 347-356. Retrieved December 6, 2005.
15. Hirscheim, R. (1984). Information systems epistemology: *An historical perspective. Presented at IPIF Working Group 8.2 Conferences, Manchester, UK 1984*, 9-33. Retrieved October 10, 2005.
16. Hirscheim, R., & Klein, H. (2000). Information systems research at the crossroads: External versus internal views. *Presented at IPIF Working Group 8.2 Conferences, Aalborg, Denmark. 2000*, 233-254. Retrieved October 10, 2005.
17. Kidd, J. B. (1998). Knowledge creation in Japanese manufacturing companies in Italy. *Management Learning*, Vol. 29 (2), 131-146.
18. Lyles, M. A. and Schwenk, C. R. (1992). Top Management, Strategy and Organizational Knowledge Structures. *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 29, 155-174.
19. Matusik S. F. and Hill, C.W.L. (1998). The Utilization of Contingent Work, Knowledge Creation, and Competitive Advantage. *Academy of Management. The Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 23 (4), 680-697.
20. McAdam, R., & McCreedy, S. (1999). A critical view of knowledge management models. *The Learning Organization*, 6(3), 91-100.
21. Nodoushani, O. (1999). Systems thinking and management epistemology: Second thoughts on the historical hegemony of positivism. In M. Liberatore & D. Nawrocki (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Russell L. Ackoff and the Advent of Systems Thinking Conference* (pp. 36-57). Villanova: Villanova University.
22. Nonaka I and N Konno (1998). The Concept of "ba": Building a Foundation for Knowledge Creation. *California Management Review*, Vol. 40 (3), 40-54.
23. Prasad, A., & Prasad, P. (2002). The comino age of interpretative organizational research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 5(1), 4-11.
24. Small, C. (2005). An enterprise knowledge-sharing model: A complex adaptive systems Perspective on improvement in knowledge sharing.
25. Thomas, J., Kellogg, W., & Erickson, T. (2001). The knowledge management puzzles: Human and social factors in knowledge management. *IBM Systems Journal*, 40(4), 863-884.
26. Tsoukas, H. (June 14, 2002). Do we really understand tacit knowledge? Presented to *Knowledge Economy and Society Seminar, LSE Department of Information Systems*. Retrieved April 15, 2005.
27. Van der Spek, R. and Spijkervet, A. (1997). Knowledge Management: Dealing Intelligently with Knowledge. In Liebowitz and Wilcox. (ed.) *Knowledge Management and Its Integrative Elements*. CRS Press.
28. Wang, S. (2005). To share or not to share: An examination of the determinants of sharing Knowledge via knowledge management systems.
29. Wilson, T. (2002). The nonsense of 'knowledge management.' *Information Research*, 8 (1). Retrieved January 15, 2005.
30. Worrall, L. (2004). A perspective on management research. *Internal Publications of the University of Wolverhampton* (working paper, OP02/04). Retrieved December 15, 2005.
31. Zander U. and B. St Kogut (1995). Knowledge and the Speed of the Transfer and Imitation of Organizational Capabilities: An empirical test. *Organization Science*, Vol. 6, 76-92.