

**AN APPLICATION OF CONTEXTUALISED KNOWLEDGE ELICITATION  
IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS  
BASED ON IDENTIFIED CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS**

**SANATH SUKUMARAN**

**A Thesis Submitted to Asia e University in  
Fulfilment of the Requirements for the  
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

**December 2017**

## **ABSTRACT**

A significant number of ineffective Knowledge Management Systems inundating the marketplace today necessitates the identification of critical success factors prior to the development of successful Knowledge Management Systems. Critical Success Factors (CSF) that embody contextual elements are investigated and determined to form a contextual-based framework that would be useful for KMS developer in building a KMS while taking into consideration of elements beyond merely technical dimensions. The framework guides the knowledge elicitation process to acquire contextual aspects from knowledge workers among others. In building the framework, a mixed mode data gathering method was adopted to investigate KM practices and KMS implementations across five organisations from various industries. A purposive sampling was used for the survey followed by semi-structured interviews. The findings led to a refined list of six (6) Critical Success Factors governing contextual knowledge elicitation namely KM Strategy, Knowledge Repository, KM Measurement Metrics, Core KM Features, Motivational Factors and KM Governance. In order to formulate the theoretical framework, activity theory and knowledge value added were used as the theoretical underpinning. The outcome of the theoretical contributions are the KMS-AT Development Framework, the Knowledge Asset Value Stream Model, the KM-AT Model and the KM Measurement Metrics. The practical contributions of this research include the KMS Business Case Blueprint and the KMS Requirements Blueprint. The culmination of the research is the validation of the KMS-AT Development Framework through the development and deployment of a prototype knowledge elicitation tool for acquiring contextual knowledge in building Knowledge Management Systems.

**APPROVAL PAGE**

I certify that I have supervised / read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is full adequate, in quality and scope as a thesis for the fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor Philosophy.

.....  
Professor Dr. Syed Malek F. D. Syed Mustapha  
Supervisor

.....  
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX  
External Examiner 1

.....  
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX  
External Examiner 2

.....  
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX  
Internal Examiner 1

.....  
Professor Dr. Siow Heng Loke  
Chairman, Examination Committee

This thesis was submitted to the School of Information & Communication Technology, Asia e University and is accepted as fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

.....  
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Roshayu  
binti Mohamad  
Dean, School of ICT

.....  
Professor Siow Heng Loke  
Dean, School of Graduate Studies

## DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the thesis submitted in fulfilment of the PhD degree is my own work and that all contributions from any other persons or sources are properly and duly cited. I further declare that the material has not been submitted either in whole or in part, for a degree at this or any other university. In making this declaration, I understand and acknowledge any breaches in this declaration constitute academic misconduct, which may result in my expulsion from the programme and/or exclusion from the award of the degree.

Name of Candidate: Sanath Sukumaran

Signature of Candidate:



Date: 27/12/2017



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere appreciation and gratitude to my supervisor Professor Dr. Syed Malek F. D. Syed Mustapha. You have been an amazing mentor to me. I would like to thank you for encouraging me and setting the standards for me to achieve. Your sustained advice on the directions of my research not only gave me immense clarity but proved to be the turning point in my research and has since proven to be priceless. I would also like to thank Prof Emeritus Dr. Lorna Uden who gave me initial guidance leading to the conceptualization of my research. I would also like to acknowledge the members of the Research Committee and Panel of Examiners for your invaluable feedback and guidance. Thank you for your brilliant comments and suggestions. I would also like to extend my gratitude to the survey respondents and the companies that I have been in touch with during my research.

A special thanks to my family. Words cannot express how grateful I am to my parents, siblings and in-laws for their support. Your good wishes and words of encouragement have sustained me in times of difficulty. I would also like to thank my friends and superior who have supported me in my writing and encouraged me to reach my goal. My heartfelt appreciation to my lovely wife, for her understanding and patience as well as the initial proofing of the thesis.

To all others who have contributed to this research in one way or another, I will always treasure your words of encouragement and good wishes. Finally, I would like to thank the Almighty for His presence and guidance throughout my PhD.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
<b>ABSTRACT</b>	ii
<b>ENDORSEMENT</b>	iii
<b>DECLARATION PAGE</b>	iv
<b>COPYRIGHT PAGE</b>	v
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>	vi
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	vii
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b>	xvi
<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b>	xix
<b>CHAPTER</b>	
<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Overview	1
1.2 Background of the Research	2
1.3 Issues in Knowledge Elicitation	5
1.4 Problem Statement	8
1.4.1 Putting Context into Knowledge Elicitation	12
1.5 Significance of the Research	13
1.6 Motivation of the Research	13
1.7 Research Objectives	15
1.8 Research Question	15
1.9 Research Approach and Methodology	15
1.9.1 Overview	16
1.9.2 Study Organisations	16
1.9.3 Quantitative Method	17
1.9.4 Qualitative Method	18

1.9.5	Information System driven implementation of a KMS	19
1.10	Research Contributions	19
1.11	Research Scope and Context	23
1.12	Limitations of the Study	27
1.13	Organisation of the Thesis	29
1.14	Summary	32
<b>2.0</b>	<b>LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	<b>33</b>
2.1	Introduction	33
2.2	Review of Definition, Concepts and Perspectives	33
2.2.1	Knowledge and Knowledge Management	33
2.2.2	Knowledge Management (KM) Activities	40
2.2.3	Knowledge Management Systems (KMS)	40
2.3	Knowledge Elicitation and Contextual Knowledge	43
2.3.1	Background	43
2.3.2	Challenges in Knowledge Elicitation	45
2.3.3	Contextual Factors in Knowledge Elicitation	47
2.3.4	Renewed Approach in Contextual Knowledge Elicitation	51
2.4	IS and KMS Development Approaches	53
2.4.1	Background	53
2.4.2	Key Differences between IS and KMS	55
2.4.3	Salient features in an Ideal KM System	59
2.4.4	Renewed Approach	64
2.5	KMS Frameworks, Models and Strategies	65
2.6	Current Knowledge Management Systems	80
2.7	Failure of Prevailing Knowledge Management Systems	85
2.8	Studies on KM implementation in Malaysia	88



2.9	Knowledge Management Critical Success Factors	96
2.9.1	Background	96
2.9.2	Analysis of Critical Success Factors	100
2.9.3	Selection of Critical Success Factors	101
2.10	Theories and Models in Contextual Knowledge Elicitation	104
2.10.1	ISDT and Work Systems Theory	104
2.10.2	Activity Theory	105
2.10.3	Rationale	107
2.10.4	Activity Theory and Knowledge Management	109
2.10.5	Activity Theory and Contextual Knowledge Elicitation	110
2.10.6	Activity Theory and Knowledge Management Systems	112
2.11	Knowledge Measurement and Metrics	113
2.11.1	Background	113
2.11.2	Importance of Knowledge Measurement	115
2.11.3	Existing Approaches to Knowledge Measurement	116
2.11.4	Renewed Approach to Knowledge Measurement	118
2.12	Research Gap	121
2.13	Summary	124
<b>3.0</b>	<b>RESEARCH METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>126</b>
3.1	Introduction	126
3.2	Research Design	126
3.3	Sources of Data	128
3.4	Sampling Design	129
3.4.1	Population	129
3.4.2	Unit of Analysis	129
3.4.3	Sample Design	129

3.5	Survey Instrument	133
3.5.1	Similar Instruments	134
3.5.2	Selection of Critical Success Factors in the Survey Instrument	142
3.6	Structure of the Survey Instrument	144
3.7	Research Activities	147
3.7.1	Outline of the Research Activities	148
3.8	Data Collection Procedure	151
3.8.1	Quantitative Data Collection	151
3.8.2	Qualitative Data Collection	152
3.9	Summary	156
<b>4.0</b>	<b>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</b>	<b>157</b>
4.1	Overview	157
4.2	Current Status of Knowledge Management System	157
4.3	Involvement of the Organisations in KM activities	160
4.4	Experience in KM activities (Years)	163
4.5	Personnel for Overseeing KM activities in the organisation	166
4.6	Mechanism for Capturing Contextual Knowledge in the Organisation	168
4.7	System, Tool, Resources Currently Employed in the Organisations for KM Activities	172
4.8	Biggest Hurdles in Implementing KM in the Organisation	174
4.9	Type of Systems Currently Used or Planning to Use in the Future	179
4.10	Effectiveness of Various Techniques in Knowledge Elicitation	181
4.11	Reliability Analysis	184
4.12	Descriptive Statistics - Critical Factors for the successful implementation of KM in the Organisations (N = 108)	185
4.12.1	KM Strategy	186

4.12.2	KM Governance	187
4.12.3	Motivational Factors	187
4.12.4	Knowledge Repository	188
4.12.5	Core KMS Features	188
4.12.6	KM Measurement	189
4.13	Availability of Guidelines, Systems, Procedures and Processes for KM in the Organisations	189
4.13.1	Performance bonus for KM Activities	189
4.13.2	Performance bonus for Knowledge Sharing	191
4.13.3	Presence of Standard KM Maturity Model	192
4.13.4	Presence of Systems, Processes and Procedures for Tacit Knowledge Sharing within the Organisation	194
4.13.5	Evaluation System for Measuring Outcome from KM Initiative	195
4.13.6	Presence of Systems, Processes and Procedures to Measure Whether KM Initiatives are Meeting Established Milestones	197
4.13.7	Presence of Measures to Determine Organisational Knowledge Gap	198
4.13.8	Resource allocation for knowledge sharing	200
4.13.9	Policies to Encourage Knowledge Sharing	201
4.13.10	Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for Evaluation of Employees Based on the Extent of Knowledge Sharing	203
4.13.11	Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for Evaluation of Employees based on the Contribution to the Organisational Knowledge Repository	204
4.14	Extent to which the Existing KMS Serves the Intended Purpose of Achieving Organisational Goals	206
4.15	Need for Revamping or Redesigning of existing KMS	207
4.16	Summary of Quantitative Data Analysis	209
4.17	Analysis of Qualitative Data	209

4.17.1	Background	209
4.17.2	Factor I: KM Alignment	213
4.17.3	Factor II: Contextual Knowledge Elicitation	215
4.17.4	Factor III: Key Components of KMS	218
4.17.5	Analysis of Emerging Factors	220
4.17.6	Summary of Qualitative Data Analysis	226
4.18	Summary	228
<b>5.0</b>	<b>DISCUSSIONS AND CONTRIBUTIONS</b>	<b>229</b>
5.1	Introduction	229
5.2	Key Contributions of the Research Study	229
5.2.1	Theoretical Contribution	232
5.2.2	Practical Contributions	232
5.3	KMS-AT Development Framework (Critical Success Factors)	232
5.3.1	Critical Success Factor 1: Knowledge Repository	235
5.3.2	Critical Success Factor 2: Motivational Factors	238
5.3.3	Critical Success Factor 3: KM Governance	241
5.3.4	Critical Success Factor 4: KM Strategy	245
5.3.5	Critical Success Factor 5: Core KMS Features	247
5.3.6	Critical Success Factor 6: KM Measurement Metrics	249
5.4	Knowledge Asset Value Stream Model	251
5.5	KM-AT Model	254
5.6	KM Measurement Metrics	258
5.7	KMS Business Case Blueprint	264
5.7.1	Background	264
5.7.2	Rationale and Mapping	267
5.8	KMS Requirements Blueprint	275

5.9	Other Contribution	279
5.10	Validation of the KMS-AT Development Framework	280
	5.10.1 Expert Validation	281
	5.10.2 Operational Readiness	282
	5.10.3 KMS Prototype	282
5.11	Development of a Prototype Knowledge Management System	283
	5.11.1 Login	283
	5.11.2 Manage Profile	284
	5.11.3 Manage Account	284
	5.11.4 Manage Knowledge	285
	5.11.5 Authenticate Knowledge	288
	5.11.6 Search	289
	5.11.7 Manage Q&A	289
	5.11.8 Manage Group	290
	5.11.9 Manage Project	290
	5.11.10 Manage Organisational Goals	291
	5.11.11 Manage Value Stream	292
	5.11.12 Manage Gamification	292
	5.11.13 Manage Knowledge Management (KM) Strategy	293
	5.11.14 Manage Approvals	293
	5.11.15 Generate Analytics	294
	5.11.16 Manage Knowledge Assets	296
	5.11.17 Future Enhancements of the KMS Prototype	296
5.12	Summary	297
<b>6.0</b>	<b>CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>299</b>
6.1	Introduction	299
6.2	Review of the Research	300

6.2.1	Problem Statement	300
6.2.2	Research Objectives and Research Question	301
6.2.3	Methodology Development	302
6.2.4	Framework Development	302
6.2.5	Implication of the study	303
6.3	Important Assumptions	303
6.4	Recommendations	305
6.4.1	To KM Researchers	305
6.4.2	To Organisations	306
6.4.3	To KM Practitioners	309
6.4.4	To KMS Developers and Vendors	310
6.5	Directions for Future Research	311
6.6	Summary	314
<b>REFERENCES</b>		<b>318</b>
<b>APPENDICES</b>		<b>331</b>
	Appendix A: KM-AT Model	332
	Appendix B: KMS Business Case Blueprint	333
	Appendix C: KMS Requirements Blueprint	336
	Appendix D: KMS Features (Core KMS Features)	349
	Appendix E: KMS Features (KM Governance)	356
	Appendix F: KMS Features (KM Measurement Metric)	362
	Appendix G: KMS Features (Motivational Factors)	364
	Appendix H: KMS Features (Organisation Goals)	366
	Appendix I: KMS Features (KM Strategy)	367
	Appendix J: KMS Features (Knowledge Repository)	368
	Appendix K: KMS Prototype	372
	Appendix L: Survey Instrument	384

Appendix M: Qualitative Interview Transcripts	398
Appendix N: Companies with KM Solution in Malaysia	414
Appendix O: Pilot Rollout	415

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>Table</b>		<b>Page</b>
2.1	The difference in focus between KM and KMS (Dehghani & Ramsin, 2015; Smuts et al., 2009; Williams, 2015)	42
2.2	Summary of the literature - Factors involved in Contextual Knowledge Elicitation	50
2.3	Summary of KM Implementation Efforts in Malaysia	89
2.4	Gap Analysis of KM and KMS implementation in Malaysia	96
2.5	Summary of Important Critical Success Factors of KM	99
2.6	Mapping between AT Constructs and Knowledge Elicitation for KM	111
2.7	Mapping of Research Gap against Research Objectives	121
3.1	Number of Respondents based on Similar Studies	130
3.2	Description of Companies involved in the Survey	131
3.3	Questionnaire Distribution	131
3.4	Questionnaire Distribution by Job Positions in the Surveyed Organisations	132
3.5	Survey Response Rate by Company	132
3.6	Adapted Items from Critical Success Factors	139
3.7	Identification of Critical Success Factors and their Sources	143
3.8	Operationalizing the Factors for Measurement	144
3.9	Source triangulation across 5 industries	154
4.1	Present Status of KM System within the Organisations	157
4.2	Involvement of the Organisations in KM activities	160
4.3	Experience in KM activities	163
4.4	Team Overseeing KM activities	166
4.5	Mechanism for Capturing Contextual Knowledge in the Organisations	169



4.6	System, Tool, Resources Currently Employed in the Organisations for KM Activities	172
4.7	Biggest Hurdles in Implementing KM in the Organisation	175
4.8	Type of Systems Currently Used or Plan to Use in Future	179
4.9	Effectiveness of Various Techniques in Knowledge Elicitation	181
4.10	Reliability Statistics of Critical Factors in KMS implementation	184
4.11	Critical Success Factors for Effective Implementation of KMS in the Organisations	185
4.12	Descriptive Statistics – KM Strategy (KMSTGY)	186
4.13	Descriptive Statistics – KM Governance (KMG)	187
4.14	Descriptive Statistics – Motivational Factors (MF)	187
4.15	Descriptive Statistics – Knowledge Repository (KR)	188
4.16	Descriptive Statistics – Core KMS Features (KMSF)	188
4.17	Descriptive Statistics – KM Measurement Metrics (KMMM)	189
4.18	Performance bonus for KM Activities	190
4.19	Performance Bonus for Knowledge Sharing	191
4.20	Presence of Standard KM Maturity Model	193
4.21	Presence of Systems, Processes and Procedures for Tacit Knowledge Sharing within the Organisation	194
4.22	Evaluation Systems for Measuring Outcome from KM Initiative	195
4.23	Presence of Systems, Processes and Procedures to Measure whether KM Initiatives are Meeting Established Milestones	197
4.24	Presence of Measures to Determine Knowledge Gap	199
4.25	Resource Allocation for Knowledge Sharing	200
4.26	Policies to Encourage Knowledge Sharing	202
4.27	Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for Evaluation of Employees Based on the Extent of Knowledge Sharing	203

4.28	Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for Evaluation of Employees Based on the Contribution to the Organisational Knowledge Repository	205
4.29	Extent of Usefulness of Present KMS	207
4.30	Need for Revamping or Re-designing the existing KMS	208
5.1	Summary of Key Contributions	230
5.2	Summary of the Critical Success Factors	234
5.3	KMS Roles and Escalation Levels against KMS Features	244
5.4	KM Measurement Metrics	263
5.5	KMS Features and Functionalities	277
5.6	KMS-AT Operational Elements	282

## LIST OF FIGURES

<b>Figure</b>		<b>Page</b>
1.1	KM Research Areas (A.F. Ragab & Arisha, 2013)	23
2.1	Difference between First-Generation and Second-Generation KM	39
2.2	KM Model (Daniel & Kavitha, 2009)	66
2.3	The Four Modes of Knowledge Conversion Nonaka (2015)	68
2.4	Organisational Knowledge Creation Spiral Nonaka (2015)	70
2.5	Earl's schools of Knowledge Management (Galvis-Lista & Sánchez-Torres, 2013)	74
2.6	Framework for Knowledge Management Support (Kannabiran & Pandyan, 2010; Yusoff et al., 2012)	78
2.7	KM Strategy alignment with Business Goals (Gudas, 2017)	79
2.8	Basic unit of an Activity (Sukumaran & Chandran, 2014)	106
2.9	Activity System (Y Engeström, 2016)	107
3.1	Selection of Critical Success Factors	142
3.2	High-Level Overview of Research Activities	148
4.1	Triangulation of the Findings	212
5.1	KMS-AT Development Framework	233
5.2	Mapping of Knowledge Repository against KM Strategy	236
5.3	Internal Mapping of Knowledge Repository against KM Strategy	236
5.4	Adding Knowledge into a KMS	237
5.5	KMS Motivational Framework (Sukumaran & Chandran, 2014)	239
5.6	Gamification Features (Manage Points & Ranking)	241
5.7	Verification and Verification Level in a KMS	243
5.8	Approval Levels in the KMS	245

5.9	KM Strategy to organisational goals Mapping	246
5.10	Mapping of KM Strategy to a Best Practice	247
5.11	Profile Settings in the KMS	248
5.12	Generate Analytics	251
5.13	Knowledge Asset Value Stream Model	252
5.14	Relationship between Best Practices and Value Stream	253
5.15	Adding Activities for a Value Stream	253
5.16	KM-AT Model	255
5.17	Relationship between Knowledge Asset Value Stream Model and the KM-AT Model	256
5.18	Adding Knowledge for a Knowledge Activity	257
5.19	Snapshot of the KMS Business Case Blueprint	267
5.20	Snapshot of the KMS Requirements Blueprint	276
6.1	Problem Statement and KMS-AT Developmental Framework (Critical Success Factors) Mapping	300
6.2	Direction for Further Research (Data Analytics)	313

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1 Overview

Organisations need knowledge to make business decisions and so Knowledge Management is arguably an essential ingredient of success. Traditional methods of eliciting knowledge have proven to be ineffective as they more often than not fail to contribute to an organisation's success (Fuentes-Fernández, Gómez-Sanz, & Pavón, 2010; Gavrilova & Andreeva, 2012). In an ideal setting, a Knowledge Management (KM) initiative in place may offer the opportunity for employees to achieve greater quality of work outcomes given that best practices (knowledge) can now be seamlessly elicited and consequently leveraged. However, this is easily said that done. Managers are often bombarded with an almost constant stream of data and information on a daily basis if not constantly. It is therefore important that there are measures in place to ensure knowledge is effectively elicited before it is disseminated. This phenomena is synonymous to the old adage, *garbage in garbage out*.

Knowledge elicitation is central to any KM initiative. Despite the growing number of literatures inundating the marketplace, the elicitation of knowledge within the realms of organizations and individuals alike is difficult (Dalkir & Liebowitz, 2011; Murray E., Stefan, & David, 2014). Prominent authors like Davenport and Prusak (1998) in their seminal paper have espoused the challenges involved in eliciting tacit knowledge. Others like Jayasingam, Ansari, Ramayah, and Jantan (2013) and Gavrilova and Andreeva (2012) have concurred with Davenport and Prusak of the difficulties involved in eliciting tacit knowledge particularly in the

context of Knowledge Management Systems (KMS). The difficulty is compounded by today's world that is characterized by changing markets, evolving products, emerging new technologies, intense competition, increasing regulations, and changing societies toward innovation and growth. Given these new technological development and societal advancements, it is not far-fetched to note that knowledge elicitation is a key component of KM and an important source of sustainable competitive advantage in a knowledge-driven economy (Daniel & Kavitha, 2009; Yusoff, Mahmood, Jaafar, & Salak, 2012).

This preceding paragraphs encapsulates the focus of the research in broad terms. In essence, the main goal of the research is the identification of critical success factors to effectively elicit contextual knowledge from subject matter experts to achieve organisation-wide dissemination of critical knowledge.

## **1.2 Background of the Research**

It is difficult to define knowledge because what is perceived as knowledge by one person can be an information for the other (Girard & Girard, 2015). Given the preceding challenges involved in defining knowledge, it is equally challenging to elicit knowledge let alone document and disseminate knowledge.

Organisations have begun to recognise the importance of eliciting critical knowledge as an important resource (albeit tangible) for corporate success ((Anvari, Alipourian, Moghimi, & Baktash, 2011). Similar views were echoed by Ehsan, Mohammad, H. Sabet, Z. Seyed, and Mahmoud (2012) who stated that organisations have increasingly recognised knowledge as an important resource, and the ability to elicit and deploy knowledge across the organisation is an important source of organisational advantage. These observations indicate heightened levels of interest

shown by organisations that regard knowledge as a strategic resource (Albers, 2009; Omotayo, 2015). The aforementioned authors' emphasis on knowledge as the strategic asset suggests that managing knowledge in general and eliciting knowledge in the context of a KMS should therefore assume greater significance and priority in attaining competitive advantage and improved productivity.

Although organisations realise the importance of “knowing what they know”, i.e. best practices, there are many problems associated with eliciting these knowledge assets and being able to leverage them for organisational gains (Karabag, 2010). Regardless of the approach taken, organisations in general have started giving increasing prominence to the importance of knowledge utilisation in general whilst embarking on enterprise-wide KM and KMS implementation (Karabag, 2010). Moving forward, it is time organisations facilitate an environment to enable and encourage knowledge contributions from its employees (knowledge workers) in a contextualised yet purposeful manner as this is by far the easiest way to achieve KM (Moshari, 2013). As organisations continue to embrace the knowledge economy in the wake of global competition, such a transition will surely become a necessity.

Organisations can gain numerous benefits from the implementation of KM initiatives in general and KMS in particular. Some of the benefits that organisations obtain include better decision-making capability, better product and service offerings, improved responsiveness to the needs of customers, improvement in the effectiveness of employees, better flow of operations and processes which leads to performance improvement (Azmi, 2010; Murray E. et al., 2014). Other documented benefits of implementing an organisational-wide KMS are increased innovation and efficiency of its internal and external supply chain networks resulting in increased productivity (McIver & Wang, 2016).

Knowledge Management initiatives should not be seen merely as an attempt to alleviate some of the problems of poor control and poor use of knowledge and information resources in the face of increasing complexity but also as a means for organisations to have better leverage on what it does best. A holistic implementation of a KM initiative and the deployment of a KMS is necessary so that such an initiative does not disrupt existing work processes, but adds value to its operations leading to improved productivity and overall organisation performance.

For knowledge to reach levels for it to gain substantial competitive advantage, it must be effectively elicited. Suffice to say that knowledge elicitation is central to any Knowledge Management initiative (Gavrilova & Andreeva, 2012). However, as much as elicitation of knowledge is important for KM to succeed, the irony is that elicitation of knowledge within the realm of employees of an organisations remains a difficult exercise (Basir & Salam, 2015). This challenge if unresolved could derail KM efforts and one that organisations must deal with. Organisations embarking on KM initiatives in general and knowledge elicitation in particular are confronted with issues on how to effectively capture knowledge and experiences of its employees with the aim of garnering measurable results (Albers, 2009; Sukumaran & Chandran, 2014). The added challenge is how to extend the aforementioned in the realm of KMS.

Given the above-mentioned findings, KM implementations must therefore be approached differently. There is a need to capture tacit knowledge (experiential) as opposed to explicit knowledge alone. In any case, it is imperative that for knowledge to be disseminated organisation-wide, a Knowledge Management System (KMS) ought to be deployed utilising tents of information and communication technology (Kaptelinin & Nardi). Nonetheless, the panacea is not in the deployment of a KMS