
Knowledge Management Orientation: A Synthesized Window for Future Research

South Asian Journal of
Business Insights
2021, 1(1),61-77.
ISSN 2773-7012(print)
ISSN 2773-6997(online)
© 2021, Faculty of
Management and Finance
University of Ruhuna, Sri Lanka

Jayampathi E.K.*

Faculty of Management and Finance, University of Ruhuna, Sri Lanka

De Alwis, A.C.

Faculty of Commerce and Management Studies, University of Kelaniya, Sri Lanka
chamaru@kln.ac.lk

Razi, M.J.M.

Faculty of Commerce and Management Studies, University of Kelaniya, Sri Lanka
razim@kln.ac.lk

Abstract

The knowledge management behavior of an organization is discussed under the concept of knowledge Management Orientation (KMO). As one of the most important strategic resources of an organization, there is a growing interest among scholars and practitioners about KMO. Although the interest in KMO is widely spread all over the world, little attention has been given to integrate the findings of former surveys and assess the prevailing status of the research in this field. This study aims to conduct a systematic review of KMO research, to identify the various kinds of definitions of KMO, measurements of KMO, areas in which KMO studies are conducted, research gaps addressed in KMO research, limitations confronted by the former studies and the future focuses of the KMO research. By following multiple filtering processes, 35 scholarly works on KMO published during the period from 2015 to 2020 were identified. The study reveals that there is a high potential for future studies in KMO in association with numerous fields of study. Future scholars and practitioners who wish to conduct their studies on KMO can use the findings of this study as a motive to initiate their research work.

Keywords: Knowledge Management Orientation, Measures, Synthesis

* Corresponding Author- Jayampathi2k@gmail.com

Introduction

With the advent of the knowledge economy, business organizations had to convert their operations toward knowledge-based systems. All functions related to the business activities are based on the knowledge of the organizational leaders and the subordinates. The knowledge has been accepted as a strategic asset of an organization, which improves the organizational capabilities (Wang & Wang, 2012). Some scholars argue that organizational knowledge is an asset as well as a strategic resource (Barney, 1991; Brown & Duguid, 1991; Davenport et al., 1998), having the qualities of rare, valuable, difficult to imitate, and substitute. Organizational knowledge is considered to be one of the most important fundamental drivers of wealth creation and prosperity (Yashou & Jian, 2011; Wang & Lin, 2012) and a strategic weapon for attaining organizational success (Lee & Byounggu, 2003). The creation and spread of knowledge are vital for modern businesses to deal with the complex social and economic environment (Rodiah et al., 2019). To be more competitive in the marketplace, enterprises need to exploit and explore more knowledge to enhance the performance (Bueren et al., 2004; Darroch, 2005; Lee & Choi, 2003; Liao et al., 2008).

Knowledge Management (KM) is identified as a pathway for leaders, managers, or decision-making bodies in an organization to deal with the intensified complexity in the increasingly global marketplace. KM is the management of organizational knowledge (Petrash, 1996). KM is the management of the firm's information and maintaining the information in a systematic way. Transferring the correct knowledge to the right people at the right time and helping organizations improve their decision-making efficiency are also identified as the KM (Wang & Lin, 2013). A firm's ability in managing both explicit and tacit knowledge and also the conversion between tacit and explicit knowledge are of vital importance to get the efficiency and effectiveness of KM, subsequently improving the organizational performance (Kogut & Zander, 1992; Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995; Grant, 1996; Bueren, Schierholz, Kolbe, & Brenner, 2004; Darroch, 2005; Wang & Lin, 2013).

The knowledge-based theory views knowledge as a strategic asset of an organization (Brown & Duguid, 1991). Performance differences among firms result from the knowledge differences and different capabilities followed by organizations in developing and deploying the knowledge (Bierly & Chakrabarti, 1996). The firm that has the specific capability in exploiting the existing knowledge and exploring the new knowledge from external or internal backgrounds of the organization shows a unique capability required to compete at the extremely competitive marketplaces (Prieto & Easterby-Smith, 2006).

The Knowledge Management Orientation (KMO) is used to understand the behavioral importance of the KM. KMO is a reliable and valid measure to identify the KM-oriented behaviors of firms (Wang & Lin, 2013). It examines the effect of KM on creating organizational capabilities and improving organizational performance. Moreover, KMO acts as a practical tool to periodically assess the KM implementation of organizations

(Wang & Lin, 2013). Yazhou and Jian (2013) emphasized that KMO is one of the determinants in enhancing organizational performance. Furthermore, if the organization has a higher level of KMO behavior, it ensures higher organizational performance (Wang et al., 2008). If organizations perform well in KMO, they understand where to look for opportunities, and can accurately measure the value of pursued opportunities, and better extract the value from such opportunities (Farooq & Viji, 2018).

Researchers and practitioners in the KM strive to get a thorough understanding of the KMO because it is an emerging field of study with little empirical evidence. Also, business organizations are in an effort to understand the appropriateness and usefulness of KMO. Moreover, there is little attention on systematic review and synthesizing the studies on KMO in order to provide a clear idea of KMO for researchers and practitioners (Hussein et al., 2019). This study, therefore, focuses to uncover the following questions through a systematic review.

- What are the different measures used and areas addressed in KMO studies?
- What are the limitations of existing KMO studies and future directions suggested by current KMO studies?

Overall, the contribution of this study is two-fold. First, the study provides the reader with a comprehensive understanding of KMO while also providing a mind map of KMO study themes for researchers who want to identify the research areas for future studies. Second, this review will provide interesting insights into industry practitioners, making them up to date on KMO activities and the current status of KMO in the organizational context.

Review Method

A systematic review approach (Hanafizadeh et al., 2014) was used to address the questions highlighted in the introduction. As noted by Webster and Watson (2002), a systematic review can aid in advancing knowledge, facilitate theory development and identify new areas where the attention to be paid with studies. A systematic review creates a platform for the process of identification, evaluation, and interpretation of all the existing research findings relevant to the subject field of study, the research questions, or the rising interest of phenomenon (Kitchenham & Charters, 2007).

This study was based on the research work published in online journal databases of Elsevier, JSTOR, Sage, Emerald, Taylor & Francis, and Wiley Online Library. Research studies published in peer-reviewed scholarly journals such as *American Journal of Industrial and Business Management*, *European Journal of Marketing*, *Journal of Information & Knowledge Management*, *International Journal of Business Economics and Law*, *International Journal of Information Management*, *International Journal of System Modeling and Simulation*, *International Research Journal of Business Studies*, *International Review of Management and Business Research*, *Journal of Knowledge Management*, *Journal of Management*, *Journal of Management Information Systems*,

Knowledge Management Research & Practice, Knowledge Management Research & Practice, and Strategic Management Journal were considered for the review of the study. Moreover, as the quest of more relevant nature of the information of the phenomenon, few textbooks and conference papers were also reviewed. The phenomenon of “Knowledge Management Orientation” was explored during the period of 2015-2020 from this study. Although the concept of KMO was introduced by Wang and her research group in 2008 (Hussein et al., 2016), a tremendous growth of KMO-related studies among scholars and practitioners has evolved since 2015. Accordingly, a total of 35 scholarly works was considered to come up with the outcome of this study.

Literature Review

Following multiple reviewing steps were adapted to identify a more robust perspective on the KMO and its application in contemporary organizational settings. The results of the study provide a synthesis for potential studies of KMO.

Different Views on KMO

The KMO construct provides insights into the individual's behavior in applying knowledge management for organizational activities. As per Farooq and Vij (2018), KMO is the capability of an organization to create an effective learning culture within the organization, sharing the knowledge among organizational members, and store knowledge for future purposes. KMO as a set of knowledge-based behaviors of individuals can efficiently and effectively support to improve problem-solving capabilities and organizations can achieve more productive results than their competitors (Rodiah et al., 2019). Organizational relative propensity to share, assimilate or adapt, and be receptive or open up to the new knowledge can be identified as the KMO (Lin, 2015). KMO is a multidimensional construct, encompassing learning orientation, knowledge sharing orientation, knowledge absorption orientation, and receptive orientation of knowledge (Farooq & Vij, 2018). The learning orientation leads to the creation and application of knowledge in organizational matters. Knowledge sharing orientation directs the motives of facilitating, encouraging, and rewarding employees for exchanging the tacit and explicit knowledge of themselves. Knowledge absorption orientation guides to identify the firm's ability to understand the new and external knowledge and knowledge sources, adjust in order to new knowledge (assimilate) and apply such knowledge in the commercially valued events.

Table 1: Different Views on KMO

Author	View/s
Rodiah et al., 2019	A set of knowledge-based behaviors of individuals that can efficiently and effectively support to improve problem-solving know-hows and organizations can achieve more productive end results than their competitors
Farooq & Vij, 2018	The capability of an organization to create an effective learning culture within the organization, sharing the knowledge among organizational members, and to store knowledge for future purpose
Farooq & Vij, 2018	KMO encompasses learning orientation, knowledge sharing orientation, knowledge absorption orientation, and receptive orientation of knowledge
Farooq, 2018	Organization's distinct capability of managing organizational memory, knowledge sharing, and creating a learning culture
Hussain et al., 2017	KMO is about the behavior of the organization in implementing and organizing knowledge management while managing the existing knowledge, sharing the tacit knowledge, absorbing the knowledge, and being receptive to the new knowledge
Roxas & Chadee, 2016	The positive and proactive approach to search, acquire, assimilate, integrate, and exploit the external knowledge as some core business activities in a firm
Lin, 2015	KMO is the relative propensity to share, assimilate, and being receptive to the new knowledge by an organization, and knowledge assimilation and opening up to new knowledge and investing money in search of new knowledge is essential to get maximum results at the end of the organizational strategizing process
Lin, 2015	Organizational relative propensity to share, assimilate or adapt, and be receptive or open-up to the new knowledge

Source: Literature Review (2020)

KMO is about the behavior of the organization in implementing and organizing knowledge management while managing the existing knowledge, sharing the tacit knowledge, absorbing the knowledge, and being receptive to the new knowledge (Hussain et al., 2017). The organization's distinct capability of managing organizational memory, knowledge sharing, and creating a learning culture is identified as the KMO (Farooq, 2018). Wang et al., (2008) as cited in Kmiecik and Michna (2018), KMO is the behavior of a firm that demonstrates organized and systematic knowledge management and its implementation in view of developing the existing knowledge (organizational memory), sharing the available knowledge (knowledge sharing), assimilating the external and internal knowledge (knowledge absorption), and opening up to the new knowledge (knowledge receptivity).

KMO adopted as a business input strategy by organizations may direct for the superior performance with the new product they introduce to the market (Ghahroudi, 2019). Organizational leaders consider knowledge management as a strategic tool to enable their organizations to use knowledge as an asset for creating value (Ghahroudi, 2019).

If a firm uses more specified and defined KM behaviors, they are likely to have more KMO (Darroch & McNaughton, 2003 as cited in Ghahroudi, 2019).

As Lin (2015) pointed out, KMO is the relative propensity to share, assimilate, and being receptive to the new knowledge by an organization. He emphasizes the importance of sharing the existing knowledge among departmental units of the organization to have better organizational results. Knowledge assimilation and opening up to new knowledge and investing money in search of new knowledge are essential to get maximum results at the end of the organizational strategizing process (Lin, 2015). The positive and proactive approach to search, acquire, assimilate, integrate, and exploit external knowledge as some core business activities in a firm is considered as the KMO (Roxas & Chadee, 2016). In order to ensure a sustainable competitive advantage in the long run, a firm should have the capacity to convert its crucial capabilities into a knowledge-based system. In the sense of transferring organizational capabilities into a strategize process, it may enhance organizational innovativeness. Hence, KMO helps business firms to control knowledge-based resources in order to strengthen their innovative capabilities in a variety of ways (Roxas & Chadee, 2016). With the sense of organizational culture, KMO is a kind of organizational capability to create a learning culture to facilitate the sharing of knowledge and managing the organizational information effectively (Farooq & Vij, 2019).

Different Measures Used in KMO Studies

The literature clearly shows the different measures used to measure the KMO in different geographical and organizational settings. Many studies carried out under the KMO literature have used organizational memory, knowledge sharing, knowledge absorption, and knowledge receptivity as the dimensions of KMO (Rodiah et al., 2019; Kmiecik & Michna, 2018; Hussain et al., 2017; Lin, 2015). These four dimensions are widely used by scholars to measure the effect of KMO in organizations as it covers a vast area of knowledge. Wang et al., (2008) introduced this measurement model of KMO to test the knowledge orientation of the organizations in Western culture. Also, this model was initially adopted with large-scale organizations, and later it has been used to analyze the KMO of small and medium scale enterprises too.

Farooq in 2018 has used learning orientation, knowledge sharing, organizational memory, and knowledge re-use as the dimensions in the KMO. Some studies focus on the tacit and implicit orientation of knowledge with respect to the KMO (Aslan & Ulutas, 2016).

Ghahroudi (2019) introduced new dimensions; knowledge acquisition, knowledge dissemination, and knowledge accountability to measure KMO in an organizational setting. To assess the orientation of knowledge at a more specific level, Vij and Farooq (2017) have used knowledge sharing orientation, information technology orientation, and learning orientation of an organization as the dimensions in measuring KMO.

Table 2: Different Measures Used to Measure KMO

Author/s	Measures
Rodiah et al., 2019; Kmieciak & Michna, 2018; Hussain et al., 2017 Ghahroudi, 2019	Organizational memory, knowledge sharing, knowledge absorption, and knowledge receptivity as the dimensions of KMO knowledge acquisition, knowledge dissemination, and knowledge accountability
Farroq, 2018	learning orientation, knowledge sharing, organizational memory, and knowledge re-use
Vij & Farooq, 2017	knowledge sharing orientation, information technology orientation and learning orientation
Aslan & Ulutas, 2016	tacit and implicit orientation of knowledge

Source: Literature Review (2020)

Different Areas Addressed in KMO Studies

Table 3 given below illustrates the areas where the scholars considered more in KMO studies during the last five years. Most of the studies have focused on organizational innovation, culture, EO, and MO. There are some new KMO-related research areas that have gained more scholarly attention in the recent past.

During 2015-2020, there had been a focus on new KMO-related research areas amongst the scholars. Most of the scholars believe that KMO is strongly correlated with the organizational culture (Rodiah et al, 2019; Farroq & Vij, 2018; Aliyu, 2016) and ambidexterity of the organization (Santoro et al., 2018). To incorporate more knowledge-oriented behaviors into the organization, its culture and ambidexterity are essential. These studies understand the necessity of developing new mechanisms to inculcate organizational culture to get the maximum benefits from investments on knowledge. Entrepreneurial orientation (Farroq & Vij, 2018; Vij, 2017; Aliyu, 2016) and market orientation (Ghahroudi, 2019; Ullah et al., 2019; Vij & Farooq, 2017) have also gained much attention in KMO studies during the last five-six years.

As usual, many studies conducted under the KMO, yet considered the business performance (Farroq & Vij, 2018; Vij, 2017; Aliyu, 2016; Lin, 2015) as it is a timely requirement.

As a new phenomenon, KMO with information technology orientation (Farroq & Vij & Farooq, 2018; Aslan & Ulutas, 2016) was considered by several scholars in their studies to recognize the importance of IT for the effective implementation of KMO in organizations. Innovation (Ullah et al., 2019; Hussain, 2018; Kmieciak & Michna, 2018; Ghasemi et al., 2017; Roxas & Chadee, 2016) has taken significant attention among KMO scholars as it is fueling organizations to reap more harvests from their investments. Many scholars strongly believe that effective KMO drives innovative entrepreneurial behavior (Kmieciak & Michna, 2018; Roxas & Chadee, 2016).

Table 3: Different Areas Covered through KMO Studies

Research area/s	Authors
Organizational culture	Roadiah et al., 2019; Farroq & Vij, 2018; Aliyu, 2016
Entrepreneurial orientation	Farroq & Vij, 2018; Vij, 2017; Aliyu, 2016
Business performance	Farroq & Vij, 2018; Vij, 2017; Aliyu, 2016; Lin, 2015
Information technology orientation	Farroq & Vij & Farooq, 2018; Aslan & Ulutas, 2016
Innovation	Ullah et al., 2019; Hussain, 2018; Kmiecik & Michna, 2018; Ghasemi et al., 2017; Roxas and Chadee, 2016
Demographics (such as age, gender, marital status, professional tenure)	George & Venkatapathy, 2018
Market orientation	Ghahroudi, 2019; Ullah et al., 2019; Vij & Farooq, 2017
New product commercialization	Ghahroudi, 2019
Financial and non-financial impact	Lin, 2015
Dynamic capability	Santoro et al., 2018
Organizational ambidexterity	Santoro et al., 2018
Environmental management practices	Roxas and Chadee, 2016
Hospital management	Ghasemi et al., 2017; Aslan & Ulutas, 2016
Knowledge quality	Aslan & Ulutas, 2016

Source: Literature Review (2020)

Future Studies Suggested by Current KMO Studies

KMO has evolved rapidly and generated substantial interest among researchers and practitioners. There is a growing interest in KMO since 2008. With the introduction of the knowledge-based view theory by Grant in 1996, he considered the effect of knowledge as a strategic resource of an organization. However, during this review, the researchers have identified that there are some areas still in the early stage and need more investigations to uncover the relational behavior of knowledge. Being focused on the future studies on KMO, the researchers were able to identify several untouched areas as well as the areas where more future studies need to be conducted. One of the main limitations highlighted by the researchers on KMO was the use of limited samples for their respective studies (Rodiah, 2019). They suggested working on more representative samples to get vivid results at the end of the study. As Rodiah (2019) directs, future research can focus on the style of leadership, employee motivation, psychological factors of individuals with the effect of KMO.

Table 4: Limitations and Future Research

Scholar	Limitations and future research
Kmieciak & Michna, 2018; Hussain et al., 2017; Vij & Farroq, 2017	KMO studies should not be stick to the large-scale organizations and should focus on SMEs
Ullah et al., 2019; Kmiecik & Michna, 2018; Sontoro et al., 2018; Ghasemi et al., 2017; Aliyu, 2016; Rodiah et al., 2019; Rodiah, 2019	Despite the basis on limited time period, a longitudinal study is required to assess the right effect of KMO on organizations
Rodiah et al., 2019; Vij & Farooq, 2017; Sontoro et al., 2018	A single respondent from a firm does not produce a clear picture of the KMO behavior in organizations. To evade the common method bias, it is needed to consider multiple respondents and also a large number of respondents to generalize the study results more specifically
Rodiah et al., 2019; Kmiecik & Michna, 2018; Aslan & Ulutas, 2016; Lin, 2015	Consideration of different contexts, different cultures, different geographical areas, and different organizational levels is needed to understand the rigorous applicability of KMO in modern organizational settings
Sontoro et al., 2018; Vij & Farroq, 2017	Innovations, organizational learning, financial and non-financial needs should be assessed with KMO
Rodiah et al., 2019	New studies on KMO-performance are required as there is no consensus between the existing KMO studies and organizational performance
Hussain et al., 2017	Leadership, employee motivation, and individual's psychological factors can be considered with KMO
Hussain, 2018; Hussain et al., 2017; Aslan & Ulutas, 2016	Replication of studies on KMO is important to explore more behavioral aspects of KMO in different organizational, regional, and cultural contexts
Hussain, 2018	Assess the KMO with innovation, market orientation, and organizational performance
Kmieciak & Michna, 2018	KMO studies should give more attention to the market capabilities of the firm, and entrepreneurial marketing to identify the effect of the KM on the marketing function of the firm
	Investigate the effect of technological and market turbulence on KMO

Aliyu, 2016	Revisit the effect of KMO on organizational performance by means of the contingency theory
Lin, 2015	Examine the effectiveness of KMO at an individual level, group level, and organizational level
Lin, 2015; Ullah et al., 2019	The validity and the applicability of the study results of KMO studies are extremely limited as there are no studies with cross-industry comparisons. Future studies are motivated to study and compare KMO behaviors among different industries
Lin, 2015	Rather than sticking to a specific geographical region, future studies should focus more on different regions, different cultures as well as different levels in organizations to get more robust information and vivid results
Vij & Farooq, 2015	Social capital, human capital, and environmental munificence should be tested in future studies as mediators to get a deep understanding of KM and its applications in organizational settings
Sontoro et al., 2018	Cross-cultural effect on KMO should be tested in upcoming studies and re-validation of the KMO construct in different industries is also timely required
Vij & Farooq, 2017; Sontoro et al., 2018	Case studies on KMO and in-depth interviews with organizational knowledge officers or relevant management bodies should be used more to provide novel insights into the KMO of organizations
Sontoro et al., 2018	Focus on dynamic capabilities and organizational ambidexterity to assess the organizational performance with KMO in different industries.
Roxsas & Chadee, 2016	Future studies should focus on new definitions and measurements of KMO to understand the real effect of KMO on organizational performance
Ullah et al., 2019	Studies on KMO should be extended toward the banking, education, and medicine sectors

Source: Literature Review (2020)

KMO is more focused on employees' knowledge capabilities and their utilization in the organization. Employee motivational schemes implemented in the organization are needed to analyze in improving or developing new motivational programs. As there is a dearth of research on KMO in the existing literature, replication of studies on KMO is important to explore more behavioral aspects of KMO (Hussain et al., 2017), in different organizational, regional, and cultural contexts. Moreover, Hussain et al., (2017) suggest that there is a need for more studies to investigate the consequences of innovation, market orientation, and organizational performance with the application of KMO (Hussain, 2018). As the complexity and the comprehensiveness of the model used to

analyze the organizational KMO behavior, it may limit some study results (Hussain, 2018).

Further studies on KMO should focus on the market capabilities of the firm, and entrepreneurial marketing to identify the effect of knowledge management on the marketing function of the firm (Hussain, 2018). Effective KMO facilitates more intended innovations in the organization. A new study is needed to understand the effect of KMO on innovation (Aslan & Ulutas, 2016). The effective introduction of KMO may facilitate the technological capabilities of the firm. More knowledge and effective management may lead to pursuing more performance while successfully addressing the technological and market instabilities. Thus, Kmiecik and Michna (2018) pointed out to investigate the effect of technological and market turbulence on KMO. Knowledge is considered as a strategic resource of an organization. Most of the studies in the literature build on the knowledge-based theory introduced by Grant in 1996. Aliyu (2016) proposed to revisit the effect of KMO on organizational performance by means of the contingency theory. With this new philosophy, the organization can assess their KMO behavior with the organizational environment and its issues. Further, longitudinal and case-based studies are recommended to investigate the effective utilization of knowledge management, and entrepreneurial orientation (Aliyu, 2016; Ghasemi et al., 2017; Ullah et al., 2019). Furthermore, future studies can consider the effectiveness of KMO at an individual level, group level, and organizational level (Lin, 2015). It will really support understanding the consequences of well-organized KMO practices in future organizations. As per Lin (2015), not having a cross-industry comparison on KMO and organizational performance was one of the main limitations of his study (Ullah et al., 2019). Identification of knowledge and its behaviors at different levels will heighten the applicability of study results. Rather than sticking to a specific geographical region, future studies should focus more on different regions, different cultures as well as different levels in organizations. Consequently, it will provide more robust information to analyze the effectiveness of KMO of organizations with vivid results (Lin, 2015). Vij and Farooq (2017) who have studied KMO from an Indian perspective suggested that future studies should focus on the KMO behaviors of SMEs. They argue that effective management and utilization of knowledge in SMEs may provide additional value to their business activities. Additionally, they emphasize that more innovations and creative undertakings could be taken place within SMEs if they only focus on their knowledge management. Moreover, social capital, human capital, and environmental munificence were suggested to test in future studies as mediators to get a deep understanding of KM and its applications in organizational settings (Vij & Farooq, 2015). Cross-cultural effect on KMO should be tested in upcoming studies, suggested by Sontoro et al., in 2018. Furthermore, they suggested the necessity of re-validating the KMO construct in different industries. Case studies on KMO and in-depth interviews with organizational knowledge officers or relevant management bodies should be used more to shed light on the KMO of organizations (Sontoro et al., 2018; Vij & Farooq, 2017). Instead of adhering to the knowledge-based views of organizations, Sontoro et al., (2018) suggested focusing on dynamic capabilities and organizational ambidexterity to assess the organizational performance with KMO in different industries. As Roxsas and Chadee (2016) pointed out, future scholars should expand the descriptions and measurements of KMO of firms

to capture more outstanding features of KM, and its impact on the tactics and competencies of SMEs. To get more understanding of KMO, it should be focused on specific areas of study (Ghasemi et al., 2017). For instance, future studies should identify which KM areas have a more significant effect on innovation. In addition, more qualitative work on KMO is recommended to get a more practical understanding at the firm level. Conducting more qualitative studies on KMO is likely to disclose new insights into knowledge managers in organizations to develop the knowledge and its effective usage in organizations as a strategic resource (Ghasemi et al., 2017). Requirements for more studies on banking, education, and medicine sectors are highlighted by Ullah et al., in 2019. Meantime, they proposed future researchers work on organizational learning, time management, and organizational culture to assess the effectiveness of KMO in firms.

Synthesis of the Review

The systematic review attempts to provide an overview of the knowledge management orientation concept and its implications in modern world organizations. KMO is an area of research that has gained much attention among scholars and practitioners across many disciplines. In order to identify the KMO and its nature in modern research philosophy, the study mainly focused on five research questions. These research questions were grounded on gathering the knowledge on KMO, identify the measures used in KMO studies, understand the areas where KMO knowledge is applied, and especially, identify the future directions of the field of KMO. A systematic review approach was used to answer the research questions based on the studies conducted during the period of 2015-2020. Relying on a multiple filtering process, 35 papers were considered for the study.

The study provides a vibrant idea regarding the KMO. It discusses the overall impression of the KMO and its uses. Consequently, the study describes the different measurement models used in the literature to assess KMO behavior. Moreover, the areas where the KMO is applied were discussed to get a clear picture of where the concept of KMO has been used. The review highlighted the limitations confronted by the scholars while studying KMO and the future directions of the KMO. /In-depth review was applied to understand the efforts needed with respect to the KMO in the future.

The literature review explores that many studies on KMO had limitations in terms of the number of respondents. Many studies have been conducted with a single respondent from a single organization. These study results would not draw a clear picture about the industry as errors with common method bias are possible. Almost all studies on KMO were carried out based on large-scale organizations. However, some scholars suggested conducting the same kind of studies in the small and medium sectors to identify the importance of KMO for the development of SMEs. Also, the study proves that there is no consensus among the existing study results on KMO and organizational performance. Therefore, more studies are needed to validate the results of KMO-OP in different regions, contexts, and different organizations.

As the review highlighted, researchers would suggest studying further the influence of some factors such as culture, organizational types, organizational levels to assess the KM behavior in organizations. It will provide more robust and validated information for decision-makers. New studies based on the longitudinal data are required besides the short-term information. The majority of the studies in the literature were based on less than one year period of data. These data could not be possible to draw up a clear picture about the KMO of an organization as it is not a mission that can be implemented as quickly as imagined. Leadership, employee motivation, and some other psychological factors can be considered to assess in KMO studies to produce more robust information. These factors will support enhancing the integrity of human-related factors of the organization with respect to the KMO. It is required to assess the human factors with KMO as organizations are highly dependent on knowledge workers in the knowledge economy. As one of the most vibrant functional areas in an organization, the effect of marketing is significant. Therefore, future KMO studies should pay more attention to marketing, considering market orientation, market capability, and entrepreneurial marketing, etc. Adaptation to the ICT and facing the market turbulence should also be visited through KMO studies in the future. To provide more insights into KMO studies, it is highly recommended to conduct future studies between/among different industries or business sectors. This will be an advanced research footpath in KMO as it will provide information to compare between industries or business sectors. Similar to the cross-industry analysis, future researchers can consider the cross-cultural effect of KMO. Some future studies can be carried out in knowledge industries like the banking sector, education sector, and medical sector to produce more insights about the KMO and its applicability in different sectors.

In contrast, this review would be a valuable outcome for those who are willing to study KMO in business organizations. This review plays as a mind-mapping tool by providing future researchers with filtered output. We strongly believe that the output of this review would be of greater importance for both academics and practitioners. As the KMO is still a vibrant field of study among the scholars, findings of this study will act as a foundation for researchers to identify new research paradigms and get an overview of the existing phenomenon to recognize the future potentials of work.

References

- Aliyu, M. S. (2016). Influence of knowledge management on performance in small manufacturing firms. *International Journal of Business, Economics and Law*, 8(2), 63-67.
- Aslan, S., & Utlas, D.A. (2016). The Mediator Effect of Knowledge Management Orientation in the Relationship between Information Technology Support and Knowledge Quality. *International Journal of System Modeling and Simulation*, 1(3).
- Barney, J (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99–120.

- Bierly, P., & Chakrabarti, A. (1996). Generic knowledge strategies in the US pharmaceutical industry. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17(S2), 123-135.
- Brown, J. & Duguid, P. (1991) Organisational learning and communities of practice: toward a unified view of working, learning, and innovation *Organisation Science*, 2(1), 40-57.
- Bueren, A., Schierholz, R., Kolbe, L., & Brenner, W. (2004). Customer knowledge management - improving performance of customer relationship management with knowledge management. 37th Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences, 1-10.
- Busalim, A.H., & Hussin, R.C. (2016). Understanding social commerce: A systematic literature review and directions for further research. *International Journal of Information Management*, 36, 1075-1088.
- Darroch, J. (2005). Knowledge management, innovation and firm performance. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 9(3), 101-115.
- Darroch, J., & McNaughton, R. (2003). Beyond market orientation: Knowledge management and the innovativeness of New Zealand firms. *European Journal of Marketing*, 37(3/4), 572-593.
- Davenport, T. H., & Prusak, L. (1998). *Working Knowledge: How Organization Manage What They Know*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Durst, S., & Edvardsson, I. R. (2012). Knowledge management in SMEs: A literature review. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 16, 879-903.
- Farooq R. & Vij, S. (2018). Linking Entrepreneurial Orientation and Business Performance: Mediating Role of Knowledge Management Orientation, *Pacific Business Review International*, 10(8), 174-183.
- Farooq, M. (2018). Economic survey 2017-18: Telecom sector revenues touched Rs235.5 billion in FY 2017-18. *Pakistan Today Profit*. Retrieved from <https://profit.pakistantoday.com.pk/2018/04/27/economic-survey-2017-18-telecomsector-revenues-touched-rs235-5-billion-in-fy-2017-18/>
- Farooq, R., & Vij, S. (2017). Knowledge Management Orientation and its Relationship with Business Performance (Doctoral dissertation, Lovely Professional University).
- Farooq, R., & Vij, S. (2019). Does Market Orientation Mediate between Knowledge Management orientation and Business Performance? *Journal of Information & Knowledge Management*, 18 (4).
- George, M. G., & Venkatapathy, R. (2018). Mediating effect of knowledge management on spiritual intelligence and employee engagement. *International Review of Management and Business Research*, 7(3), 685-698.
- Ghahroudi, M.R., Hoshino, Y., & Ahmadpoury, F. (2019). The Impact of Knowledge Management Orientation on New Product Commercialization: The Mediating Role of Market Orientation, *American Journal of Industrial and Business Management*, 9, 1949-1968.
- Ghasemi, M., Nejad, M.G., & Bagzibagli, K. (2017). Knowledge Management orientation: An Innovative Perspective to Hospital Management. *Iran Journal of Public Health*, 46(12), 1639-1645.

- Grant, R.R. (1996). Toward a knowledge-based theory of the firm. *Journal of Strategic Management*, 17, 109–122.
- Hanafizadeh, P., Keating, B. W., & Khedmatgozar, H. R. (2014). A systematic review of Internet banking adoption. *Telematics and Informatics*, 31(3), 492–510.
- Hult, G.T.M. (2003). An integration of thoughts on knowledge management. *Decision Sciences*, 34 (2),189-196.
- Hult, G.T.M., Snow, C.C., & Kandemir, D., (2003). The role of entrepreneurship in building cultural competitiveness in different organizational types, *Journal of Management*, 29(3), 401-426.
- Hussein, A. S., Rahayu, M., & Prabandari, S. P. (2017). Revisiting the dimensions of knowledge management orientation behavior in Indonesia creative industry. *International Research Journal of Business Studies*, 9(2), 63-73.
- Hussein, A.S. (2018). The Importance of Knowledge Management Orientation Behaviour and Innovation on Business Performance: A Lesson from Indonesia Creative Economy Sector. *Asia-Pacific Management and Business Application*, 7(2), 95-108.
- Kitchenham, B. (2004). Procedures for performing systematic reviews, Keele University, UK and National ICT Australia., 3, 28.
- Kitchenham, B., & Charters, S. (2007). Guidelines for performing systematic literature reviews in software engineering, Keele University and University of Durham, 2, 1051.
- Kmiecik, R and A Michna (2012). Relationship between knowledge management and market orientation in SMEs. In International Conference on Management, Knowledge and Learning, Celje, Slovenia, 175–183.
- Kmiecik, R., & Michna, A. (2018). Knowledge management orientation, innovativeness, and competitive intensity: evidence from Polish SMEs, *Knowledge Management Research & Practice*, 14 (6), 559-572
- Kogut, B. & Zander, U. (1992). Knowledge of the firm and the replication of technology *Organisation Science*, 3(3), 383-397.
- Lee, H., & Byounggu, C. (2003). Knowledge management enablers, processes, and organizational performance: an integrative view and empirical examination, *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 20 (1),179-228.
- Lee, H., & Choi, B. (2003). Knowledge management enablers, processes, and organizational performance: an integrative view and empirical examination. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 20(1), 179–228.
- Lee, T.S., & Tsai, H.J. (2005). The effects of business operation mode on market orientation learning orientation and innovativeness. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 105(3), 325–348.
- Liao, S., Fei, W., & Liu, C. (2008). Relationships between knowledge inertia, organizational learning and organization innovation, *Technovation*, 28, 183–195.
- Liao, S.H., Fei, W.C., & Chen, C.C. (2007). Knowledge sharing absorptive capacity and innovation capability: An empirical study of Taiwan's knowledge-intensive industries. *Journal of Information Science*, 33(3), 340–359.
- Lin, H. F. (2015). Linking knowledge management orientation to balanced scorecard outcomes. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 19 (6), 1224–1249.

- Nonaka, I. and Takeuchi, H. (1995), *The Knowledge-creating Company*, Oxford University Press, New York, 96-104.
- Petrash, G. (1996). Dow's journey to a knowledge value management culture. *European management journal*, 14(4), 365-373.
- Prieto, I and E Revilla (2006). Learning capability and business performance: A non-financial and financial assessment. *The Learning Organization*, 13(2), 166–185.
- Rodiah, S., Azmi, Z., & Binangkit I.D. (2019). The Influence of Interdependent Culture on Knowledge Management Orientation, *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 373, 79-82.
- Roxas, B and D Chadee (2016). Knowledge management view of environmental sustainability in manufacturing SMEs in the Philippines. *Knowledge Management Research & Practice*, 14(4), 514–524.
- Santoro, G., Thrassou, A., Bresciani, S., & Giudice, M.D. (2018). Do Knowledge Management and Dynamic Capabilities Affect Ambidextrous Entrepreneurial Intensity and Firms' Performance? *IEEE Transactions On Engineering Management*.
- Ullah, I., Mirza, B., Kashif, A. R., & Abbas, F. (2019). Examination of knowledge management and market orientation, innovation and organizational performance: Insights from telecom sector of Pakistan. *Knowledge Management & E-Learning*, 11(4), 522–551.
- Vij, S., & Farooq, R. (2015). The Relationship Between Learning Orientation and Business Performance: Do Smaller Firms Gain More from Learning Orientation? *IUP Journal of Knowledge Management*, 13(4), 7-28.
- Wang Y., & Lin, J. (2012). An Empirical Study of the Impact of Knowledge Management Orientation on Organizational Performance, *Journal of Convergence Information Technology(JCIT)*, 7(17).
- Wang, C.L., Ahmed, P.K., & Rafiq, M. (2008). Knowledge management orientation: construct development and empirical validation. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 17(3), 219-235.
- Wang, Y., & Lin, J. (2013). An empirical research on knowledge management orientation and organizational performance: The mediating role of organizational innovation. *African Journal of Business Management*, 7, 604–612.
- Wang, Z., & Wang, N. (2012). Knowledge sharing, innovation and firm performance, *Expert Systems with Applications*, 39(10), 8899-8908.
- Webster, J., & Watson, R. (2002). Analyzing the past to prepare for the future: writing a literature review. *Management Information Systems Quarterly*, 26(2), 13–23.

Authors

Jayampathi E.K. is a Senior Lecturer working at the Department of Management and Entrepreneurship, Faculty of Management and Finance, University of Ruhuna, Sri Lanka. He obtained his bachelor's degree from the University of Ruhuna, Sri Lanka, MBA degree

from the University of Sri Jayewardenepura, Sri Lanka and reading for the PhD at the University of Kelaniya, Sri Lanka. His teaching and research interests include Knowledge Management, Small and Medium scale Enterprises, Microfinance, tourism. He has published several research papers in local and international journals and conferences.

De Alwis A.C. is currently working as a Professor in Human Resource Management in the Department of Human Resource Management, Faculty of Commerce and Management Studies, University of Kelaniya, Sri Lanka. He obtained his bachelor's degree from the University of Sri Jayewardenepura, Sri Lanka; MBA degree from the University of Sri Jayewardenepura, Sri Lanka, and PhD from the Tomas Bata in Zlin, CZ. His teaching and research interests include Total Quality Management, Entrepreneurship Management, Marketing Management, Management, Small Business Management, Reward Management. He has published many scholarly works in refereed journals and conferences.

Razi M.J.M. is Professor at the Department of Commerce and Financial Management, Faculty of Commerce and Management Studies, University of Kelaniya, Sri Lanka. He obtained his bachelor's degree from the University of Colombo, Sri Lanka, MBA degree from the University of Colombo, Sri Lanka and PhD from the International Islamic University Malaysia, Malaysia. His teaching and research interests include Knowledge Management, Information Systems, Consumer Behavior, E-commerce. He has published many scholarly works in refereed journals and conferences.
