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Abstract
In recent years, knowledge has emerged as a major source of competitive advantage. Nevertheless theoretical backgrounds of Korean style knowledge management are not actively discussed. This paper identified the Korean style knowledge management model design based on cultural psychology of Korean. For this, literature review of existing model was conducted. As a result, we could find normative KM model. This includes the models in terms of environmental and corporate strategy, information system, HRM, knowledge transformation process. And we examined the Korean value, belief, affect, and attitude because of applying these for Korean style model. As result, we could find three level points for KM design: employment relationship between organization and employees based on community, pursuit of cooperation to have knowledge sharing and creation among work group members, individual development to get task knowledge of employees. This study further offered concrete design factors and propositions inherent in the model.
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ABSTRACT

In recent years, knowledge has emerged as a major source of competitive advantage. Nevertheless theoretical backgrounds of Korean style knowledge management are not actively discussed. This paper identified the Korean style knowledge management model design based on cultural psychology of Korean.

For this, literature review of existing model was conducted. As a result, we could find normative KM model. This includes the models in terms of environmental and corporate strategy, information system, HRM, knowledge transformation process. And we examined the Korean value, belief, affect, and attitude because of applying these for Korean style model. As result, we could find three level points for KM design: employment relationship between organization and employees based on community, pursuit of cooperation to have knowledge sharing and creation among work group members, individual development to get task knowledge of employees. This study further offered concrete design factors and propositions inherent in the model.
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