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Abstract:
Knowledge, its effective use, and the acquisition of new knowledge are considered the only way organizations can sustain a competitive advantage in today’s highly competitive environment. This paper reviews the associations among knowledge management, knowledge management infrastructure, and job satisfaction.
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1. Introduction
Several researchers argued that an assortment of disciplines like sociology, economics, and management have approved that knowledge has taken the attention away from conventional resources. They further challenged that managers and executives ought to place close concentration to the management of knowledge (Maertensson, 2000; Schiuma et al, 2012; Shannak et al, 2012; Masa’deh et al, 2015a, 2015b, 2015c). Consequently, it has been suggested that managing knowledge be supposed to be at the basis of an organization’s capability improvement effort, which eventually leads to superior business performance (Tarhini et al., 2015; AlHrassi et al., 2016; Almajali et al., 2016; Masa’deh et al., 2018; Yassien and Mufleh, 2017; Alenezi et al., 2017; Alkandari et al., 2017; Khwaldeh et al., 2017; Mikkawi and Al-Lozi, 2017) and creating value for the company’s various stakeholders (Schiuma et al, 2007; AlHarrasi & Al-Lozi, 2015, 2016; Khalayleh et al., 2017). As such, knowledge management is regarded as a prerequisite for the improvement of productivity and flexibility of the organization (Maertensson, 2000; Ammari et al., 2017; Obeidat et al., 2017; Abualoush et al., 2018).

Masa’deh (2016) stated that “By dissecting the term knowledge management into its origins, we end up with two concepts, “knowledge” and “management”. Management refers to the process of controlling, guiding, coordinating, and communicating interconnected actions, activities, and modes of knowing that are restricted by certain purposes, rules, and routines (Rechberg and Syed, 2014). Various interpretations have been provided for the word “knowledge”. Knowledge has been previously linked to terms such as data, information, intelligence, skills, expertise, ideas, and insights (Gao et al, 2008). Such a link can be attributed to the traditional way of looking at knowledge where data is arranged to become information, then information is processed in the minds of individuals in which experiences and judgments are included resulting in the creation of knowledge. According to this, knowledge can be defined as the information understood by individuals and related to facts, procedures, concepts, interpretations, ideas, observations, and judgments. However, not every piece of information turns into knowledge, this relates to the fact individuals sometimes fail to understand the contextual meaning of the information, thereby keeping the information in its current form (Cho, 2011). Knowledge can also be defined as a mix of experiences, values, contextual information, and expert insight that provides a foundation for evaluating and incorporating new experiences and information which is originated and applied in the minds of individuals (Gharakhani and Mousakhan, 2012)”.

An imperative view to think when managing knowledge is the sort of knowledge to be managed (Singh, 2008). Knowledge can be alienated into two categories: explicit and tacit knowledge (Gao et al, 2008). Explicit knowledge is considered as knowledge that can be conveyed in the form of official and organized languages (Nonaka et al, 2006). It relates to what be able to be captured and shared throughout information technology (Maertensson, 2000). Explicit knowledge refers to a central management instrument which can be used in the handling of organizational knowledge, which usually occurs in words, computer codes, pictures, procedure manuals, diagrams, and so one, which be able to be communicated to others in ways that are considered as formal and observable (Dyck et al, 2005). Tacit knowledge considers to unspoken knowledge that occurs in the
minds of people and is hard to explain and convey (Singh, 2008). Noe (2002) defined tacit knowledge as “personal knowledge based on individual experience and influenced by perceptions and values” (p. 167). Researchers have argued that tacit knowledge contains lessons learned, rule of thumb, know-how, intuition, judgments, (Bollinger and Smith, 2001), skills, beliefs, individual experience, values, and creative processes (Cho, 2011). In addition to the literature, tacit knowledge is a significant organizational source as 42 percent of corporate knowledge exists in the minds of staff and that the thriving success of tasks depends on tacit knowledge (Singh, 2008). In order to advance organizational performance and generate value, organizations ought to manage both tacit and explicit knowledge given that they are mutually dependent on each other and strengthen each others’ qualities (Cho, 2011). At this point, systematic and detailed processes are used to acquire, organize, sustain, apply, share and renew mutually tacit and explicit knowledge (Bhirud et al, 2005) seeing that tacit knowledge be able to be of essential significance to organizations when it is transformed into explicit form and shared with others (Frappaolo, 2006).

2. Knowledge Management

Knowledge management as an intact is regarded as much more multipart in meaning more than the terms management and knowledge alone (Gao et al, 2008). Knowledge management can be distinguished as a formal, directed progression of shaping which information would advantage the company well again, compared to others, and ruling ways to craft information willingly available to those that require it (AL-Lozi, 2002; Sing, 2008; AL-Syaidh et al., 2014, 2016; Darawsheh et al., 2016). Horwitch and Armacost (2002) considered knowledge management as a means of creating, executing, transforming, and storing the accurate knowledge that escorts to the design of improved policy, adaptation of action, and delivery of results.

Masa'deh (2016) declared that "The importance of knowledge management for organizations has been reported by many researchers over the years. Gharakhani and Mousakhani (2012) for example, suggested that knowledge management creates new capabilities for organizations, enables superior performance, encourages innovation, and enhances customer value. Demchig (2015) supported this by stating that knowledge management stimulates innovation, improves services provided to customers, and helps organizations achieve business excellence by accumulating, improving the availability and accessibility, and effective use of knowledge. Cho (2011) also reported that managing knowledge well assists organizations in becoming flexible, responding quickly to changing conditions, becoming innovative, and improving decision making capacity and productivity. However, in order for knowledge management to be efficient and effective certain capabilities are required. Aujiroppan et al (2010) argued that resource-based capability consisting of technology, structure, and culture, in addition to knowledge-based capability, including expertise, learning, and information, are needed for organizations to effectively and efficiently manage knowledge. In this study, the resource-based capabilities, also known as knowledge management infrastructure (Gold et al, 2001), will be investigated further as an important component of knowledge management".

Bounfour (2003) considered knowledge management as a set of procedures, infrastructures, technical and managerial ways used to create, share, and influence
knowledge within and around the organization. After reviewing the literature comprehensively, it would be distinguished that researchers and practitioners defined knowledge management in terms of three trends: First: work processes and activities that knowledge management encompasses processes, procedures, systems, and instruments that maintain the identification, capturing, and leveraging the required knowledge (Carvalho and Ferreira, 2001; Milam, 2005). Second: Technology infrastructure, which reflects the investment in information to codify, store, share, and disseminate precise forms of knowledge ahead of physical and time obstructions in an easier and less exclusive approach than done before (Cho, 2011). Third: Behavioral norms and practices (Organizational culture) which refers to “a set of valid knowledge, created and shared by a group of people, to solve problems they face in their environment” (Pauleen et al, 2007, p. 5).

3. Knowledge Management Infrastructure

The concept of knowledge management infrastructure relates to modular products and directorial designs that support knowledge management actions in an organization (Smith, 2006). Knowledge management infrastructure would be classified into two foremost capabilities, technical and social infrastructure. While technical infrastructure comprises IT infrastructure, physical, devices and components; social infrastructure, on the other side, encompasses culture, human, and structure resources (Kushwaha and Rao, 2015). Therefore, it be capable of noted that Knowledge management infrastructure presents the infrastructural environment, both IT and non-IT, that boosts knowledge management actions (Cho, 2011; Kanaan et al, 2013; Albaz, 2014). Additionally, organizations be supposed to make every effort to expand infrastructure capabilities not only in terms of hardware and software, but also in terms of technology, structure, culture, and people (Kushwaha and Rao, 2015). Davenport et al. (1998) supported this issue by representing that organizations that make use of both technical and organizational infrastructures are further likely to put into practice flourishing knowledge management schemes.

3.1. Culture

Regarding the cultural concept, Masa'deh (2016) stated that “Organizational culture not only defines the value and advantage of knowledge for organizations, it also influences the ability of employees to share knowledge (Yeh et al, 2006). It has been reported that organizational culture is crucial for knowledge sharing and team work (Cho, 2011). The reason behind this is that organizational culture is pivotal in encouraging interaction and collaboration between individuals that is necessary for the flow of knowledge. It also provides individuals with the ability to self-organize their personal knowledge to facilitate problem solving and the sharing of knowledge (Sandhawalia and Dalcher, 2011). In addition, researchers have reported that one of the most significant elements of culture for knowledge sharing to consider is trust. High levels of trust reduce the reluctance of individuals to share knowledge and decrease the associated risk of losing competitiveness (Kushwaha and Rao, 2015). Therefore, creating a culture that allows for easy access of knowledge should be at the top of management’s agenda during the implementation stage of knowledge management (Yeh et al, 2006). However, this is easily said than done as aligning the culture of the organization with the goals of knowledge management is considered a complex process, especially in organizations characterized by hierarchical structures and bureaucratic controls (Pandey and Dutta,
In addition, Shannak and Obeidat (2012) argued that culture would have an impact on the way strategic decisions are implemented in firms. They discussed that culture play a vital role in the implementation process within Jordanian banks, for instance.

### 3.2. Structure

The relationship linking organizational structure and knowledge sharing trunks from the social feature of organizations that consists of hierarchy, density, and connectivity that relates employees collectively in that way smooth the progress of the exchange of knowledge. In this point of view, authors propose that two features of organizational structure have an effect on the course of knowledge; formalization and centralization (Islam et al, 2015). Centralization relates to the extent to which decision making and the right to assess activities are concerted at the peak of the organizational hierarchy (Lee and Choi, 2003). Formalization refers to “formal rules and regulations that govern organizational activities and manage work relations” (Kushwaha and Rao, 2015, p. 4). Consequently, organizational structure is well thought-out an essential aspect for assists the flow of knowledge in organizations all the way through the use of organizational processes, systems of rewards, policies, and incentives so as to agree on how knowledge is admissanced and afterward flows all the way through the organization (Sandhwalia and Dalcher, 2011).

### 3.3. Technology

Technology infrastructure acts an essential task in an organization’s knowledge management system in the conditions of creating and using novel knowledge, and sharing presented knowledge by integrating an assortment of technological platforms. While hardware, bandwidth, and networking fundamentals of technology are significant, they are not ample to execute the knowledge management activities of sharing, storing, disseminating, and maintaining knowledge. Other tools are therefore essential, in the vein of social media, dynamic websites, and content repositories (Islam et al, 2015). Even though technology improves the organization’s capability to carry out knowledge management actions, such as a sole construct it is not ample on its own. Technology for that reason necessitates the sustain of other knowledge management enablers such as organizational business strategy, culture, and structure; and to make certain that the accurate knowledge is being managed in the correct way (Cho, 2011).

### 4. Job Satisfaction

The concept of job satisfaction would be considered as the extent to which an employee like his/her job (Abu Raddaha et al, 2012). Masa'deh (2016) affirmed that “Job satisfaction can also be seen as the affective, cognitive, and evaluative reactions of individuals towards their jobs (Greenberg and Baron, 2003; Bilimoria et al, 2006). Griffin and Moorhead (2007) suggested that job satisfaction reflects the gratification and sense of fulfillment one receives from doing their job. George and Jones (2008) defined job satisfaction as the collection of beliefs and feelings people have about their jobs. Bahnase (2011) referred to job satisfaction as the degree to which individuals accept their work and their relationship with others in the work environment. All in all job satisfaction relates to how people think, feel, and perceive their jobs (Spector, 1997), i.e. their attitudes towards different aspects such as work itself, level of pay, promotion opportunities, and satisfaction with co-workers (Scheimerhorn et al, 2005, p. 158). Over the years, various researchers have attempted to determine and classify the factors affecting job satisfaction. Two perspectives have emerged regarding the determinants of
job satisfaction. The content perspective approaches job satisfaction from the perspective of needs fulfillment. Studies advocating the content perspective include Maslow’s needs hierarchy, Herzberg’s two factor theory, Alderfer’s ERG theory, and McClelland’s theory of needs. The process perspective focuses on the cognitive process leading to job satisfaction. Process theories include Vroom’s expectancy theory, Adam’s equity theory, behavior modification, and cognitive evaluation theory (Abdulla et al, 2011; Al-Ma’seb and Al-Gaoud, 2015). Both content and process perspectives have reported a sea of factors related to job satisfaction. These factors can be grouped into two broad categories: demographic factors and environmental factors. Demographic factors relate to individual attributes and characteristics such as: gender, age, job-level, and work experience. Environmental factors refer to factors associated with the work itself or work environment such as salary, promotion, supervision, climate management, fairness of appraisal systems, and satisfaction with coworkers (Abdulla et al, 2011). Other scholars have classified job satisfaction factors into intense and extrinsic factors. Intrinsic factors relate to the actual work individuals do in the organization. Such factors include variety, skill utilization, and autonomy. Extrinsic factors relate to aspects of the work environment such as pay, working conditions, and coworkers (Al-Ma’seb and Al-Gaoud, 2015).

In addition, measuring job satisfaction has been a face up to for both researchers and managers. Therefore, generating a measurement technique that is free from bias is a main apprehension in organizational behavior research. Indeed, job satisfaction can be considered as a fundamental social incident for organizations, as it guides to the stipulation of high quality presentation by enhancing the consistency and confidence of persons. It is also significant as it is intimately interconnected to working behaviors such as efficiency and productivity. In such situation, satisfied employees have the inspiration to get better their work behaviors, while unsatisfied workers be inclined to perform less effectively (Papadopoulos, 2015). Also, several methodologies be presented for measuring satisfaction. Quinn and Mangion (1973) assessed a weighted model, Schneider and Dalcher (1978) payed attention on the stability of the job descriptive index (JDI), Acarpeello and Campbell (1983) confronted the global single-item measurements, Furnham et al. (2002) faced the facet significance of job satisfaction, Matzler and Renzl (2007) reviewed asymmetric outcome in satisfaction formation, and Carter and Dalal (2010) disputed the scale of JDI (Khalilzadeh et al, 2013).

5. Conclusion

In conditions of organizational culture, various researches have been executed to study the association between culture and job satisfaction. The findings of these researches are, conversely, quite contradictory. A number of scholars have declared that organizational culture is one of the most significant antecedents of job satisfaction, by this means demonstrating a positive rapport between organizational culture and job satisfaction (See Denison et al, 2004; Silverthorne, 2004; Park and Kim, 2009; Platsidou and Diamantopoulou, 2009; Bellou, 2010; Andreassi et al, 2012; Boerebach et al, 2012; Masum et al, 2015).

Initially, Masa’deh (2016) stated that “Whereas others, such as Johnson (2004) and Navaie-Waliser et al (2004) have argued that job satisfaction and organizational culture
are not related. Organizational structure has been suggested to affect employees’ judgements and perceptions and in turn play a significant role in human resource issues (Feizi and Farid, 2013). Therefore, organizational behaviorists and human resource professionals have long debated the preferred way to structure the work environment to affect employee outcomes (Kessler, 2007). Willem et al. (2005) examined the relationship between organizational structure and job satisfaction. The researchers found that the two dimensions of structure (specialization and formalization) positively affected job satisfaction and that centralization had a negative effect on job satisfaction. Kessler’s (2007) study indicated that the structure of academic departments is related to faculty members’ outcomes. More specifically, faculty members working in organically structured departments have higher levels of job satisfaction compared to other structures”. Also, researchers called for more research on the enabling factors of applying electronic services (e.g. Masa’deh, et al., 2008, 2013a, 2013b; Karajeh & Maqableh, 2014; Maqableh & Karajeh, 2014; Al-Dmour et al., 2015; Almajali & Maqableh, 2015; Kateb et al., 2015; Maqableh et al., 2015; Masa’deh, 2016; Tarhini et al., 2015; 2016, 2017a, 2017b; Almajali & Al-Dmour, 2016; Almajali et al., 2016; Alenezi et al., 2017; Al-Dmour et al., 2017; Khwaldeh et al., 2017; Mikkawi & Al-Lozi, 2017; Obeidat et al., 2017; Yassien & Mufleh, 2017; Tarhini et al., 2018; Al-Dmour et al., 2019), hence, future research is vital to examine these enablers as to assist stakeholders on their decisions on reaching high levels of such services, and in turn enhancing knowledge management systems.

Other researchers such as Feizi and Farid (2013) also examined the liaison link between organizational structure and job satisfaction and confirmed that the dimensions of structure (complexity, formalization, and centralization) explain only 32 percentage of the disparity in job satisfaction, showing that other variables be supposed to be taken into thoughtfulness in amplification the disparity in job satisfaction. In addition, considering that technology is well thought-out one of the the majority significant knowledge management enablers within organizations (Ahmadi et al., 2013; Kanaan et al, 2013; Masa’deh et al, 2015a, 2015b), its consequence on job satisfaction should be examined with full considerations. The significance key role of technology for job satisfaction has been represented by numerous researchers. Ali and Ali (2005), for instance, resulted that work technology was positively and significantly associated with job satisfaction. Albaz’s (2014) study findings also demonstrated that the use of information technology and organizational structure had a considerable impact on job satisfaction. Such results are in line with the conclusions formed by Attar and Sweis (2010) who exposed that the further a company invests in information technology, the further satisfied its employees will be with their operational conditions, their interactions with colleagues and individual job characteristics.
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