

Benefits, Process and Challenges of Knowledge Management

¹Rafael Fierro and ²Gaby Benalil

^{1,2}School of Management, Pontifical Catholic University of Peru, San Miguel 15088, Peru.

¹benalilgabyw@hotmail.com

Correspondence should be addressed to Rafael Fierro : benalilgabyw@hotmail.com

Article Info

Journal of Journal of Enterprise and Business Intelligence (<http://anapub.co.ke/journals/jebi/jebi.html>)

Doi: <https://doi.org/10.53759/5181/JEBI202404009>

Received 20 June 2023; Revised from 18 October 2023; Accepted 18 November 2023.

Available online 05 April 2024.

©2024 The Authors. Published by AnaPub Publications.

This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license. (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

Abstract- The significance of knowledge management (KM) in modern society has been widely discussed in recent years. There is widespread agreement that an organization's long-term health, competitive advantage, and capacity to stimulate innovation depend on its capabilities to effectively its information resources effectively. In this context, “management” refers to the internal process of disseminating, creating, retrieving, and storing data and knowledge inside an organization. Its principal goal is to aid the firm in its operations and improve its profitability. Successful knowledge management adoption calls for a comprehensive shift in an organization's culture and the unwavering commitment of its leaders at all levels. By fostering a conducive organizational environment, a company may effectively use its collective organizational learning and knowledge to address challenges on a global scale, irrespective of time constraints. This can be achieved through the implementation of KM practices. The principle objective of this research is to enhance the comprehension of KM and its capacity to help firms attain their business goals. Subsequently, an examination will be undertaken regarding certain obstacles pertaining to the execution of this approach within organizational contexts.

Keywords – Knowledge, Knowledge Management, Knowledge Sharing, Effective Management of Information, Collective Organizational Learning.

I. INTRODUCTION

Knowledge is the vital essence of a company, and it has been identified as a pivotal factor for the endurance of companies in the current dynamic and fiercely competitive period. Hence, it can be inferred that the effective management of knowledge has equal significance for an organization in comparison to the management of other assets. Organizations rely significantly on information as a resource and an important success element to achieve success and gain a competitive advantage. The heightened significance of knowledge may be attributed to the good results that arise from the efficient management of knowledge within an organization, propelling it towards the pinnacle of achievement. The existing body of literature indicates that knowledge plays a crucial role as a precursor to the sustained advancement and achievement of goals. The benefits of being a knowledge-intensive organization extend beyond what has been mentioned. The effective and strategic utilization of knowledge that is accumulated within an organization leads to enhanced productivity, improved performance, and increased innovation capability. Hence, the significance of knowledge management (KM) is on par with that of other assets and resources, since it directly impacts the organization's longevity and achievements.

The inadequate management and sharing of knowledge might lead to its rapid deterioration. It is essential to disseminate the tacit knowledge that individuals have acquired from their experiences over a period of time. Over the past few decades, knowledge sharing has been recognized as a crucial activity within the realm of knowledge management, among other procedures. According to the research conducted by Çakır and Adıgüzel [1], information sharing is vital in the achievement of the firm's performance and is increasingly being recognized as a vital strategy for survival. HR professionals have historically overlooked the practice of information sharing. However, over time, namely in the year 2000, they recognized the significance of knowledge management. Subsequently, the discipline of human resources has placed significant emphasis on KM and its associated procedures. Knowledge sharing is the process of transferring knowledge across various entities, such as people, groups, teams, departments, and companies.

The concept of knowledge management (KM) is the strategic management of organizational knowledge, with the aim of enhancing various performance indicators inside a company by facilitating more intelligent decision-making and actions. The proper use of this essential aspect enables organizations to effectively produce innovative goods and services. Many firms possess a substantial repository of knowledge including diverse organizational processes, best practices, expertise, customer confidence, management information systems, as well as cultural and normative aspects. Hence, the appropriate

management and use of knowledge are crucial for firms to fully capitalize on its worth. The recent emphasis and significance placed on the study and implementation of knowledge management in both scholarly works and practical applications can be attributed to various environmental factors. These factors include the growing impact of globalization on competition, the rapid obsolescence of knowledge and data, the dynamic nature of product and innovation process, and the prevalence of buyer-driven markets. It has been posited that knowledge has significant potential in terms of its relevance to the interests of the business realm, particularly in enhancing corporate performance. Information management is primarily concerned with the efficient dissemination of appropriate information to the relevant individual in a timely manner. The primary aim of this initiative is to generate value and effectively use and enhance the organization's knowledge assets in order to achieve its strategic objectives.

This research paper seeks to get a comprehensive understanding of the notion of KM and examine the intricacies of KM processes within the context of company operations. Following is the order in which the article's subsequent sections have been written: Section II presents a discussion. Section III reviews the previous literature works that relate to the concepts in this article. Section IV focusses on a discussion of the benefits of knowledge management. These benefits include: (i) integrating organizational knowledge, (ii) enabling better and faster decision-making, and (iii) stimulating innovations and growth. Section V presents a discussion of process of knowledge management, beginning with its acquisition and generation. Section VI reflects the challenges that come with knowledge management. Lastly, Section VII presents concluding remarks concerning the benefits, process, and challenges of knowledge management.

II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The purpose of the study is exploratory research, and the information used comes from secondary sources such books, magazines, newspapers, and the internet. The goals of this study are accomplished by a meta-review technique. The meta-analytic strategy is used because it is grounded on nomothetic knowledge, which requires drawing broad conclusions from a large body of research. Although these studies were done in the past using different methodologies and metrics, they all use the same impact size measurements.

Publications on Knowledge Management are the peer-reviewed publications of choice for this study's research paper sourcing. These sources were chosen because we believe they are the most complete sources of knowledge management material currently available. All published versions of the selected work have been investigated through. In relation to this investigation, a comprehensive search has been conducted on the papers published between 2010 and 2015. A thorough literature review on obstacles and facilitators of knowledge sharing and transfer was conducted, including all kinds of publications including qualitative and empirical studies. The selection process included identifying articles that had the specific terms "knowledge management" or "knowledge sharing." The procedure led to the aggregation of a total of 102 articles. While the primary focus was placed on the keywords of the articles, due attention was also given to the subjects addressed in the articles. The search also included papers that expressly focused on examining the factors that hinder or facilitate the sharing and transfer of information.

III. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Numerous firms have come to recognize that competitive advantages derived from technology are ephemeral, leading them to acknowledge that their personnel are the only source of sustainable competitive advantages. Consequently, these organizations strive to retain their position at the forefront and preserve their competitive edge. An essential aspect for organizations is the establishment of a robust ability to effectively retain, develop, structure, and use the abilities possessed by their employees.

As organizations increasingly grapple with the challenges posed by insufficient knowledge management, there has been a growing interest in the development of methodologies aimed at facilitating quantitative analysis [2]. Organizations should, at a minimum, undertake the task of identifying the information that has significance for them and thereafter develop a value proposition for the purpose of effectively managing this knowledge. The advancement of a framework by Khatibi, Dedekorkut-Howes, Howes, and Torabi [3] aims to assist executives in effectively initiating and overseeing a knowledge management campaign. The structure shown in Table 1 centers on three primary stages of a knowledge management program: Planning, Deployment and Maintenance. It also outlines significant activities under four distinct categories: People, Strategy, Technology, and Process. After the firm has established and expressed the business advantages, it must begin the process of strategizing the execution, guaranteeing that the program's goals are in clear alignment with the stated benefits and overarching corporate objectives. During the transition to the implementation planning phase, it is significant to consider several conditions that will influence and structure the tasks and activities associated with the project.

According to Nisar [4], the existence of KM is contingent upon the possession of knowledge to be managed. Knowledge may be defined as a comprehensive accumulation or corpus of information. Information is typically conveyed by many means, such as theories, processes, systems, or the expression of views, theories, ideas, and analyses. According to Nonaka, Toyama, and Konno [5], it is essential for employees to possess the capability to actively pursue information, engage in experimentation, derive learning from it, and effectively disseminate knowledge to others to facilitate the innovation process of new knowledge. The implementation of a KM program that fosters an understanding of the significance of individuals is crucial for achieving organizational success. According to Lee [6], knowledge may be defined as the ability to effectively use information, hence enhancing its value. Consequently, knowledge may be deemed ineffective if it remains unused.

Within organizational contexts, knowledge is not just confined to written documents but rather permeates other facets such as routines, procedures, practices, conventions, and cultures.

Table 1. Knowledge Management Initiative Framework

| | Maintain | Plan | Deploy |
|-------------------|---|---|--|
| Technology | <p>The platform customization as new features like blogs and wikis become available-community needs.</p> <p>Continue to optimize and improve the experience of the user through rapid platform and surveys releases.</p> <p>Refine tags and taxonomy as required to reflect organization Industry and vocabulary terminology updates.</p> | <p>Knowledge identification is currently accessed and stored including cloud products, shared drives, and web applications platforms.</p> <p>Requested align functions and characteristics functions with the requirements of the business.</p> <p>Evaluate solutions existing used as well as other on premise and hosted solutions (RFI/RFP).</p> | <p>Migrate and plan knowledge and new platform content.</p> <p>Implement various mediums and tools for sharing of knowledge like Document Libraries, Wikis, Blogs, Intranet, and Forums.</p> <p>The taxonomy implementation metadata and structure features to allow for developed relevant and navigation search results.</p> |
| Process | <p>Conduct regular repository reviews to maintain quality-alternatively and relevancy use a rating system.</p> <p>Track key matrices around objectives of knowledge management to track performance ongoing.</p> <p>Use a system of card catalog to track process of in-process.</p> | <p>Review all sources of management within a company and create a migrating process to the locations identified.</p> <p>Develop and design taxonomy for knowledge organization.</p> <p>Develop plan and identify gaps to create the knowledge that is missing.</p> | <p>Develop an architecture process to managing knowledge, creating, and guide creating.</p> <p>Communities with knowledge identification processes.</p> <p>Processes of validation with knowledge management and KKHs.</p> |
| People | <p>Ensure management of knowledge which continue to organize, approve, and review submitted content.</p> <p>Consumers of knowledge and reward key contributors.</p> <p>Collect feedback from technology and knowledge management process for future advancements.</p> | <p>Identify guardians and key contributors of knowledge.</p> <p>Knowledge management identification evangelist to lead knowledge communities and manage content as guides and facilitators.</p> <p>Key consumers identification of knowledge.</p> | <p>Advice contributors to share and create knowledge through corporate wide recognition.</p> <p>Train leaders of knowledge management on technologies and then let them lead training for the remaining functional societies.</p> <p>User training on a collaborative approach adoption to using shared knowledge, updating, and locating.</p> |
| Strategy | <p>Foster a culture of collaboration and knowledge sharing by growing societies of knowledge organically.</p> | <p>Identify the business benefits and requirements of management of knowledge and ensure these are addressed by the initiative.</p> | <p>Gain alignment from stakeholders on the knowledge management execution campaign-demonstrate the preposition value clearly.</p> |

According to Tiwana and Ramesh [7], processes, as a component of KM, may be defined as logical and mechanical artifacts that give guidance for the execution of work inside an organization. These processes play a crucial role in the overall functioning of the organization. An essential need for effective knowledge management is the ability to comprehend work processes and their corresponding mapping. The efficacy and efficiency of an organization may be greatly improved by its members' capacity to communicate and apply relevant information. Hau, Kim, Lee, and Kim [8] differentiate between two distinct forms of knowledge: tacit and explicit. The later refers to the knowledge that which has been formalized and can be transmitted from one person to another, whereas the former is one which is internal to people and it more challenging to implement and impart. What we call “tacit knowledge” is the data that is so deeply ingrained in a person's way of thinking, behaving, and perceiving that they may not even be aware they have it. In contrast, explicit knowledge can be specified, acquired, stored, and communicated due to its formal and systematic structure.

Knowledge, as stated by Grant [9], is too easily categorized into explicit and tacit categories. The author proposes that there are three separate types of knowledge: implicit, explicit, and tacit. Physically displayed information is meant when the word “explicit” is used. The term “implicit knowledge” is used to describe data that is not physically declared or communicated but may be. On the other hand, “tacit knowledge”, is that which is difficult to put into words or any other concrete form.

Knowledge Management, as defined by the Choo [10], is “a formalized approach to creating and maintaining an organization-wide knowledge base. This process involves the retrieval, acquisition, sharing, assimilation, integration, distribution, and reuse of both external and internal knowledge, encompassing both explicit knowledge and tacit knowledge. The goal of KM is to foster innovation within the organization, manifesting in the form of improved products, enhanced human resources, and optimized organizational processes. KM is a discipline that focuses on the systematic storage and dissemination of the collective knowledge, insights, and expertise that an organization has acquired pertaining to its many processes, procedures, and activities.

The concept of KM facilitates the dissemination of knowledge by the establishment of connections between individuals and the provision of access to information, hence enabling individuals to acquire knowledge through recorded experiences. The concept of KM is intricately intertwined with the organizational culture. According to Blackler [11], companies that effectively acquire and use new information across the whole organization are more likely to cultivate innovation, in contrast to organizations that do not prioritize this component. According to Grootswagers, Cichy, and Carlson [12], it is essential for businesses to cultivate receptors that acquire and assimilate external information, since this process is closely linked to their innovation capabilities.

According to Lustri, Miura, and Takahashi [13], the field of Knowledge Management has had significant growth in both research and practical applications in recent years. Considering the highly competitive environment, firms strategically position themselves as entities that knowledge-driven, aiming to harness their knowledge assets to attain a competitive edge. Nevertheless, companies are faced with a multitude of challenges pertaining to knowledge management (KM). The issues may be effectively mitigated by a dual approach including the identification of underlying causes and the subsequent development of appropriate remedies. The issues mentioned include the four KM processes, namely application, generation, transfer, and storage/retrieval. According to Filippini, Güttel, and Nosella [14], the primary obstacles encountered in most knowledge management initiatives are to the alteration of individuals' work routines. The difficulty is in encouraging individuals to express and exchange information via direct interpersonal communication. The primary difficulty is in formulating knowledge management strategies that prioritize the development of employee-dependent knowledge sharing platforms. Moreover, if information is seen as a source of power, it follows that those who possess such knowledge would exhibit a tendency to safeguard it, since they perceive greater advantages in retaining it rather than disseminating it. The practice of Knowledge Management has been in existence since the inception of human awareness about the concept of knowledge.

According to Maqsood, Finegan, and Walker [15], Knowledge Management (KM) emerged as a study and professional sector in the late 1980s, gaining prominence in conjunction with the advent of the Internet. Despite being relatively young, the field of knowledge management has already seen paradigm shifts. The first paradigm of knowledge management, referred to by some writers as Old Knowledge Management (TOKM), has been surpassed by many alternative paradigms that fall within the wider framework known as Second Generation Knowledge Management (SGKM). The New Knowledge Management Variation (NKMV) in the design of products was first proposed by Lynn, Reilly, and Akgün [16]. The significance of these modifications in KM is noteworthy for the field of knowledge technology (KT) since the existence of KT is predicated on its role in facilitating knowledge and KM processes at both collective and individual levels, encompassing groups, organizations, countries, and supranational entities. The evaluation of KT's efficacy is on its ability to effectively facilitate these processes. The agenda of Knowledge Translation (KT) is ultimately determined by our comprehension of KM, which serves as the foundation for assessing the effectiveness of KT services in addressing the KM, knowledge, and business processing challenges that arise in our daily lives.

According to Kim, Çavuşgil, and Calantone [17], the significance of information management for firms is readily apparent, as their dedication to delivering services and products serves as a catalyst for advancements in corporate performance. The practice of information management enables organizations to effectively use their information resources to enhance productivity, foster innovation, streamline operations, and motivate employees. One notable outcome of information management is the integration of people, systems, and technology into a cohesive entity. Organizations consistently need the transformation to explicit knowledge from tacit knowledge to facilitate the use of expertise for process improvement. The knowledge management process offers a structured framework for effectively implementing knowledge management practices inside businesses, with the individual in charge being expected to adhere carefully to this guidance.

The life cycle of knowledge management (KM) culminates in the stage of awareness development, during which individuals devise novel approaches to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of company processes. According to Holsapple [18], the generation of knowledge inside organizations mostly stems from the collective efforts of employees via community communication, interactions, talents, and attitudes. There are two distinct modes in which information may be developed: implicit awareness and explicit knowledge. Explicit knowledge may be derived from a range of established and conserved sources, such as books, journals, records, newspapers, and instructional materials. This process involves the

establishment of a management structure that is centered on information, and the generation of knowledge from both external and internal sources.

IV. BENEFITS OF KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT

The use of KM systems and technologies facilitates enhanced communication that is characterized by increased depth, richness, and transparency. Effective communication is crucial for facilitating effective research and development endeavors. A KM system is considered a very important tool for enterprises due to its many benefits and advantages.

Integrate organizational Knowledge

Knowledge integration is the process of transferring knowledge across the borders of organizations to facilitate exchange and application. In accordance with the findings of Jetter, Kraaijenbrink, Schröder, and Wijnhoven [19], we provide a proposed operational definition of knowledge integration. Additionally, we suggest a systematic approach for identifying and categorizing the strategies, practices, channels, and processes that facilitate the integration of diverse information across organizational borders. To solve complex problems, experts in the emerging subject of information management integration transmit and combine data from many repositories. When information is integrated, its many variables and identifiers are merged into a single master record. The creation of a cohesive and integrated visual representation allows for the effective display of data via the use of charts, graphics, or a dashboard. The process of integrating data does not generate novel data; rather, it serves as a streamlined approach to data retrieval and consolidation, enabling users to conveniently access and locate all relevant information inside a single repository.

While knowledge integration has the potential to foster creativity, simplicity, and team cohesion, it may also give rise to confusion and an inflexible organizational climate. Additional obstacles that organizations face include limitations on transactive memory, inadequate levels of mutual understanding, difficulties in sharing and retaining contextual information, as well as the rigidity of organizational connections. In a more optimistic vein, Jackson, Park, and Probst [20] discovered a correlation between innovation and the successful integration of information. The study conducted by Salunke et al. aimed to assess the implications of knowledge integration skills on the creation and maintenance of a competitive advantage via service innovation. Furthermore, scholars have conducted investigations on a large range of advantages, like but not limited to enhanced speed in product development, heightened productivity, improved quality, expansion of firms, establishment of sustainable competitive advantage, enhanced team performance, diversification of products, and the co-creation of knowledge. A KM data integration approach was established, drawing upon prior research, with the aim of facilitating the benefits and addressing the obstacles associated with knowledge integration.

Enabling Better and Faster Decision Making

The significance of KM in influencing making decision has been emphasized by Abubakar, Elrehail, Alatailat, and Elçi [21]. Furthermore, Maier, Hädrich, and Peinl [22] conducted empirical research that demonstrated the favorable impacts of KM infrastructure on both the quality and speed of decision-making. The interdependence between knowledge and time is apparent. According to Mohanty [23], decision-making and problem-solving might be considered synonymous. Conversely, Jarrahi [24] defines organizational decision-making as the systematic procedure of recognizing and resolving challenges. In addition to include the process of issue identification, Daft's definition also incorporates the concept of decision effectiveness. The choice that has been made must effectively address the situation at hand. From an organizational perspective, our consideration of decision-making and problem-solving has led us to conclude that these two processes are fundamentally synonymous. Both the issue identification and solution stages might include many departments and a larger number of organizations.

The expeditious process of organizational decision-making may enable organizations to strengthen their competitive performance via the adoption of new technologies that may improve effectiveness and efficiency, as well as the implementation of new goods. Irrespective of the presence of environmental turbulence, the ability of enterprises to make prompt judgments may facilitate their ability to capitalize on emerging possibilities before they become obsolete. Simultaneously, expeditious decision-making that prioritizes expediency above the thoroughness and comprehensiveness of pertinent information may result in unfavorable conclusions and adverse outcomes. Therefore, it is of utmost importance to prioritize the efficacy of choices rather than only emphasizing their promptness. According to Papadakis and Barwise [25], making quick but inefficient judgments might have a detrimental impact on productivity. In some situations, it may be advantageous to make prompt judgments, even if they exclude a thorough examination of the available facts, due to various factors. In situations when gathering further information is not feasible and the decision-making process cannot be enhanced, there is no justification for postponing the decision.

In light of the trade-off between choice correctness and decision speed, an increasing number of decision theorists have endeavored to comprehend the characteristics that enable organizations to make prompt and efficient judgments. Intuition is often seen as a viable approach to resolving this issue. It is important to emphasize that intuition may prioritize the speed of decision-making above its quality. In a recent study conducted by Förster, Higgins, and Bianco [26], a significant association of 66.4% was observed between decision quality, specifically innovative issue solving, and decision speed, which pertains to the pace at which problems are solved. It seems that organizations with the capability to generate innovative choices also possess the capacity to execute them expeditiously. This association is intriguing as it demonstrates that choice quality and decision speed are not inherently contradictory. Moreover, they have provided empirical evidence to support the notion that

an industry's KM infrastructure significantly enhances both the quality and speed of decision-making. It is fair to propose that relying just on intuition may not be the exclusive recourse for managers who are confronted with the need to make prompt judgments.

Stimulating Growth and Innovations

The desire to enhance revenues is a common objective among firms; yet, achieving this goal becomes more challenging in mature sectors characterized by heightened rivalry. The act of sharing emotional knowledge, engaging in collaborative efforts, and delivering information has the potential to foster creativity by generating novel insights and understanding. Knowledge management has the potential to provide benefits not just for certain divisions within an organization, but also for individual workers, therefore contributing to the overall success of the firm. According to Sung and Choi [27], the main objective of KM is to foster creativity. Furthermore, Aydin and Dubé [28] put out a theoretical framework that establishes a connection between knowledge management, innovation, and competitiveness. Carneiro examines the correlation between knowledge management, innovation levels, and competitiveness levels within firms, emphasizing the strategic significance of knowledge creation. The author posits that KM has a favorable effect on both competitiveness and innovation. As per Singh, Gupta, Busso, and Kamboj [29], impact KM serves a mechanism that is coordinating that improves both organizational and innovation performance.

Calantone, Çavuşgil, and Zhao [30] posited that firms must engage in continuous learning from external sources to get a competitive edge. By effectively disseminating and exchanging information, organizations have the potential to foster innovation. Organizations are required to establish internal channels that facilitate the exchange of information among personnel. According to the study conducted by Newell, Huang, Galliers, and Pan [31], it is believed that knowledge management implementation system that pushes the boundaries of creativity might enhance the process of innovation by facilitating faster access and dissemination of novel information. Furthermore, the implementation of good KM plays a pivotal role in the achievement of success while introducing new products. The current research asserts that information and its management are influential aspects in determining an organization's innovation capability.

V. PROCESS OF KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT

The process of KM refer to a set of actions implemented by an organization to facilitate and use knowledge. The process of KM involves the ongoing transformation of one kind of knowledge into another. Knowledge management techniques facilitate the transformation to explicit knowledge from tacit knowledge, as well as the conversion of explicit information back into tacit knowledge. Several authors have outlined several strategies for managing knowledge.

Knowledge Acquisition and Generation

While tacit knowledge is the primary emphasis of knowledge acquisition in knowledge management, explicit information is also part of the process. According to the Marra [32], knowledge may be transformed from tacit to explicit via the process of externalization. As an example, papers or databases may be used to turn tacit knowledge into a written or recorded form that can be accessed and utilized by others. The process of figuring out what an organization already knows and what it needs to know to achieve its goals should begin long before any new information is gathered. The term "knowledge identification" is occasionally used to discuss this procedure. Knowledge creation is rooted in the cultivation and use of information for the sake of discovery and exploitation. Knowledge may be acquired via the act of writing, including both formal and informal modes of expression. Secondly, it might be acquired through research. The fundamental purpose of research, characterized by its methodical inquiry, is to produce new information. Some examples of institutions are research institutions and tertiary institutions. Shared issue solving, often known as brainstorming, is a collaborative process aimed at generating ideas and solutions to a particular challenge. This pertains to individuals with expertise in a certain field convening to exchange their perspectives on an issue with the aim of proposing solutions. Some examples are seminars, conferences, and workshops.

Knowledge Capture

According to Park [33], knowledge capture is identified as one of the five activities inside the context of the KM process. The process of knowledge capture involves transforming tacit information into explicit knowledge, so converting the knowledge held by individuals into a tangible form that can be accessed and used by the company. The process of knowledge capture encompasses the use of many technologies to facilitate the generation and dissemination of information. Information technology plays a pivotal role in facilitating KM and enhancing the delivery of efficient services within an organizational context. Knowledge mapping is a technique used to ascertain the specific locations within an organization where knowledge is situated. Knowledge mapping involves the use of several methodologies such as questionnaires, interviews, and sometimes observations. The questionnaire ought to ascertain individuals inside the company who possess unique knowledge or experience. In their publication, Balaid, Rozan, Hikmi, and Memon [34] provided a description of knowledge mapping as a tool for facilitating navigation and organizing both explicit information and tacit knowledge. They emphasized the significance of knowledge mapping in highlighting the interconnections and dependencies across different knowledge repositories. There are five knowledge management approaches that may be used for the purpose of knowledge capture (see **Table 2**).

Table 2. KM Methodologies Used in Knowledge Capture

| KM methodologies | Explanation |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Exit Interview | The purpose of an Exit Interview is to record the expertise of departing workers. Many organizations depart the market based on solely qualitative considerations, such as exit interviews with key staff. The goal of an Exit Interview might be knowledge capture as part of a larger KM strategy. |
| Knowledge Harvesting | Knowledge Harvesting refers to the process of sharing and collecting the knowledge of subject matter experts. In order to create value, knowledge is harvested and turned into assets. As a result, the company may avoid the high costs associated with talent attrition and prevent critical skills from being unavailable when they are required. The appropriate tool for this is the Retention Interview. |
| Knowledge Jam | The goal of a Knowledge Jam is to share what has been learnt by facilitating a discussion between those who have the knowledge and those who are seeking it. Through the practices of facilitation, dialogue, and translation, Knowledge Jam brings latent expertise to the fore and puts it to use. |
| Knowledge Modeling | Knowledge modeling, often called knowledge capture and modeling (KCM) [35], is the method through which information about a given process, facility, or product is transformed into a form that a computer can understand and use. It's a multi-disciplinary strategy for documenting and modeling expertise in a form that may be used again for the sake of revision, addition, substitution, aggregation, and reuse. |
| Retrospect | Retrospect is a conference held at the conclusion of a project that is designed to gather as much of the team's collective knowledge as possible via a planned and supported process. Quickly collecting information is the goal of the Paraphrase team. Involving a member of the next team to tackle a comparable business problem in the conversation may turn a team's retrospective into a peer help for that team. |

Knowledge Organization

The effective arrangement of knowledge is essential for facilitating convenient access and retrieval of learned, produced, or created information. Librarians, in their role as information practitioners, engage in the organization of knowledge in recorded form, which is often referred to as information resources, via the processes of cataloguing and categorization. According to Bakewell [36], cataloguing may be described as the systematic procedure of recording descriptive details about a book or non-book material on a catalogue card. On the other hand, classification involves the allocation of a class number to a book, which aligns with a topic title based on a selected classification system. Furthermore, Smiraglia [37] delineated many components associated with the organization of knowledge, including the identification of messages, identification of texts, and description of content. Indexing, abstracting, and cataloguing techniques are often used tools for the structuring of knowledge.

Knowledge Storage

The generation and acquisition of knowledge need appropriate storage and preservation to facilitate later access, use, and for the purpose of ensuring its longevity. Donate and De Pablo [38] identified knowledge storage as a key component of KM, including the activities of collecting, transcribing, and coding information. According to Chou [39] the concept of knowledge storage, referred to as knowledge “repository” in the sector of KM, is the process of capturing and storing documents containing embedded information for the purpose of facilitating future retrieval.

Knowledge Sharing

Knowledge sharing conceptualization may be characterized as the process through which wisdom, skills, and technology are exchanged across different subunits within an organization. information sharing pertains to the shared ideas and behavioral patterns within a department or company that facilitate the exchange of employee information, experiences, and abilities. Alegre and Chiva [40] asserts that the effective and intentional dissemination of valuable information leads to increased rates of organizational and individual innovation and learning. This, in turn, facilitates the production of superior goods that may be expediently introduced to the intended market, hence boosting overall market performance. Knowledge sharing is an inherent process that occurs spontaneously, exhibiting variability at the individual level. Various variables influence knowledge sharing at both the group and individual levels, including motivation, corporate culture, managerial support, organizational structure, information and communication technology (ICT), incentive systems, and interpersonal trust.

Knowledge Application

The central focus of knowledge management revolves on the concept of knowledge application (KA), as it enhances the active and pertinent use of knowledge for the purpose of generating value inside an organization. The KBV (Knowledge-Based View) asserts that the knowledge value is derived from its application, due to its tacit nature and stickiness. When organizations effectively utilize pertinent information, they decrease the probability of errors, minimize duplication, enhance efficiency, and consistently transform their organizational expertise into tangible goods. By effectively using knowledge, organizations may enhance the efficiency of their new product creation process as well as the management of administrative

and technological systems. Knowledge management (KM) addresses the many forms of knowledge present inside an organization and leverages the use of information that has been generated and disseminated.

In their research, Ode and Ayavoo [41] emphasize the significance of knowledge application (KA) above other processes such as knowledge creation or information sharing. Singh, Gupta, Busso, and Kamboj [42] argue that knowledge has no value until it is put into practice. According to Compton and Jansen [43], knowledge acquisition facilitates the ability of individuals within an organization to optimize intended results. Previous research has either overlooked or just briefly explored the potential connection between knowledge acquisition (KA) and innovation performance. However, this study posits that KA may serve as a mediator in the interaction between other knowledge management (KM) activities, such as creation, firm innovation, dissemination, and storage. This implies that the effectiveness of knowledge generation and dissemination is contingent upon its practical application in the delivery of services and products, as well as its ability to successfully address and resolve issues. Once information has been disseminated across individuals within an organization, it is imperative that this shared knowledge be effectively used in order to address and resolve pertinent issues or challenges. Richards and Kang [44] asserts that the effective application of acquired, stored, generated, and shared information is crucial to avoid rendering the whole process futile. To ensure good knowledge application, it is essential to describe the KM process to users. In other words, the application of knowledge should be directed towards achieving effective and efficient use in order to address a certain need or requirement.

VI. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT CHALLENGES

The impediments that inhibit the generation of new information inside an organization are known as deterrents to knowledge sharing. Many scholar works have identified many obstacles to the process of transferring and sharing knowledge within an organizational context. Among the several obstacles impeding information exchange inside organizations, the deficiency of trust has emerged as the foremost and thoroughly researched barrier. The research done in 2013 on knowledge sharing and transfer yielded significant results about the barriers that impede the sharing of information inside organizations [45]. Notably, a recurring theme across numerous studies was the identification of a lack of trust among employees as the primary obstacle to knowledge sharing.

The presence of interpersonal mistrust poses a significant obstacle to the exchange of information both within and across organizations. The knowledge-sharing behaviors of people are influenced by factors such as trust, motivation (both extrinsic and intrinsic), and incentives. The absence of incentives and rewards systems may impede the knowledge transfer and exchange process. Likewise, the supply of incentive assumes a significant function for the individual sharing information. The provision of appropriate incentives, such as recognition, praise, and cash prizes, serves as a catalyst for motivating people to participate the process and activities of knowledge sharing with their peers. Likewise, a deficiency in equitable remuneration may hinder the dissemination of knowledge inside the firm. The research conducted by Burgess [46] emphasized that a lack of enough motivation among repatriates serves as an obstacle to the sharing and transfer of information.

Numerous scholars and practitioners have acknowledged that organizational culture represents a notable impediment to the process of information exchange. It serves as a hindrance to the dissemination and exchange of information inside the company. The cultural characteristics proposed by Al-Adaileh and Al-Atawi [47] have been widely assess in the knowledge xchange and tranfer context across distinct cultures. Power distance (PD) is a concept that pertains to the degree to which community members are willing to tolerate and accept unequal distribution of power within an organizational setting. A significant power distance is indicative of a cultural context in which a tribal structure poses obstacles to social advancement. The connection between the provider and recipient of information is asymmetrical. The distribution of power and money is characterized by significant disparities, but the authority of leaders remains largely unchallenged. The concept of individualism/collectivism pertains to the extent to which a person perceives themselves as an integral component of a collective or as an autonomous individual. In a cultural context characterized by high collectivism, there exists a strong interconnection among people, who see themselves as integral components of a larger collective entity. Conversely, under a cultural context characterized by high levels of individualism, people tend to exhibit loose or weak interpersonal connections. A high degree of individualism within a culture is associated with a notable predominance of self-interest.

Uncertainty avoidance, as a cultural factor, pertains to the extent to which people exhibit reluctance in accepting ambiguity and uncertainty. In a cultural context characterized by high levels of uncertainty avoidance, people have a tendency to be adverse to risk and demonstrate limited receptivity towards stringent regulations, laws, policies, and rules. Femininity/Masculinity pertains to the extent to which people are inclined to uphold societal standards. Within a societal context characterized by a strong emphasis on masculinity, there exists a prevailing reliance on conventional power structures. There seems to be a diminishing emphasis on social welfare. Extensive research has been conducted on the cultural factors within the context of China. Buckley, Clegg, and Tan [48] have demonstrated that the presence of a culture characterized by a significant elevated masculinity, power distance, high uncertainty, and low individualism serves as an impediment to the transfer and sharing of knowledge within Chinese organizations. This cultural context hinders individuals from engaging in risk-taking behaviors and experimentation.

The process of transferring information across culturally distinct contexts necessitates the consideration of openness to variety. Based on the study conducted by Smith [49], it has been determined that embracing diversity and fostering a multicultural workforce facilitates the acquisition and dissemination of knowledge from the company's headquarters to its

subsidiaries. Conversely, a vigorous discourse has taken place among scholars, with some individuals positing that openness to variety might impede the diffusion of knowledge. According to Kühlmann and Heinz [50], it has been suggested that a significant level of cultural diversity might impede the effective transfer of information and lead to suboptimal employee performance. Similarly, in instances when workers possess a reduced inclination towards embracing diversity, they tend to refrain from engaging in the exchange and dissemination of information. Moreover, the absence of effective communication inside an organization has been recognized as a significant impediment to the dissemination and exchange of information.

In situations characterized by limited time and a substantial workload, the process of sharing and transferring information becomes challenging. This assertion has been corroborated by several studies. According to Connelly, Ford, Turel, Gallupe, and Zweig [51], the presence of time pressure serves as a hindrance to the act of sharing information. Due to heightened levels of competitiveness, there has been a corresponding rise in work-related demands, resulting in challenges for people in allocating time for participation in knowledge-sharing endeavors.

The primary factor leading to a lack of time for information exchange has been identified by researchers as an excessive workload. A significant impediment to the transfer and sharing of data is the presence of a substantial workload. The aforementioned variable has been extensively examined as a significant impediment to the dissemination and exchange of information in the year 2010. In their study, Rasool, Warraich, and Sajid [52] shown that a high workload within an organization hinders the transfer of information among employees.

Lack of technical resources is a significant obstacle since it prevents information from being disseminated and transmitted efficiently. Knowledge creation, storage, dissemination, and application, as well as company learning, were all mentioned as activities hampered by inadequate technical support. It has been shown that the high cost involved and the limits imposed by information technology are obstacles to knowledge exchange inside the organization. Haq and Anwar [53] emphasized on the fact that, despite the presence of barriers that inhibit the sharing of knowledge, there is a significant desire among individuals to exchange information and participate in mutual learning. Failure to properly disseminate and transfer information within an organization is hindered by a lack of suitable support from top management and the presence of weak leadership. A lack of backing from upper management, as stated by Connelly and Kelloway [54], hinders effective communication and knowledge transmission. The failure to provide proper leadership also hinders the free flow of information. In contrast, Davison, Ou, and Martinsons [55] looked at knowledge exchange in China's collectivist cultural environment. According to the data, a connection between leadership style and sharing of knowledge in the Chinese setting does not exist.

The absence of organizational commitment is a hindrance to the knowledge exchange processes and transfer within the firm. Organizational commitment refers to the motivational force that compels employees to remain affiliated with their employing firm. Organizational commitment is comprised of three distinct components, namely normative commitments, affective commitments, and continuation commitments.

According to Saks [56], employees may experience various levels of commitment during their career in a business. Affective commitment refers to the extent to which a person has emotional attachment to their employing company. Affective commitment is also indicative of the degree to which a person connects with and engages in an organization. Nordin [57] elaborated on the concept that people who cultivate elevated levels of emotional commitment have favorable emotions towards their organization, making it hard for them to disengage. Normative commitment, as defined by Somers [58], refers to the extent to which employees feel a sense of obligation towards their organization. In contrast, continuance commitment is associated with an individual's focus on the calculated or perceived costs associated with their employment in the organization. The role of company commitments in relations between predictors of knowledge sharing itself has been examined in a research conducted by Ismail, Tajuddin, and Yunus [59]. Additionally, another study has explored the moderating impact of emotional trust on the relationship between affective commitment and knowledge sharing.

Likewise, the absence of absorptive ability has been recognized as a hindrance to the transmission and sharing of information. Absorptive capacity refers to an individual's capability to effectively use external information sources. The extent of absorptive ability is heavily contingent upon pre-existing information that is relevant to the subject matter. The concept of absorptive ability is intricately linked to the recipient of knowledge. Harrington and Guimarães [60] explored the correlation between absorptive capacity and the use of ICT. The researchers discovered that the strategic use of ICT may lead to an increase in absorptive ability inside a company. Consequently, this heightened absorptive capacity will expedite the transfer of knowledge throughout the firm.

Additional obstacles pertaining to the dissemination of information include technological advancements, absence of interactive platforms for discourse, inadequate allocation of resources, and other related factors. The concept of knowledge uniqueness has been examined as a noteworthy factor in relation to the sharing of incomplete information. The challenges of information sharing have been recognized as the lack of a suitable mechanism and the absence of coordination. The challenges of knowledge sharing that have been found include a lack of attention and appreciation, as well as a fear of seeming ignorant. The presence of ambiguity in both the context and content of information, along with the inherent uncertainty, serves as a hindrance to the transmission of knowledge. The extent of tacitness has been recognized as a notable obstacle to the dissemination of information using social web technologies. In addition, the absence of interpersonal interaction among coworkers serves as an impediment to the dissemination of information.

VII. CONCLUSION

The findings in this research indicate that the implementation of KM practices is of paramount importance for the long-term viability and achievement of companies in the contemporary dynamic and highly competitive business landscape. The proficient administration of knowledge has the potential to provide favorable consequences, including but not limited to ongoing innovation, heightened productivity, enhanced performance, and bolstered innovative capacity. Knowledge sharing is seen as a crucial component within the realm of knowledge management, as it facilitates the dissemination of information across various entities such as people, groups, teams, departments, and organizations. Knowledge management and exploitation are emphasized for their relevance in the research. KM refers to the practice of strategically disseminating data to those who can use it in an efficient and timely way. Its ultimate goal is to help an organization reach its goals by making the most of its intellectual capital.

This article was composed following a review of various secondary sources, including academic publications, news stories, and online databases. To achieve this, we adopt a meta-review technique to take a comprehensive look at and assess the current body of research on the challenges and benefits of information sharing. Literature review findings emphasize the need of companies having robust personnel retention, development, organization, and utilization capabilities in order to achieve competitive advantage. In addition, the paper presents a conceptual model for launching and managing a successful knowledge management endeavor, which is divided into three distinct phases: preparation, implementation, and upkeep. It further delineates crucial tasks falling under four distinct categories: Strategy, Personnel, Procedures, and Technology. The study underscores the significance of knowledge management in facilitating firms in attaining their business goals.

Data Availability

No data was used to support this study.

Conflicts of Interests

The author(s) declare(s) that they have no conflicts of interest.

Funding

No funding was received to assist with the preparation of this manuscript.

Competing Interests

There are no competing interests.

References

- [1]. F. S. Çakır and Z. Adıgüzel, "Analysis of Leader Effectiveness in Organization and Knowledge Sharing Behavior on Employees and Organization," SAGE Open, vol. 10, no. 1, p. 215824402091463, Jan. 2020, doi: 10.1177/2158244020914634.
- [2]. "Knowledge management: problems, promises, realities, and challenges," IEEE Journals & Magazine | IEEE Xplore, Feb. 01, 2001. <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/912386>
- [3]. F. S. Khatibi, A. Dedekorkut-Howes, M. Howes, and E. Torabi, "Can public awareness, knowledge and engagement improve climate change adaptation policies?," Discover Sustainability, vol. 2, no. 1, Mar. 2021, doi: 10.1007/s43621-021-00024-z.
- [4]. T. Nisar, "A systematic review of knowledge management and knowledge sharing: Trends, issues, and challenges," Taylor & Francis. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/23311975.2015.1127744>
- [5]. I. Nonaka, R. Toyama, and N. Konno, "SECI, Ba and Leadership: a Unified Model of Dynamic Knowledge Creation," Long Range Planning, vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 5–34, Feb. 2000, doi: 10.1016/s0024-6301(99)00115-6.
- [6]. J.-N. Lee, "The impact of knowledge sharing, organizational capability and partnership quality on IS outsourcing success," Information & Management, vol. 38, no. 5, pp. 323–335, Apr. 2001, doi: 10.1016/s0378-7206(00)00074-4.
- [7]. A. Tiwana and B. Ramesh, "A design knowledge management system to support collaborative information product evolution," Decision Support Systems, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 241–262, Jun. 2001, doi: 10.1016/s0167-9236(00)00134-2.
- [8]. Y. S. Hau, B. Kim, H. Lee, and Y. Kim, "The effects of individual motivations and social capital on employees' tacit and explicit knowledge sharing intentions," International Journal of Information Management, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 356–366, Apr. 2013, doi: 10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2012.10.009.
- [9]. R. M. Grant, "The knowledge-based view of the firm: Implications for management practice," Long Range Planning, vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 450–454, Jun. 1997, doi: 10.1016/s0024-6301(97)00025-3.
- [10]. C. W. Choo, "The knowing organization: How organizations use information to construct meaning, create knowledge and make decisions," International Journal of Information Management, vol. 16, no. 5, pp. 329–340, Oct. 1996, doi: 10.1016/0268-4012(96)00020-5.
- [11]. F. Blackler, "Knowledge, Knowledge Work and Organizations: An Overview and interpretation," Organization Studies, vol. 16, no. 6, pp. 1021–1046, Nov. 1995, doi: 10.1177/017084069501600605.
- [12]. T. Grootswagers, R. M. Cichy, and T. A. Carlson, "Finding decodable information that can be read out in behaviour," NeuroImage, vol. 179, pp. 252–262, Oct. 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2018.06.022.
- [13]. D. A. Lustri, I. K. Miura, and S. Takahashi, "Knowledge management model: practical application for competency development," The Learning Organization, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 186–202, Mar. 2007, doi: 10.1108/09696470710727023.
- [14]. R. Filippini, W. H. Güttel, and A. Nosella, "Ambidexterity and the evolution of knowledge management initiatives," Journal of Business Research, vol. 65, no. 3, pp. 317–324, Mar. 2012, doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2011.04.003.
- [15]. T. Maqsood, A. Finegan, and D. H. T. Walker, "Applying project histories and project learning through knowledge management in an Australian construction company," The Learning Organization, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 80–95, Jan. 2006, doi: 10.1108/09696470610639149.
- [16]. G. S. Lynn, R. R. Reilly, and A. E. Akgün, "Knowledge management in new product teams: practices and outcomes," IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management, vol. 47, no. 2, pp. 221–231, May 2000, doi: 10.1109/17.846789.
- [17]. D.-K. Kim, S. T. Çavuşgil, and R. J. Calantone, "Information System Innovations and Supply chain Management: channel relationships and firm performance," Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 40–54, Jan. 2006, doi: 10.1177/0092070305281619.

- [18]. C. Holsapple, *Handbook on Knowledge Management 1: Knowledge Matters*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [19]. A. Jetter, J. Kraaijenbrink, H.-H. Schröder, and F. Wijnhoven, *Knowledge integration: The Practice of Knowledge Management in Small and Medium Enterprises*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.
- [20]. M. Y. Yi, J. Jackson, J. S. Park, and J. C. Probst, "Understanding information technology acceptance by individual professionals: Toward an integrative view," *Information & Management*, vol. 43, no. 3, pp. 350–363, Apr. 2006, doi: 10.1016/j.im.2005.08.006.
- [21]. A. M. Abubakar, H. Elrehail, M. Alatailat, and A. Elçi, "Knowledge management, decision-making style and organizational performance," *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 104–114, Apr. 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.jik.2017.07.003.
- [22]. R. Maier, T. Hädrich, and R. Peinl, *Enterprise Knowledge Infrastructures*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2009.
- [23]. S. N. Mohanty, *Decision Making And Problem Solving: A Practical Guide For Applied Research*. Springer Nature, 2021.
- [24]. M. H. Jarrahi, "Artificial intelligence and the future of work: Human-AI symbiosis in organizational decision making," *Business Horizons*, vol. 61, no. 4, pp. 577–586, Jul. 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.bushor.2018.03.007.
- [25]. V. Papadakis and P. Barwise, *Strategic decisions*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [26]. J. Förster, E. T. Higgins, and A. T. Bianco, "Speed/accuracy decisions in task performance: Built-in trade-off or separate strategic concerns?," *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, vol. 90, no. 1, pp. 148–164, Jan. 2003, doi: 10.1016/s0749-5978(02)00509-5.
- [27]. S. Y. Sung and J. N. Choi, "Effects of team knowledge management on the creativity and financial performance of organizational teams," *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, vol. 118, no. 1, pp. 4–13, May 2012, doi: 10.1016/j.obhdp.2012.01.001.
- [28]. S. Aydin and M. Dubé, "Knowledge management, innovation, and competitive advantage: is the relationship in the eye of the beholder?," *Knowledge Management Research & Practice*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 402–413, Jul. 2018, doi: 10.1080/14778238.2018.1496564.
- [29]. S. K. Singh, S. Gupta, D. Busso, and S. Kamboj, "Top management knowledge value, knowledge sharing practices, open innovation and organizational performance," *Journal of Business Research*, vol. 128, pp. 788–798, May 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.04.040.
- [30]. R. J. Calantone, S. T. Çavuşgil, and Y. Zhao, "Learning orientation, firm innovation capability, and firm performance," *Industrial Marketing Management*, vol. 31, no. 6, pp. 515–524, Sep. 2002, doi: 10.1016/s0019-8501(01)00203-6.
- [31]. S. Newell, J. C. Huang, R. D. Galliers, and S. L. Pan, "Implementing enterprise resource planning and knowledge management systems in tandem: fostering efficiency and innovation complementarity," *Information and Organization*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 25–52, Jan. 2003, doi: 10.1016/s1471-7727(02)00007-6.
- [32]. M. Marra, "The contribution of evaluation to socialization and externalization of tacit knowledge," *Evaluation*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 263–283, Jul. 2004, doi: 10.1177/1356389004048278.
- [33]. S. C. Park, "Knowledge capturing methodology in process planning," *Computer-Aided Design*, vol. 35, no. 12, pp. 1109–1117, Oct. 2003, doi: 10.1016/s0010-4485(02)00182-3.
- [34]. A. Balaid, M. Z. A. Rozan, S. N. Hikmi, and J. Memon, "Knowledge maps: A systematic literature review and directions for future research," *International Journal of Information Management*, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 451–475, Jun. 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2016.02.005.
- [35]. C. Lin, "To share or not to share: modeling tacit knowledge sharing, its mediators and antecedents," *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 70, no. 4, pp. 411–428, Oct. 2006, doi: 10.1007/s10551-006-9119-0.
- [36]. K. G. B. Bakewell, *A manual of Cataloguing practice: International Series of Monographs In library and Information Science*. Elsevier, 2014.
- [37]. R. P. Smiraglia, *The elements of knowledge organization*. Springer, 2014.
- [38]. M. J. Donate and J. D. S. De Pablo, "The role of knowledge-oriented leadership in knowledge management practices and innovation," *Journal of Business Research*, vol. 68, no. 2, pp. 360–370, Feb. 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2014.06.022.
- [39]. S. Chou, "Knowledge creation: absorptive capacity, organizational mechanisms, and knowledge storage/retrieval capabilities," *Journal of Information Science*, vol. 31, no. 6, pp. 453–465, Dec. 2005, doi: 10.1177/0165551505057005.
- [40]. J. Alegre and R. Chiva, "Assessing the impact of organizational learning capability on product innovation performance: An empirical test," *Technovation*, vol. 28, no. 6, pp. 315–326, Jun. 2008, doi: 10.1016/j.technovation.2007.09.003.
- [41]. E. Ode and R. Ayavoo, "The mediating role of knowledge application in the relationship between knowledge management practices and firm innovation," *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 210–218, Jul. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.jik.2019.08.002.
- [42]. S. K. Singh, S. Gupta, D. Busso, and S. Kamboj, "Top management knowledge value, knowledge sharing practices, open innovation and organizational performance," *Journal of Business Research*, vol. 128, pp. 788–798, May 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.04.040.
- [43]. P. Compton and R. J. G. Jansen, "A philosophical basis for knowledge acquisition," *Knowledge Acquisition*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 241–258, Sep. 1990, doi: 10.1016/s1042-8143(05)80017-2.
- [44]. D. Richards and B. H. Kang, *Knowledge management and acquisition for intelligent systems: 12th Pacific Rim Knowledge Acquisition Workshop, PKAW 2012, Kuching, Malaysia, September 5-6, 2012, Proceedings*. Springer, 2012.
- [45]. M. Kukko, "Knowledge sharing barriers in organic growth: A case study from a software company," *The Journal of High Technology Management Research*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 18–29, Jan. 2013, doi: 10.1016/j.hitech.2013.02.006.
- [46]. D. J. Burgess, "What motivates employees to transfer knowledge outside their work unit?," *Journal of Business Communication*, vol. 42, no. 4, pp. 324–348, Oct. 2005, doi: 10.1177/0021943605279485.
- [47]. R. Al-Adaileh and M. S. Al-Atawi, "Organizational culture impact on knowledge exchange: Saudi Telecom context," *Journal of Knowledge Management*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 212–230, Apr. 2011, doi: 10.1108/13673271111119664.
- [48]. P. J. Buckley, J. Clegg, and H. Tan, "Cultural awareness in knowledge transfer to China—The role of guanxi and mianzi," *Journal of World Business*, vol. 41, no. 3, pp. 275–288, Sep. 2006, doi: 10.1016/j.jwb.2006.01.008.
- [49]. T. J. Smith, "Diversity and disability: exploring the experiences of vision impaired people in the workplace," *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion*, vol. 21, no. 8, pp. 59–72, Dec. 2002, doi: 10.1108/02610150210787262.
- [50]. T. M. Kühlmann and R. Heinz, *Managing Cultural Diversity in Small and Medium-Sized Organizations: A Guideline for Practitioners*. Springer, 2017.
- [51]. C. E. Connelly, D. P. Ford, O. Turel, R. B. Gallupe, and D. Zweig, "'I'm busy (and competitive)!' Antecedents of knowledge sharing under pressure," *Knowledge Management Research & Practice*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 74–85, Feb. 2014, doi: 10.1057/kmrp.2012.61.
- [52]. T. Rasool, N. F. Warraich, and M. I. Sajid, "Examining the impact of technology overload at the workplace: A Systematic review," *SAGE Open*, vol. 12, no. 3, p. 215824402211143, Jul. 2022, doi: 10.1177/21582440221114320.
- [53]. M. A. U. Haq and S. Anwar, "A systematic review of knowledge management and knowledge sharing: Trends, issues, and challenges," *Cogent Business & Management*, vol. 3, no. 1, p. 1127744, Jan. 2016, doi: 10.1080/23311975.2015.1127744.
- [54]. C. E. Connelly and E. K. Kelloway, "Predictors of employees' perceptions of knowledge sharing cultures," *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, vol. 24, no. 5, pp. 294–301, Aug. 2003, doi: 10.1108/01437730310485815.
- [55]. R. M. Davison, C. X. Ou, and M. G. Martinsons, "Interpersonal knowledge exchange in China: The impact of guanxi and social media," *Information & Management*, vol. 55, no. 2, pp. 224–234, Mar. 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.im.2017.05.008.
- [56]. A. M. Saks, "Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement," *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, vol. 21, no. 7, pp. 600–619, Oct. 2006, doi: 10.1108/02683940610690169.

- [57]. N. Nordin, "The Influence Of Emotional Intelligence, Leadership Behaviour And Organizational Commitment On Organizational Readiness For Change In Higher Learning Institution," *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 29, pp. 129–138, Jan. 2011, doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.11.217.
- [58]. M. J. Somers, "The combined influence of affective, continuance and normative commitment on employee withdrawal," *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, vol. 74, no. 1, pp. 75–81, Feb. 2009, doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2008.10.006.
- [59]. I. R. Ismail, N. Tajuddin, and N. K. M. Yunus, "Trust and intention to share as predictors of online Knowledge-Sharing behavior," in *Springer eBooks*, 2018, pp. 57–67. doi: 10.1007/978-981-13-0203-9_6.
- [60]. S. J. Harrington and T. Guimarães, "Corporate culture, absorptive capacity and IT success," *Information and Organization*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 39–63, Jan. 2005, doi: 10.1016/j.infoandorg.2004.10.002.