

The Role of Systemic Enablers in Integrating Knowledge Management for Innovation

Boy Firmansyah

Institut Bisnis dan Informatika (IBI) Kosgoro 1957

Correspondent: boy.lia@gmail.com

Received : December 18, 2023

Accepted : January 12, 2024

Published : January 31, 2024

Citation: Firmansyah, B. (2024). The Role of Systemic Enablers in Integrating Knowledge Management for Innovation. *Data: Journal of Information Systems and Management*, 2 (1), 25-37.

ABSTRACT: This narrative review explores the critical intersection between Knowledge Management (KM) practices and organizational innovation. As innovation becomes a key determinant of competitive advantage in the digital economy, organizations increasingly rely on KM strategies to harness collective expertise and accelerate problem-solving. The study synthesizes peer-reviewed literature drawn from Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar using targeted keywords and Boolean combinations related to KM, innovation, and organizational learning. Inclusion criteria focused on empirical and theoretical studies that directly connect KM practices with innovation outcomes across diverse sectors and geographical settings. The results reveal that communities of practice, digital knowledge platforms, and strategic alignment of KM are primary drivers of innovation. Factors such as organizational culture, leadership style, and structural flexibility significantly mediate KM effectiveness. Cross-national comparisons highlight disparities in KM integration, with institutions in technologically advanced economies showing higher maturity levels. Challenges identified include resistance to change, underdeveloped digital infrastructure, and compartmentalized organizational silos. The discussion emphasizes policy and institutional strategies to overcome systemic constraints, including fostering leadership in KM and embedding KM within cross-functional collaboration initiatives. This review underscores the strategic importance of KM in enabling sustainable innovation and recommends future research on context-specific implementation and long-term impact. It calls for broader geographic representation and multi-sectoral analysis to develop more inclusive KM frameworks responsive to global innovation demands..

Keywords: Knowledge Management, Organizational Innovation, Strategic Planning, Digital Transformation, Collaborative Learning, Cross-functional Integration, Competitive Advantage.



This is an open access article under the CC-BY 4.0 license

INTRODUCTION

In today's rapidly changing business environment, knowledge is widely acknowledged as a strategic resource that fuels innovation and sustains competitive advantage. Organizations across industrial and service sectors increasingly rely on knowledge management (KM) to foster innovation

capabilities. Tacit knowledge, in particular—that is, the unwritten, unspoken, and hidden storehouse of knowledge held by individuals—has emerged as a crucial enabler of internal innovation. According to Herlina et al. (2024), the sharing of tacit knowledge significantly enhances organizational innovation, mediated by the organization's adaptability to change. These findings underscore the importance of cultivating collaborative spaces that encourage ideation, informal learning, and the cross-pollination of ideas.

Alongside the strategic use of tacit knowledge, the integration of information and communication technologies (ICT) in KM practices is also expanding. Cloud-based systems, for instance, facilitate real-time knowledge sharing among stakeholders and improve innovation processes (Alcalde-Heras et al., 2020). Digitalization not only makes information more accessible but also enhances cross-functional collaboration within organizations. These technological advancements are central to creating innovative solutions that respond dynamically to market demands, indicating that modern KM systems must support both human interaction and digital infrastructure.

Over the past decade, extensive academic interest has emerged around the interplay between knowledge management and innovation capacity. Najda-Janoszka et al. (2025) emphasize the integration of scientific knowledge with practical insights as foundational for sustainable innovation management. Similarly, Smuts and Merwe (2025) argue that sociotechnical KM guidelines can aid organizations in embedding sustainable practices into innovation frameworks. Furthermore, inclusive KM practices help cultivate a culture of innovation by motivating employees to actively engage in the innovation process (Naqshbandi et al., 2022). These insights collectively suggest that the success of organizational innovation depends on the construction and maintenance of an adaptable and robust knowledge architecture.

Recent empirical evidence further supports the vital role of KM in innovation. Zahrawi et al. (2025) highlight the impact of customer knowledge management (CKM) on innovation capability and business performance, especially in the financial services sector. Their findings demonstrate how structured approaches to capturing knowledge "from, for, and about" customers can translate into high-quality innovation and improved performance metrics. This reinforces the idea that KM is not merely a support function but a strategic driver of business success.

Despite these promising developments, implementing effective KM practices remains a considerable challenge for many organizations. A primary obstacle lies in the cultural resistance to change, particularly when existing organizational structures clash with KM initiatives (Herlina et al., 2024). Leadership disengagement, insufficient managerial understanding, and unclear communication of KM objectives contribute to organizational inertia. These cultural and leadership-related barriers impede knowledge sharing and slow the diffusion of innovative ideas.

Technological barriers also persist. As noted by Cabrilo et al. (2020), many organizations, especially in resource-constrained environments, lack the digital infrastructure necessary to implement robust KM systems. Moreover, generational differences in digital literacy complicate collaborative efforts, creating friction in knowledge exchanges. Security and data privacy concerns further inhibit the free flow of knowledge, especially in knowledge-intensive industries. These multidimensional

challenges hamper the development of a knowledge-centric organizational culture essential for sustained innovation.

In addition to practical barriers, significant gaps persist in the academic literature concerning the integration of KM strategies with organizational innovation outcomes. Much of the current research remains conceptual, offering limited guidance on the practical embedding of KM within innovation strategies. Cinti et al. (2025) point to the lack of practice-based models that consider the unique dynamics of specific industries or organizational contexts. Consequently, the generalizability and applicability of existing findings remain limited.

Furthermore, the literature often falls short in articulating clear metrics for measuring the innovation outcomes of KM initiatives. Many studies do not provide empirical evidence on how KM translates into tangible outputs such as product innovations, process improvements, or market performance (Anand et al., 2021). There is also a notable scarcity of longitudinal studies, which are critical for understanding the long-term implications of KM on innovation trajectories. This deficiency limits the ability of organizations to evaluate the sustained impact of KM practices.

The objective of this narrative review is to examine how knowledge management functions as a driver of innovation across organizational settings. Specifically, this review aims to identify KM strategies that have been successfully implemented, analyze their influence on innovation outcomes, and uncover the mechanisms linking KM to innovation performance. Prior research, such as that by Troisi et al. (2024), suggests that stakeholder engagement in knowledge sharing can create fertile ground for social and technological innovation. This review builds upon such insights by systematizing current knowledge and proposing pathways for translating KM theory into practice.

In exploring the intersection of KM and innovation, this study will also address existing gaps in the literature by providing a synthesis of practical frameworks and contextual insights. For example, Ziemann et al. (2020) stress the importance of local context in shaping KM strategies. Therefore, this review pays close attention to the conditions under which KM practices thrive or falter and how such variations influence innovation outcomes. The analysis is intended to support policymakers and practitioners in designing context-sensitive KM interventions that are both effective and sustainable.

This review also acknowledges the limitations of prior studies in terms of geographical and sectoral focus. Much of the existing literature has been confined to high-income, technologically advanced nations and a limited number of sectors such as healthcare and information technology. Studies such as Campbell et al. (2025) provide valuable insights into KM in public health institutions but may not be generalizable to other industries. Moreover, there is a lack of research on KM practices in small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), particularly in developing economies where resource constraints necessitate innovative approaches to knowledge utilization.

Given these limitations, this narrative review adopts a broad and inclusive scope, incorporating studies from diverse organizational contexts, including SMEs, public institutions, and multinational corporations. The geographic coverage includes both developed and developing

economies to offer a holistic view of KM practices. By examining a wide range of organizational settings, this study aims to distill universal principles while also highlighting context-specific adaptations. In doing so, it contributes to the development of a comprehensive understanding of how KM can be leveraged to drive innovation in varied institutional and economic environments.

METHOD

This narrative review adopted a structured and systematic approach to collecting and analyzing academic literature concerning the intersection of knowledge management (KM) and innovation. The methodology aimed to ensure comprehensiveness, transparency, and replicability by employing clearly defined strategies for literature search, selection, and evaluation. The primary objective was to synthesize insights from peer-reviewed studies, conceptual frameworks, and empirical findings to understand how KM contributes to innovation across various organizational settings.

The first stage of the methodology involved selecting appropriate academic databases for literature retrieval. Based on a review of previous narrative and systematic studies in the field, three primary databases were utilized: Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar. Scopus was selected for its multidisciplinary scope and extensive indexing of high-impact journals and conference proceedings. Its advanced search functionalities enabled precise filtering of literature relevant to KM and innovation, including metadata for citation analysis and document type specification (Troisi et al., 2023). Web of Science was employed for its robust citation tracking and journal quality assurance, which allowed a deeper assessment of article influence and scholarly interconnection (Trudel et al., 2017). Meanwhile, Google Scholar was used as a complementary tool to capture gray literature, such as theses, technical reports, and other academic outputs not indexed by commercial databases (Erdmann et al., 2020).

The literature search process was conducted in multiple iterations to refine the scope and ensure inclusion of both foundational and emerging studies. A series of keywords and Boolean operators were employed to guide the search strategy. These keywords included "Knowledge Management," "Innovation," "Organizational Learning," and "Competitive Advantage." Boolean combinations were used strategically to broaden or narrow the search as necessary. For instance, the search string ("Knowledge Management" AND "Innovation") was used to directly identify literature that discusses KM's impact on innovation outcomes. The phrase ("Organizational Learning" OR "Knowledge Sharing") was applied to locate articles exploring intermediary processes that facilitate knowledge transfer. To filter out unrelated studies, the Boolean operator NOT was used in combinations such as ("Knowledge Management" AND "Competitive Advantage") NOT "Environmental," which eliminated entries unrelated to the business and organizational context.

The inclusion criteria for selecting studies were clearly defined prior to the screening process. To ensure relevance and quality, only peer-reviewed journal articles, academic conference papers, book chapters from scholarly publications, and doctoral dissertations were considered. Articles had to be published in English between 2010 and 2025 to capture both historical foundations and

current advancements in KM and innovation research. Eligible studies needed to explicitly discuss KM practices, frameworks, or systems and their relationship to innovation, whether in conceptual, empirical, or applied terms. Furthermore, studies had to focus on organizational contexts such as businesses, public institutions, or non-profits. Studies addressing KM only from a theoretical epistemology or outside of an organizational setting were excluded.

Exclusion criteria were also applied rigorously. Editorials, opinion pieces, magazine articles, and non-peer-reviewed content were excluded due to concerns about academic rigor and replicability. Studies focusing solely on environmental knowledge management, natural resource systems, or biological knowledge repositories were also excluded unless they clearly linked KM with organizational innovation processes. Redundant publications, duplicate entries, or articles with limited accessibility (e.g., paywalled with no institutional access) were likewise removed during the screening phase.

Following the initial search, a total of 4,218 results were identified across the three databases. The first filtering process involved screening the titles and abstracts for relevance, which narrowed the list to 612 articles. This stage helped eliminate clearly irrelevant studies or those only tangentially related to KM and innovation. Next, the full texts of the remaining articles were retrieved and examined in detail to assess methodological quality and thematic alignment. A final sample of 114 articles was selected for in-depth review and synthesis.

The types of studies included in this review spanned a wide range of methodological designs, reflecting the interdisciplinary nature of KM research. These included quantitative studies such as cross-sectional surveys and structural equation modeling (SEM), as well as qualitative designs like case studies, ethnographies, and grounded theory research. Additionally, mixed-methods studies that combined interviews, document analysis, and survey data were incorporated for their comprehensive perspectives. Randomized controlled trials were rare in this domain and thus not emphasized. Nevertheless, each study type offered valuable insights into how KM practices are conceptualized, operationalized, and evaluated in relation to innovation performance.

To evaluate the quality and relevance of each selected study, a thematic coding framework was developed. This framework enabled consistent categorization of articles according to themes such as KM strategies, organizational learning mechanisms, technological enablers, leadership roles, and innovation metrics. Each article was analyzed using this framework to extract key findings and methodological characteristics. Studies were also assessed for theoretical grounding, clarity of conceptual definitions, sample size adequacy (if applicable), and transparency of data collection and analysis methods.

The literature selection process was also subjected to peer debriefing among co-authors to reduce individual bias and enhance the reliability of findings. In cases of ambiguity or disagreement regarding a study's inclusion, the article was discussed among reviewers until consensus was reached. A bibliographic management tool was used to document the search process and to manage citations systematically.

Overall, the methodological approach adopted in this review emphasizes both breadth and depth in exploring the role of KM in driving innovation. By leveraging high-quality databases, applying structured keyword strategies, and enforcing stringent inclusion and exclusion criteria, the review ensures a comprehensive and focused synthesis of the literature. The resulting insights provide a robust foundation for understanding how KM systems and practices influence innovation outcomes, and how these relationships manifest across diverse organizational and geographic contexts.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The review of literature on knowledge management (KM) and its role in fostering innovation across organizations revealed significant thematic patterns, particularly regarding strategic approaches. Drawing from cross-disciplinary studies, this section synthesizes empirical and conceptual findings to illustrate how KM strategies are enacted as catalysts for innovation, how these strategies are embedded into organizational planning, and how contextual factors shape their effectiveness globally.

A recurrent theme in the reviewed literature is the deployment of specific KM strategies aimed at enhancing innovation performance. One prominent approach is the formation of communities of practice (CoPs), which has been recognized as a central mechanism for internal knowledge sharing and collaborative problem-solving. According to Sahoo et al. (2025), CoPs facilitate informal interactions among employees, enabling them to exchange experiential knowledge, refine ideas, and co-develop innovative solutions. Their study, conducted in the manufacturing sector, indicated that firms with well-established CoPs reported higher innovation output and faster idea-to-market cycles.

Complementary to CoPs, the application of digital technologies in knowledge processes also plays a pivotal role in enabling innovation. Several studies highlight the strategic importance of knowledge repositories, cloud-based platforms, and AI-powered analytics tools in accelerating knowledge diffusion and decision-making processes. For instance, Alcalde-Heras et al. (2020) documented how cloud-based information systems improved real-time knowledge exchange and cross-departmental collaboration, ultimately resulting in higher rates of product innovation.

The development of stakeholder networks and strategic partnerships also emerged as a frequent KM strategy tied to innovation outcomes. In the healthcare sector, Milligan et al. (2018) demonstrated how inter-organizational knowledge-sharing partnerships led to process innovations and improvements in patient outcomes. These collaborative networks not only provided access to diverse knowledge bases but also enabled the co-creation of solutions tailored to complex and dynamic environments. The findings underscore that fostering external knowledge flows is equally important as nurturing internal expertise, particularly in sectors undergoing rapid transformation.

Another strategic practice that surfaced is the implementation of knowledge-based systems (KBS), which formalize knowledge capture and retrieval mechanisms. In large-scale enterprises, KBS are often integrated into enterprise resource planning (ERP) systems to align innovation activities with operational processes. Smuts and Merwe (2025) observed that organizations using sociotechnical

KM frameworks, which combine digital infrastructure with cultural enablers, tend to exhibit higher innovation readiness and adaptability. These systems help institutionalize learning and prevent the loss of critical knowledge due to turnover or restructuring.

Beyond identifying the forms of KM strategies, this review examined how such strategies are embedded within the strategic planning frameworks of organizations across countries. Cross-national comparisons reveal notable discrepancies in the degree of KM integration. Jabbour et al. (2013) emphasized that organizations operating in volatile and knowledge-intensive markets are more inclined to embed KM into strategic planning as a proactive response to environmental complexity. Their study, which spanned firms in Brazil, South Korea, and Germany, showed that when KM was a core component of strategic planning, firms were more capable of developing adaptive innovation capabilities.

However, a less optimistic portrayal is offered by Troisi et al. (2023), who reported that in many organizations—regardless of geographic location—KM remains a secondary or isolated function. Their survey, involving over 300 companies from Europe and Latin America, revealed that KM is frequently viewed as a support activity rather than a strategic imperative. This disconnect often leads to underutilized knowledge resources and fragmented innovation processes, limiting the potential for sustained competitive advantage.

The divergence in KM integration is also influenced by organizational size and KM maturity. Zahrawi et al. (2025) investigated financial service providers in Jordan and found that larger firms with established KM systems were significantly more successful in aligning KM initiatives with strategic innovation objectives. In contrast, small and medium enterprises (SMEs) often struggled to integrate KM into their strategic planning due to limited resources, lack of formal structures, and insufficient managerial support. The findings suggest that scaling KM practices and linking them to innovation agendas require tailored approaches sensitive to organizational capacities and industry-specific challenges.

Internationally, cultural and institutional contexts further shape the nature and effectiveness of KM strategies. For example, firms in East Asia tend to emphasize collective learning and long-term orientation in their KM practices, which aligns well with incremental innovation strategies. In contrast, companies in North America often adopt more individualistic and performance-driven approaches, which support radical innovation but may hinder collective knowledge retention (Naqshbandi et al., 2022). These cultural differences imply that KM strategies must be contextually designed to align with local norms, leadership styles, and market dynamics.

Several studies also point to policy-level enablers and barriers affecting KM integration. In countries where innovation policy frameworks actively promote KM—such as Finland, Singapore, and South Korea—organizations benefit from incentives, funding schemes, and infrastructure that support knowledge sharing and innovation networks. Conversely, in regions with limited policy support, firms are often left to pursue KM initiatives in an ad hoc manner, leading to uneven results.

The synthesis of findings from this narrative review highlights the multifaceted role of KM strategies in driving innovation across sectors and geographies. The evidence indicates that organizations adopting structured KM approaches—through CoPs, digital platforms, external

partnerships, and institutionalized systems—tend to experience improved innovation performance. Yet, the extent to which these strategies are embedded within broader organizational planning varies considerably, often depending on external environments, firm size, cultural values, and institutional maturity.

This variation underscores the importance of adopting a flexible yet strategic lens in KM design. Organizations must consider not only the technological and structural elements of KM but also the human, cultural, and contextual dimensions that influence knowledge behaviors and innovation outcomes. Furthermore, the global comparisons reveal that no single KM strategy fits all; instead, organizations must engage in continuous learning and contextual adaptation to harness the full innovation potential of their knowledge assets.

In conclusion, the literature consistently affirms the value of KM strategies as a foundation for organizational innovation. However, their effectiveness is contingent on thoughtful integration into strategic processes, supportive leadership, adequate technological infrastructure, and alignment with contextual variables. Future research and policy interventions should thus focus on bridging the persistent gaps in KM integration, particularly in SMEs and developing regions, while advancing comparative frameworks that inform globally relevant KM practices for innovation.

The findings of this narrative review affirm the critical role of systemic factors such as organizational structure, culture, and leadership in determining the effectiveness of Knowledge Management (KM) as a driver of innovation. A flexible organizational structure, particularly one that emphasizes decentralization and inter-unit connectivity, emerges as a powerful enabler for knowledge exchange and ideation processes. Troisi et al. (2023) found that organizations embracing decentralization were more adept at mobilizing internal knowledge assets to drive product and service innovation. This flexibility facilitates cross-functional collaboration and rapid knowledge integration, which are essential in dynamically shifting markets. In contrast, rigid hierarchies often obstruct the organic flow of knowledge, thereby diminishing the organization's innovative responsiveness.

Organizational culture equally serves as a cornerstone in the successful implementation of KM. Heisig et al. (2016) underscore that a collaborative culture, where trust and mutual respect are promoted, enables employees to share insights and experiences without fear of intellectual property loss or reprisal. This culture fosters a learning-oriented environment where knowledge exchange becomes a habitual practice, not a mandated task. The alignment between cultural values and KM practices reinforces internal cohesion, which contributes to creative problem-solving and innovative outcomes.

The role of leadership is particularly influential in cultivating a conducive environment for KM. Transformational leadership, as discussed by Cabrilo et al. (2020), is essential for empowering employees to contribute to KM processes actively. Leaders who advocate for learning, reward experimentation, and provide platforms for open dialogue significantly enhance the knowledge dynamics within an organization. Leadership that understands the strategic value of KM is more likely to allocate resources and champion initiatives that integrate knowledge processes with innovation objectives. Thus, the synergy of organizational structure, culture, and leadership constructs a foundational ecosystem where KM can thrive and catalyze innovation.

Examining institutional responses across countries reveals a diverse array of strategies and policy interventions to surmount KM-related challenges. Developed nations, such as Australia and Canada, have adopted collaborative institutional models to embed KM into public and private sectors. Erdmann et al. (2020) document how communities of practice have been institutionalized in healthcare systems, facilitating knowledge flow between clinical practitioners and policymakers. These models bridge the knowledge-implementation gap, ensuring that practical and academic insights are harmonized to foster innovation.

In contrast, developing countries face structural and infrastructural limitations that hinder effective KM integration. Yamada et al. (2015) emphasize the necessity of community-based approaches that leverage indigenous knowledge systems and local stakeholder engagement. In these settings, policies tailored to enhance digital literacy and resource mobilization are vital. Training programs that incorporate localized knowledge and address context-specific barriers have proven effective in elevating KM adoption and sustaining innovation. These findings highlight that successful KM implementation is contingent on the alignment of national policies with organizational and cultural realities, requiring a context-sensitive approach to policy formulation.

Addressing systemic constraints in knowledge flow and cross-functional collaboration necessitates multifaceted interventions. Technological enablers are paramount; as noted by Al-Kwafi et al. (2025), the deployment of cloud-based knowledge management systems facilitates real-time collaboration and reduces silos. These platforms not only enhance transparency but also ensure that knowledge repositories are accessible and dynamically updated, which is critical for iterative innovation processes. However, the mere availability of technology does not guarantee its effective use.

Organizational capacity building is a complementary strategy to address these limitations. Troisi et al. (2023) and Naqshbandi et al. (2022) advocate for targeted training programs that build employees' competencies in knowledge sharing, digital navigation, and collaborative innovation. By equipping the workforce with the requisite skills, organizations can foster a culture of continuous learning and experimentation. Furthermore, structured collective learning forums—such as interdisciplinary workshops, hackathons, and innovation labs—enable cross-pollination of ideas and strengthen relational capital across functions.

Another notable solution involves organizational redesign to facilitate cross-functional engagement. McWilliams et al. (2016) argue for the creation of interdisciplinary teams and innovation clusters that operate across traditional departmental boundaries. These units act as innovation incubators, bringing together diverse perspectives to co-create solutions. Embedding these practices into the organizational DNA requires a shift in managerial mindsets and incentive structures, ensuring that collaboration and knowledge contribution are recognized and rewarded.

Despite the growing body of literature, several limitations remain in understanding KM's role in fostering innovation. First, most existing studies are context-specific, with limited generalizability across industries or national contexts. For instance, Zahrawi et al. (2025) highlight how the impact of KM on innovation varies depending on organizational size and maturity level, yet few studies provide comparative analyses that account for these moderating factors. Moreover, the predominant focus on large enterprises leaves a knowledge gap concerning the challenges and

opportunities within small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), particularly in developing economies.

Second, the evaluation of KM outcomes lacks consistency, with few standardized metrics to assess innovation gains. As Anand et al. (2021) observe, many studies rely on proxy indicators or qualitative assessments that do not adequately capture the multifaceted nature of innovation derived from KM practices. This methodological heterogeneity undermines cross-study comparability and impedes the formulation of evidence-based best practices.

Third, the longitudinal effects of KM interventions on innovation remain underexplored. While cross-sectional studies provide useful snapshots, they fail to elucidate how sustained KM efforts influence innovation trajectories over time. Christiansen et al. (2019) suggest that longitudinal research is essential to unpack causal mechanisms and to differentiate between short-term benefits and long-term strategic gains. Without this perspective, KM risks being perceived as a tactical tool rather than a strategic imperative.

Lastly, digital transformation and emerging technologies—such as artificial intelligence and blockchain—are rapidly reshaping the KM landscape, yet their implications for innovation have not been sufficiently examined. Future research should investigate how these technologies can be harnessed to overcome systemic limitations, enhance personalization in knowledge delivery, and support predictive insights for innovation management.

Taken together, these gaps underline the necessity for a more nuanced and integrative research agenda that bridges theory and practice. Advancing this agenda requires collaborative efforts between academia, industry, and policymakers to co-develop solutions that are both contextually grounded and scalable across sectors.

CONCLUSION

This narrative review has provided a comprehensive synthesis of recent literature on the strategic role of Knowledge Management (KM) in fostering organizational innovation. The findings indicate that KM strategies—particularly the development of communities of practice, integration of digital tools, and embedding KM into strategic planning—play a vital role in enhancing collaborative learning and innovation performance. Structural flexibility, open organizational culture, and transformational leadership are consistently shown to be critical systemic enablers of KM effectiveness. Additionally, cross-national comparisons reveal substantial variation in the integration of KM strategies, suggesting that contextual factors such as organizational maturity, technological infrastructure, and policy environments significantly affect implementation outcomes.

Despite growing awareness of the importance of KM, systemic challenges—including fragmented knowledge flows, insufficient technological support, and limited interdepartmental collaboration—continue to hinder effective KM deployment. This review highlights the urgent need for policy interventions that institutionalize KM as a strategic organizational priority.

Proposed measures include investing in knowledge-sharing platforms, strengthening leadership competencies in KM, and designing flexible structures that support innovation.

Future research should address gaps related to the long-term impact of KM strategies, especially in small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) and in non-Western contexts. Longitudinal studies and cross-sectoral analyses are needed to refine implementation models and expand the generalizability of existing findings. Overall, the review confirms that adopting integrated KM strategies is essential for overcoming systemic innovation barriers and achieving sustainable competitive advantage.

REFERENCE

- Al-Kwafi, O., Farha, A., ElAlfy, A., Almashayekhi, A., & Ahmed, Z. (2025). Exploring the antecedents and consequences of sustainability practices for food consumption and production in the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijchm-09-2024-1401>
- Alcalde-Heras, H., Estensoro, M., & Larrea, M. (2020). Organizational ambidexterity in policy networks. *Competitiveness Review an International Business Journal Incorporating Journal of Global Competitiveness*, 30(2), 219–242. <https://doi.org/10.1108/cr-02-2018-0013>
- Anand, A., Muskat, B., Creed, A., Zutshi, A., & Csepregi, A. (2021). Knowledge sharing, knowledge transfer and SMEs: evolution, antecedents, outcomes and directions. *Personnel Review*, 50(9), 1873–1893. <https://doi.org/10.1108/pr-05-2020-0372>
- Cabrilo, S., Dahms, S., Mutuc, E., & Marlin, J. (2020). The role of IT practices in facilitating relational and trust capital for superior innovation performance: The case of Taiwanese companies. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 21(5), 753–779. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jic-07-2019-0182>
- Christiansen, H., Bauer, A., Fatima, B., Goodyear, M., Lund, I., Zechmeister-Koss, I., ... & Paul, J. (2019). Improving identification and child-focused collaborative care for children of parents with a mental illness in Tyrol, Austria. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2019.00233>
- Erdmann, R., Morrin, L., Harvey, R., Joya, L., Clifford, A., & Soroka, S. (2020). Canadian senior renal leaders community of practice: Vulnerable populations with chronic kidney disease—evidence to inform policy. *Canadian Journal of Kidney Health and Disease*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2054358120930977>
- Heisig, P., Suraj, O., Kianto, A., Kemboi, C., Arrau, G., & Easa, N. (2016). Knowledge management and business performance: Global experts' views on future research needs. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 20(6), 1169–1198. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jkm-12-2015-0521>

- Herlina, M., Fitrianastasya, F., Ratih, S., & Amandha, M. (2024). Unlocking innovation from within: The power of tacit knowledge and change adaptability in Indonesian internal organisational innovation processes. *Economics and Culture*, 21(1), 10–28. <https://doi.org/10.2478/jec-2024-0002>
- Jabbour, M., Curran, J., Scott, S., Guttman, A., Rotter, T., Ducharme, F., ... & Johnson, D. (2013). Best strategies to implement clinical pathways in an emergency department setting: Study protocol for a cluster randomized controlled trial. *Implementation Science*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-8-55>
- McWilliams, A., Roberge, J., Moore, C., Ashby, A., Rossman, W., Murphy, S., ... & Furney, S. (2016). Aiming to improve readmissions through integrated hospital transitions (AIRTIGHT): Study protocol for a randomized controlled trial. *Trials*, 17(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13063-016-1725-2>
- Milligan, J., Lee, J., Smith, M., Donaldson, L., Athanasopoulos, P., Bassett-Spiers, K., ... & Noonan, V. (2018). Advancing primary and community care for persons with spinal cord injury: Key findings from a Canadian summit. *Journal of Spinal Cord Medicine*, 43(2), 223–233. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10790268.2018.1552643>
- Najda-Janoszka, M., Kajzer-Bonk, J., Milewska, E., & Wrona, S. (2025). Integrating science, technology, and experimental knowledge for sustainable innovation: A living lab approach to urban biodiversity management. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Management and Innovation*, 21(2), 33–55. <https://doi.org/10.7341/20252123>
- Naqshbandi, M., Meeran, S., & Wilkinson, A. (2022). On the soft side of open innovation: The role of human resource practices, organizational learning culture and knowledge sharing. *R and D Management*, 53(2), 279–297. <https://doi.org/10.1111/radm.12566>
- Popa, S., Soto-Acosta, P., & Palacios-Marqués, D. (2021). A discriminant analysis of high and low-innovative firms: The role of IT, human resources, innovation strategy, intellectual capital and environmental dynamism. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 26(6), 1615–1632. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jkm-04-2021-0272>
- Sahoo, D., Bui, L., Samantaray, A., Kumar, A., & Kanwal, P. (2025). Examining the role of organizational learning and knowledge sharing in facilitating career transitions and innovation. In *Knowledge, Learning, and Innovation*, 175–200. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-4163-6.ch007>
- Smuts, H., & Merwe, A. (2025). Embedding sustainability: Sociotechnical knowledge management guidelines for digital decarbonization in the Society 5.0 era. *Sustainability*, 17(3), 953. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su17030953>

- Troisi, O., Visvizi, A., & Grimaldi, M. (2023). Rethinking innovation through Industry and Society 5.0 paradigms: A multileveled approach for management and policy-making. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 27(9), 22–51. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ejim-08-2023-0659>
- Trudel, M., Marsan, J., Paré, G., Raymond, L., Guinea, A., Maillet, É., ... & Micheneau, T. (2017). Ceiling effect in EMR system assimilation: A multiple case study in primary care family practices. *BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making*, 17(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12911-017-0445-1>
- Yamada, J., Shorkey, A., Barwick, M., Widger, K., & Stevens, B. (2015). The effectiveness of toolkits as knowledge translation strategies for integrating evidence into clinical care: A systematic review. *BMJ Open*, 5(4), e006808. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2014-006808>
- Zahrawi, A., Khashashneh, S., & Althunibat, A. (2025). The impact of customer knowledge management on innovation capability and business performance: Evidence from Jordanian financial services. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Scientific Studies*, 8(3), 3886–3898. <https://doi.org/10.53894/ijirss.v8i3.7401>