Asian Journal of Management and Commerce

Y Faiza Tarnam
Part-Time Research Scholar,
Jamal Institute of
Management, Jamal Mohamed
College (Autonomous),
Affiliated to Bharathidasan
University, Tiruchirappalli,
Tamil Nadu, India

Dr. U Syed Aktharsha
Associate Professor, Jamal
Institute of Management,
Jamal Mohamed College
(Autonomous), Affiliated to
Bharathidasan University,
Tiruchirappalli, Tamil Nadu,
India

Dr. A Sengottuvel
Assistant Professor,
Department of Business
Administration, Jamal
Mohamed College
(Autonomous), Affiliated to
Bharathidasan University,
Tiruchirappalli, Tamil Nadu,
India

Corresponding Author:
Y Faiza Tarnam
Part-Time Research Scholar,
Jamal Institute of
Management, Jamal Mohamed
College (Autonomous),
Affiliated to Bharathidasan
University, Tiruchirappalli,
Tamil Nadu, India

Knowledge management system and organizational learning in information technology organizations

Y Faiza Tarnam, U Syed Aktharsha and A Sengottuvel

DOI: https://www.doi.org/10.22271/27084515.2026.v7.i1c.983

Abstract
The purpose of this paper is to examine the effects of knowledge management system on the characteristics of learning in Information Technology (IT) Organizations. A sample of 65 HR managers and Software Engineers who were working in different IT organizations was taken. Chi-square test revealed that demographic characteristics of HR managers and Software Engineers and its effects on knowledge management system are found to be independent. The results of factor analysis demonstrated that some factors like innovation, different market entry, decision making through delegation, market share are significant in explaining variation on knowledge management system and factors like better information, application of knowledge, knowledge management process, and shared vision are significant in explaining the properties of organizational learning.

Keywords: Knowledge management system, organizational learning, information technology, knowledge management

Introduction

Knowledge Management (KM) comprises a range of strategies and practices used in an organization to identify, create, represent, distribute, and enable adoption of insights and experiences. Such insights and experiences comprise knowledge, either embodied in individuals or embedded in organizational processes or practice. An established discipline since 1991, KM includes courses taught in the fields of business administration, information systems, management, library and information sciences. More recently, other fields have started contributing to KM research; these include information and media, computer science, public health, and public policy. Many large companies and non-profit organizations have resources dedicated to internal KM efforts, often as a part of their 'business strategy', 'information technology', or 'human resource management' departments. Several consulting companies also exist that provide strategy and advice regarding KM to these organizations. Knowledge Management efforts typically focus on organizational objectives such as improved performance, competitive advantage, innovation, the sharing of lessons learned, integration and continuous improvement of the organization.

KM efforts overlap with organizational learning, and may be distinguished from that by a greater focus on the management of knowledge as a strategic asset and a focus on encouraging the sharing of knowledge. KM efforts can help individuals and groups to share valuable organizational insights, to reduce redundant work, to reduce training time for new employees, to retain intellectual capital as employee's turnover in an organization, and to adapt to changing environments and markets. Knowledge Management System (KMS) refers to a system for managing knowledge in organizations for supporting creation, capture, storage and dissemination of information. It can comprise a part of a Knowledge Management initiative. The idea of a KMS is to enable employees to have ready access to the organization's documented base of facts, sources of information, and solutions. KMS are developed to support and enhance knowledge-intensive process, tasks, projects, creation, construction, identification, capturing, acquisition, selection, valuation, organization, linking, structuring, formalization, visualization, transfer, distribution, retention, maintenance, refinement, revision, evolution, accessing and retrieval (Academic dictionaries and Encyclopedias).

1.1 Objectives of the study

1. To study and understand knowledge management system and organizational learning.
2. To examine the factors influencing KMS and organizational learning in selected IT organizations.
3. To examine the performance in the organizations through learning and KMS process.
4. To investigate the KMS and learning process in selected IT organizations with HR managers and software engineers.

2. Review of Literature

Knowledge depends on the action of human and results from the interaction among perceptions, judgement and insights regarding information, which is being inclined by the innovation and the user experience (Omotayo, 2015) [17]. The study exposes a positive association between constructive feedback and customer-oriented service as well as relation between organizational strategy and customer focused strategy. The researcher has incorporated quantitative analysis by performing various hypothesis testing in order to understand the impact of various attributes such as virtual platform experience, liberty to access details from said department, senior leadership support, constructive feedback, customer service, new learning, business strategy, knowledge transfer and self-upskilling on IT employees' performance as well as learning organizational effectiveness (Mohammed A Abusweilem, 2019) [14].

Application of such knowledge is viewed as the core competency of any organization for gaining sustainable competitive advantage (Nonaka & Toyama, 2003; Rajabion et al., 2019) [15, 1]. Moreover, viewing (Drucker, 1995) [5] and (Demarest, 1997) [4], knowledge is observed as the key for effective competition. For acquisition, a sustainable competitive advantage in the real organizational context, it is recognized that KM has various significant roles to play (Pandey et al., 2018; Vahdat et al.) [18]. Within the IT-based sector, the competitiveness of the company is basically dependent upon the knowledge. This organization's knowledge is examined to be acquired from their staffs but is not managed (Akhavan et al., 2019; Zhu et al.) [1]. KM obtains the information of the customer; it keeps on sharing it with the organization (Kim et al., 2018).

Effective knowledge exploitation has played the hallmark of many successful businesses (Al Sayegh et al., 2022) [2]. Any organizations that see to maintain their position should consider the characteristics of practical knowledge management and the effective organizational performance that it yields (Sauer et al., 2022, Hidary et al., 2023) [22, 7]. Knowledge and learning management have also been recognized as an integral factor in organizational performance (Santhose and Lawrence, 2023) [21]. For mining enterprises, sharing and spreading knowledge and expertise have always been problematic; thus, an adequate understanding of exactly what is effective and what is not is critical for productive methods (Olan et al., 2022) [16]. Transfer refers to the internal spread of knowledge. This occurs primarily through discussions and interaction between people via easy communication, discussion, and debate (Jerez-Gómez et al., 2005) [9]. For OL to occur, there must be appropriate mechanisms for transferring such developed knowledge from the individual employee to the team and from the team to the greater organization (Ugurlu

and Kurt, 2016) [23].

Organizational learning is seen as one of the important tasks for survivability of any type of organization in a high-competitive area (Rehman et al., 2019a) [20]. Business strategy, organizational culture, and organizational learning are watched as the internal resources for an organization. Hence, the upper management of any organization should not underestimate these resources if the upper management is keen to improve their performance in the current marketplace for a longer period of time. It means that process of creating, retaining, sharing, and distributing new/latest knowledge of organizations with a great positive effect on the performance of organizations or any type of organization that helps to gain a competitive advantage (Rehman et al., 2019a) [20]. Organizations should become more flexible so that learning in strategic decisions can forecast the internal environment for dealing with a competitive marketplace (Pawirosumarto et al., 2017) [19].

It is found by the researcher that it is essential for firms to continue their development and boost their capacities with the aid of learning in organizations, so that the products or services would safeguard satisfaction with their organization's customers (Pawirosumarto et al., 2017) [19]. Organizational learning is a prime area for those firms that enlarge themselves in a dynamic and uncertain environment to improve their performance by the learning context (Megheirkouni, 2017) [13]. It is also observed that network learning is a positive association with the start-up performance (Caseiro & Coelho, 2019) [3]. Experimental learning influences significantly to improve performance (Leal-Rodriguez & Albort-Morant, 2019) [12]. It is evident from the literature that it significantly impacts the organizational performance with respect to the RBV theory using learning in firms (Rehman et al., 2019a) [20]. A few of the earlier research works exploited innovation (mediator) between firms' resources other than firms' learning and firms' performance (Henri, 2006; Khan et al., 2019) [6, 10].

3. Research Methodology

The present study is undertaken to find out the following:

- To examine the relationship between demographic profile and knowledge management systems.
- To explore the relationship between demographic profile and organizational learning.
- To identify the variables and their grouping into factors that influence the knowledge management system and organizational learning.

Sampling Design

IT organization was preferred for leading this study. The study has considered various aspects of knowledge management system and its contribution towards organizational learning. The decision to choose IT organization was, the HR Managers and Software Engineers were agreed to respond for the questionnaire to conduct this study on knowledge management and organizational learning. A sample of 65 responses (20 HR managers and 45 Software Engineers) has been chosen from the population of 180 using stratified random sampling method. The tabulated description of demographic details of sample is presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Frequency Distribution of sample demographics

S. No	Variables	Number	Frequency (%)
	Age		
1.	Below 30	23	35
	30-40	18	28
	41-50	15	23
	Above 50	9	14
	Education Qualification		
2.	Diploma	35	54
	UG	25	38
	PG	5	8
	Designation		
3.	Software Engineer	45	69
	HR Manager	20	31
	Department		
4.	Technical Support	21	33
	HR	21	32
	Quality Assurance	23	35
	Experience		
5.	Below 10	29	45
	10-20	23	35
	21-30	6	9
	Above 30	7	11
	Income		
6.	Below 10,000	7	11
	10,000-20,000	25	39
	21,000-30,000	16	24
	Above 30,000	17	26

Data Collection

The data was collected from HR managers and Software Engineers of the selected organizations through a questionnaire which had 3 major parts;

1. Demographic characteristics,
2. Effects of Knowledge Management System (KMS),
3. Organizational learning characteristics.

Measurement Scale

The questionnaire consisted of a series of statements. The HR managers and software engineers were requested to provide answers in the form of agreement or disagreement to express their perceptions towards knowledge management system and organizational learning. 5-point Likert scale was used in this study.

4. Data Analysis

Reliability Analysis: Pre-testing techniques namely Cronbach's Alpha (value of 0.695 is acceptable) and Hoteling's T-square test were used to check the reliability and equivalence of the variables used for research. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Reliability Analysis

Dimensions	No of items	Cronbach's Alpha	Hoteling's T-square test	DF
Effects of Knowledge Management system	13	.798	491.263*	12,53
Organizational learning	11	.695	256.390*	10,55

The above results of Cronbach's Alpha indicate that the two dimensions namely effects of knowledge management system (KMS) and characteristics of organizational learning achieved a high internal consistency of 79.8% and 69.5% respectively. Similarly, Hoteling's t-squared test exhibits that the mean of items under all dimensions were significantly different at 1% level.

Chi - Square Analysis
Chi- Square Test of Significance (Age and KMS)
Hypothesis
- H_0: There is no significant relation between age and KMS.
- H_1: There is significant relation between age and KMS.

Chi- Square Test of Significance (Qualification and KMS)
Hypothesis
- H_0: There is no significant relation between qualification and KMS.
- H_1: There is significant relation between qualification and KMS.

Chi- Square Test of Significance (Department and KMS)
Hypothesis
- H_0: There is no significant relation between department and KMS.
- H_1: There is significant relation between department and KMS.

Chi- Square Test of Significance (Designation and KMS)
Hypothesis
- H_0: There is no significant relation between designation and KMS.
- H_1: There is significant relation between designation and KMS.

Chi- Square Test of Significance (Experience and KMS)
Hypothesis
- H_0: There is no significant relation between experience and KMS.

- **H$_1$:** There is significant relation between experience and KMS.

Chi- Square Test of Significance (Income and KMS)
Hypothesis
- **H$_0$:** There is no significant relation between income and KMS.
- **H$_1$:** There is significant relation between income and KMS.

The values of chi-square statistics obtained from chi-square distribution table for all 6 combinations are 12.59, 9.49, 9.49, 5.99, 12.59 and 12.59. In that order the calculated chi-square statistics values are 5.484, 2.421, 3.853, 2.596, 4.975 and 5.983 in that order which lies in the acceptance region. Thus, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected whereas alternative hypothesis is rejected. So, it can be concluded that demographic characteristics of HR managers and software engineers, effects and usage of KMS are independent on the basis of statistical evidence at 5 % level of significance. Results of chi-square are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Results of Chi-square Analysis

S. No	Variables	Chi-square statistic
1.	Age and KMS	5.484 < 12.59 (Not Significant)
2.	Qualifications and KMS	2.421 < 9.49 (Not Significant)
3.	Department and KMS	3.853 < 9.49 (Not Significant)
4.	Designation and KMS	2.596 < 5.99 (Not Significant)
5.	Experience and KMS	4.975 < 12.59 (Not Significant)
6.	Income and KMS	5.983 < 12.59 (Not Significant)

Chi- Square Test of Significance (Age and Organizational learning)
Hypothesis
- **H$_0$:** There is no significant relation between age and organizational learning.
- **H$_1$:** There is significant relation between age and organizational learning.

Chi- Square Test of Significance (Qualification and Organizational learning)
Hypothesis
- **H$_0$:** There is no significant relation between qualification and organizational learning.
- **H$_1$:** There is significant relation between qualification

and organizational learning.

Chi- Square Test of Significance (Department and Organizational learning)
Hypothesis
- **H$_0$:** There is no significant relation between department and organizational learning.
- **H$_1$:** There is significant relation between department and organizational learning.

Chi- Square Test of Significance (Designation and Organizational learning)
Hypothesis
- **H$_0$:** There is no significant relation between designation and organizational learning.
- **H$_1$:** There is significant relation between designation and organizational learning.

Chi- Square Test of Significance (Experience and Organizational learning)
Hypothesis
- **H$_0$:** There is no significant relation between experience and organizational learning.
- **H$_1$:** There is significant relation between experience and organizational learning.

Chi- Square Test of Significance (Income and Organizational learning)
Hypothesis
- **H$_0$:** There is no significant relation between income and organizational learning.
- **H$_1$:** There is significant relation between income and organizational learning.

The values of chi-square statistics obtained from chi-square distribution table for all 5 combinations are 7.82, 5.99, 5.99, 3.84, 7.82 and 7.82 in that order, the calculated chi-square statistics values are 2.554, 2.696, 3.436, 0.685, 1.099 and 3.235 in which it lies in the acceptance region. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted whereas alternative hypothesis is rejected. So, it can be concluded that demographic characteristics of HR managers, software engineers and organizational learning are independent on the basis of statistical evidence at 5 % level of significance. Results of chi-square are presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Results of Chi-square Analysis

S. No	Variables	Chi-square statistic
1.	Age and Organizational learning	2.554 < 7.82 (Not Significant)
2.	Qualification and Organizational learning	2.696 < 5.99 (Not Significant)
3.	Department and Organizational learning	3.436 < 5.99 (Not Significant)
4.	Designation and Organizational learning	0.685 < 3.84 (Not Significant)
5.	Experience and Organizational learning	1.099 < 7.82 (Not Significant)
6.	Income and Organizational learning	3.235 < 7.82 (Not Significant)

Factor Analysis
Dimension: Effects of KM
Data validity for factor analysis was calculated using KMO Measure of sampling adequacy. The minimum acceptable level is 0.5. Since calculated Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (0.777) is greater than 0.5, so it is appropriate to do factor analysis. Hence Bartlett's test of sphericity value is 299.589 it is also a kind of chi-square and it is significant. The results of

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin and Bartlett's test of sphericity are shown in table 5.

Table 5: KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.777
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	299.589
	DF	78.000
	Sig.	.000

Table 6: Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	4.610	35.460	35.460	4.610	35.460	35.460
2	1.927	14.826	50.286	1.927	14.826	50.286
3	1.187	9.130	59.416	1.187	9.130	59.416
4	1.000	7.693	67.108	1.000	7.693	67.108
5	.755	5.811	72.919			
6	.695	5.348	78.268			
7	.661	5.082	83.350			
8	.557	4.285	87.635			
9	.428	3.289	90.924			
10	.366	2.816	93.740			
11	.328	2.522	96.262			
12	.260	2.003	98.265			
13	.226	1.735	100.000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 6 reveals the Principal Component Analysis, in which 4 factors have been extracted out of 13 variables that exceed the Eigen value of one. The variables less than the Eigen value of one are not considered during extraction method.

Table 7: Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings

Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
2.833	21.793	21.793
2.433	18.715	40.508
1.866	14.353	54.861
1.592	12.247	67.108

Table 7 shows that factor 1, factor 2, factor 3 and factor 4 explain a variance of 21.793, 18.715, 14.353, and 12.247 respectively and together show the variance of 67.108.

Table 8: Rotated Component Matrix

	Component			
	1	2	3	4
Collaboration	.761	.063	.379	-.108
Innovation	.731	.131	.185	.031
Adaptation capability	.680	.213	.291	.041
Addressing of communication gap	.655	.033	.242	.474
Better ROI	.627	.073	.415	.165
Entry of different market types	-.129	.852	.084	.242
Enhanced Productivity or Service Quality	.147	.748	.332	.171
Sharing of Best Practices	.410	.704	-.015	-.062
Delegation of authority and accountability	.247	.261	.793	.065
Transformation of individual learning	.018	-.032	.612	.581
Fast and Better Decision Making	.215	.487	.495	.025
Better staff attraction	.343	.153	.012	.727
Increased market share	-.052	.499	.074	.602

Table 8 shows the Factor Loading of Rotated Component Matrix.

Table 9: Naming of factors

Factor: 1 Innovation through collaboration	Factor: 2 Different market entry through enhanced productivity	Factor: 3 Better decision making through delegation	Factor: 4 Increase market share
Collaboration	Entry of different market types	Delegation of authority and accountability	Better staff attraction
Innovation	Enhanced Productivity or Service Quality	Transformation of individual learning	Increased market share
Adaptation capability	Sharing of Best Practices	Fast and Better Decision Making	
Addressing of communication gap			
Better ROI			

It is inferred that Factor 1 consists of five variables of which collaboration and innovations are found to be significant with a variance of 21.793%. Factor 2 consists of three variables of which different market type are significant with a variance of 18.715%. Factor 3 consists of three variables of which delegation of authority and accountability are significant with a variance of 14.353%. Factor 4 consists of two variables of which better staff attraction are significant with a variance of 12.247%. Based on the results of factor loading (Table 8), the factors are named which is given in

table 9.

Dimension: Organizational Learning

Data validity for factor analysis was calculated using KMO Measure of sampling adequacy. The minimum acceptable level is 0.5. Since calculated Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (0.670) is greater than 0.5, so it is appropriate to do factor analysis. Hence Bartlett's test of sphericity value is 117.040 it is also a kind of chi-square and it is significant. The results of Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin and Bartlett's test of sphericity are shown in table 10.

Table 10: KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.670
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	117.040
	df	55.000
	Sig.	.000

Table 11: Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	2.905	26.406	26.406	2.905	26.406	26.406
2	1.377	12.516	38.921	1.377	12.516	38.921
3	1.254	11.400	50.321	1.254	11.400	50.321
4	1.133	10.304	60.625	1.133	10.304	60.625
5	.880	8.002	68.626			
6	.748	6.803	75.429			
7	.714	6.490	81.919			
8	.646	5.876	87.796			
9	.564	5.130	92.926			
10	.478	4.345	97.271			
11	.300	2.729	100.000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 11 reveals the Principal Component Analysis, in which 4 factors have been extracted out of 11 variables that exceed the Eigen value of one. The variables less than the Eigen value of one, are not considered during extraction method.

Table 12: Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings

Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1.826	16.597	16.597
1.801	16.372	32.969
1.680	15.268	48.237
1.363	12.388	60.625

Table 12 shows that Factor 1, factor 2, factor 3 and factor 4 explain a variance of 16.597%, 16.372%, 15.268%, and 12.388% respectively and together shows the variance of 60.625%.

Table 13: Rotated Component Matrix

	Component			
	1	2	3	4
Easy uploading into database	.844	.240	-.101	-.015
Readily available of information	.796	.011	.369	.033
Sharing and acting upon knowledge	.014	.766	.033	.218
Incentives for learning	.239	.676	-.025	.155
Continuous learning	.037	.674	.192	-.232
Sharing of experience and information	-.176	.048	.715	.281
Technologic enabled learning	.234	-.009	.706	-.024
Well defined KM process	.283	.338	.525	-.194
Sharing best practices	.028	.162	.067	.784
Learning through communication	.270	.312	.401	.514
Sharing powerful vision of the organization across the workforce	.427	.076	.211	.490

Table 13 shows the Factor Loading of Rotated Component Matrix.

Table 14: Naming of factors

Factor: 1 Better information	Factor: 2 Application of knowledge	Factor: 3 Knowledge management process	Factor: 4 Shared vision
Easy uploading into database	Sharing and acting upon knowledge	Sharing of experience and information	Sharing best practices
Readily available of information	Incentives for learning	Technologic enabled learning	Learning through communication
	Continuous learning	Well defined KM process	Sharing powerful vision of the organization across the workforce

It is also inferred that Factor 1 consists of two variables of which easy uploading into database are found to be significant with a variance of 16.597%. Factor 2 consists of three variables of which sharing and acting upon knowledge are significant with a variance of 16.372%. Factor 3 consists of three variables of which sharing of experience and information are significant with a variance of 15.268%. Factor 4 consists of two variables of which sharing best practices are significant with a variance of 12.388%. Based on the results of factor loading (Table 13), the factors are named which is given in table 14.

5. Conclusion

Knowledge management activities in an organization are greatly influenced by the demographic characteristic of employees and the ability of an organization to learn mainly depends on the individual characteristic of an employee. The factors like innovation through collaboration, different market entry through enhanced productivity, better decision making through delegation, increase market share causes the variance on knowledge management system. The factors like better information, application of knowledge, knowledge management process, and shared vision

contributes greatly to the properties of organizational learning. Knowledge management in the organization, perks up better staff retention and strengthens the workers to accomplish the task quickly. Knowledge management endeavors the business into different market type and trims down the communication gap between employees. Knowledge management in the organization raises the adaptation capability among the employees in which it smoothens the progress of learning. Knowledge management in the organization strengthens the collaboration among employees, it makes every effort for learning and re-learning through training modules in the organization. The practice of knowledge management in the organization makes way for sharing the best practices among employees which results in enhancing collaboration among employees. It is concluded that KMS helps the organization in improving its performance in terms of innovation and better decision making. Also, it paves the path for organization to transform into learning organization.

6. Suggestions
- This study should be made every year to evaluate new practices that can bring changes in the organization.
- Care about those people who are innovative and always ready in giving new ideas.
- There should be coordination and communication among employees for the upliftment of goals and objectives.
- There should be exchange of experience and knowledge among employees in each organization by creating online communities.

7. Limitations of the study
- The study is restricted only with selected IT organizations.
- The relatively small sample size may limit the generalizability of the findings.
- The population belongs to only HR managers and software engineers and samples are drawn from particular departments of a selected organizations.
- Identifying HR managers and software engineers who are really familiar and experienced with KMS are found to be difficult.

8. Scope for Further Research
- In this study only 2 dimensions has been focused. In future, few more dimensions can be considered in the study.
- Only selected IT organizations has been taken in this study. In future, more IT organizations can be focused.
- The study has been limited only with HR managers and software engineers with few departments. In future, more designations with more departments can be considered.

References
1. Akhavan P, Khodabandeh M, Rajabion L, Zahedi MR. Extracting and prioritizing knowledge risk components by considering the knowledge map: a case study of industrial organization. VINE Journal of Information and Knowledge Management Systems. 2019;49(2):200-212.
2. Al Sayegh AJ, Ahmad SZ, AlFaqeeh KM, *et al*. Factors affecting e-government adoption in the UAE public sector organizations: the knowledge management perspective. Journal of Knowledge Management. 2022;27(3):717-737. doi:10.1108/JKM-09-2021-0681.
3. Caseiro N, Coelho A. The influence of business intelligence capacity, network learning and innovativeness on startups performance. Journal of Innovation & Knowledge. 2019;4(3):139-145.
4. Demarest M. Understanding knowledge management. Long Range Planning. 1997;30(3):374-384.
5. Drucker PF. The information executives truly need. InformationWeek. 1995;(525):89-93.
6. Henri JF. Management control systems and strategy: a resource-based perspective. Accounting, Organizations and Society. 2006;31(6):529-558.
7. Hidary M, Panahifar S, Hosseini SH, *et al*. Organizational learning: the link between knowledge management processes and organizational performance (case study: technology-based medium enterprise). International Journal of Learning and Intellectual Capital. 2023; in press. doi:10.1504/IJLIC.2023.10055403.
8. Academic dictionaries and encyclopedias. Knowledge management. Available from: en-academic.com/dic.nsf/enwiki/10387.
9. Jerez-Gómez P, Céspedes-Lorente J, Valle-Cabrera R. Organizational learning capability: a proposal of measurement. Journal of Business Research. 2005;58(6):715-725.
10. Khan SN, Hussain RI, Rehman SU, Maqbool Q, Engku Ali EI, Numan M. The mediating role of innovation between corporate governance and organizational performance: moderating role of innovative culture in Pakistan textile sector. Cogent Business & Management. 2019;6:1631018.
11. Kim SL, Son SY, Yun S. Abusive supervision and knowledge sharing: the moderating role of organizational tenure. Personnel Review. 2018;47(1):22-38.
12. Leal-Rodriguez AL, Albort-Morant G. Promoting innovative experiential learning practices to improve academic performance: empirical evidence from a Spanish business school. Journal of Innovation & Knowledge. 2019;4(2):97-103.
13. Megheirkouni M. Leadership styles and organizational learning in UK for-profit and non-profit sports organizations. International Journal of Organizational Analysis. 2017;25(4):596-612.
14. Abusweilem MA. The impact of knowledge management process and business intelligence on organizational performance. Management Science Letters. 2019;15:1-15.
15. Nonaka I, Toyama R. The knowledge-creating theory revisited: knowledge creation as a synthesizing process. Knowledge Management Research and Practice. 2003;1(1):2-10.
16. Olan F, Ogiemwonyi Arakpogun E, Suklan J, *et al*. Artificial intelligence and knowledge sharing: contributing factors to organizational performance. Journal of Business Research. 2022;145:605-615. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.03.008.
17. Omotayo FO. Knowledge management as an important tool in organizational management: a review of

literature. Lincoln (NE): University of Nebraska-Lincoln; 2015.

18. Pandey SC, Dutta A, Nayak AK. Organizational capabilities and knowledge management success: a quartet of case studies. Kybernetes. 2018;47(1):222-238.

19. Pawirosumarto S, Setyadi A, Khumaedi E. The influence of organizational culture on the performance of employees at University of Mercu Buana. International Journal of Law and Management. 2017;59(6):950-963.

20. Rehman SU, Bhatti A, Chaudhry NI. Mediating effect of innovative culture and organizational learning between leadership styles at third-order and organizational performance in Malaysian SMEs. Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research. 2019;9(1):1-24. doi:10.1186/s40497-019-0159-1.

21. Santhose SS, Lawrence LN. Understanding the implementations and limitations in knowledge management and knowledge sharing using a systematic literature review. Current Psychology. 2023;42:1-17. doi:10.1007/s12144-022-04115-6.

22. Sauer PC, Silva ME, Schleper MC. Supply chains' sustainability trajectories and resilience: a learning perspective in turbulent environments. International Journal of Operations & Production Management. 2022;42(8):1109-1145. doi:10.1108/IJOPM-12-2021-0759.

23. Ugurlu ÖY, Kurt M. The impact of organizational learning capability on product innovation performance: evidence from the Turkish manufacturing sector. Emerging Markets Journal. 2016;6(1):70-84.