



(A Monthly, Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Scholarly Indexed, Open Access Journal)



## **Impact Factor: 8.699**

## Volume 14, Issue 5, May 2025

⊕ www.ijirset.com 🖂 ijirset@gmail.com 🖄 +91-9940572462 🕓 +91 63819 07438





|www.ijirset.com |A Monthly, Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal| e-ISSN: 2319-8753| p-ISSN: 2347-6710|

## Volume 14, Issue 5, May 2025

#### |DOI: 10.15680/IJIRSET.2025.1405379

## **Boosting Research Impact: Better Citation Strategies** for Intra-Organizational Knowledge Sharing

#### Dr. A. Akila, Dr. R. Parameswari, Dr. R. Padma

Associate Professor, Department of Computer Science and Information Technology, Vels Institute of Science,

#### Technology and Advanced Studies, Chennai, India

Professor and Head, Department of Computer Science and Information Technology, Vels Institute of Science,

#### Technology and Advanced Studies, Chennai, India

Assistant Professor, Department of Computer Science and Information Technology, Vels Institute of Science,

#### Technology and Advanced Studies, Chennai, India

**ABSTRACT:** The major objective of a researcher would be to provide contribution to his research stream and make others utilize his work in their research. To enable others to cite the work, the work should be available to other researchers. But an article could not be made available public in many cases due to the publication ethics of the publishing journal. Security on accessing the journal plays a vital role. The proposed work enables the author to provide access to his article on request. Initially the proposal is to build a web application to enable intra organizational knowledge sharing through on request article sharing to boost the citations of the researchers within the organization. The work can be further enhanced to enable other researchers outside the organization also to view the article on request.

#### KEYWORDS: Keyword Search, Citation Strategies, Knowledge Sharing, On-request Access

#### I. INTRODUCTION

Knowledge is the crux of, and a crucial element for organizational survival. In the recent past, knowledge in organizations has been considered as a critical organizational resource and the basis for creating economic value and competitive advantage. As a result, knowledge management has been with us since time immemorial and has become very important in the life of every organization. Organizations therefore concentrate on the value of their knowledge and make it unique to make their products significantly different from competitors. Because, the effectiveness and success of any organization heavily depends on the quality and quantity of knowledge at its disposal.

Knowledge management activities include knowledge acquisition, encoding, storage, transfer, application and sharing, and one of the most important purposes of knowledge management is to systematically influence knowledge sharing and application to create value. Therefore, knowledge sharing is a key part of the knowledge management process and structures that ensure effective utilization of available knowledge resources to improve performance

This is imperative because it will allow us to map and assess the existing knowledge and gaps on specific issues, which will further develop the knowledge base. This review explores several research questions: (1) What working definitions of knowledge sharing and types of knowledge are in currency? (2) What are the prime research streams? (3) In what contextual positions (research methodology and underpinning theory) are the research reported? (4) How does the literature synthesize knowledge sharing? (5) What are

The aim of this work is to bring together scattered literature on knowledge sharing and analyze them to provide a better understanding of the factors that impact on knowledge sharing and suggest emerging directions for future research. This review is very essential and different from many other reviews because it is the only review that looks at articles in the light of prime research streams, contextual positions, and influential journals at the same time. This review contributes to a coordinated framework for previous research on knowledge sharing and pinpoints emerging theoretical and methodological topics and arguments. Additionally, it will provide an evidence-based body of knowledge about knowledge sharing, which will inform the research community about the current state of knowledge sharing to provide





[www.ijirset.com |A Monthly, Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal| e-ISSN: 2319-8753| p-ISSN: 2347-6710|

#### Volume 14, Issue 5, May 2025

#### |DOI: 10.15680/IJIRSET.2025.1405379

comprehensive guidelines for practitioners and managers to formulate appropriate strategies for managing knowledge. Finally, the review will also propose an outline of the key areas where future research should be directed.

#### **II. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND**

#### 2.1 Knowledge sharing

Serenko and Bontis (2016) claimed that knowledge sharing today is considered one of the most important topics of research in management. Helmstadter (2003) defined knowledge sharing as interactions between human actors where the raw material is knowledge. Knowledge sharing is the exchange of experience, skills, and tacit and explicit knowledge among employees (Hogel, Partboteeah, & Munson, 2003). Knowledge sharing is also the ability to transfer framed experiences, information, and expert insights into practices (Wiewiora, Trigunarsyah, Murphy, & Coffey, 2013). In a broad perspective, knowledge sharing is defined as the means by which organizations have access to their own and other organizations' knowledge (Cummings, 2003). Gibbert and Krause (2002) defined knowledge sharing as the desire of a collaborator in an organization to give others the knowledge that he or she has created or acquired. For Ipe and Wagner (2008), sharing knowledge is the act of making knowledge available to others. In a wider sense, knowledge sharing is the process of transference of experience and organizational knowledge to business processes through communication channels between individuals (Oyemomi, Neaga, & Alkhuraiji, 2016).Knowledge sharing is critical to both the creation and application of organizational knowledge (Hendriks, 2004; Huysman & De Wit, 2002), which are essential processes in organizational innovation and knowledge management.

#### 2.2 Innovation

The term innovation has multiple definitions and involves different approaches. For some authors, innovation is a process wherein knowledge is acquired, shared, and assimilated to create new knowledge that embodies products and services (Herkema, 2003), methods and processes (Brewer & Tierney, 2012), and social and environmental contexts (Harrington et al., 2017). Characteristic of innovations is the creation of value. According to Pfotenhauer, Juhl, and Aarden (2019), we cannot ensure economic competitiveness because our societies and institutions are not sufficiently geared toward innovation. Innovation is also becoming an imperative for policymakers around the globe (Pfotenhauer et al., 2019). The objective of innovation is to bring together innovators and regulators so that they can reach a common understanding of how a specific innovation can be introduced (Soete, 2019).

Some inputs to innovation are financial resources, and research and development (Murimbika & Urban, 2014), but also human inputs like ideas, attitudes, leadership, management planning (De Jong & Marsili, 2006), creativity, and self-efficacy (Castaneda, 2015). Innovation is based on human exchange of competence, expertise, information, intuitions, and creative approaches. In summary, innovation is associated with knowledge sharing. However, the more complex the innovation is, the greater the number of barriers that humans have to confront in its application (Torugsa & Arundel, 2016).

There are different taxonomies of innovation. According to the OCDE (2005), there are four types of innovation: product, process, marketing, and organizational. Other classifications of innovation are technological or not (Nelson, 1993), incremental or radical (Henderson & Clark, 1990), disruptive (Christensen & Raynor, 2003), and open innovation (Chesbrough, 2012).

#### 2.3 Knowledge sharing and innovation

A factor that encourages innovation is knowledge sharing. It is unlikely that innovation occurs in the absence of knowledge sharing (Kremer, Villamor, & Aguinis, 2019). Acquiring knowledge and skills through collaboration have been effective and efficient means of successful innovation (Adams, Day, & Dougherty, 1998). In the context of innovation, knowledge sharing is the exchange of expertise oriented to create or improve products and services of value. Knowledge sharing is an important resource underlying product development capability (Hoopes & Postrel, 1999). Mesmer-Magnus and DeChurch (2009) found based on a meta-analysis that knowledge sharing can predict team performance. The lack of knowledge is the main barrier to innovation (Storey & Kelly, 2002). According to Darroch and McNaughton (2002), an organization that encourages knowledge sharing is likely to produce new ideas and facilitate innovative capabilities. Belso and Diez (2018) found that firms that increase their involvement in knowledge networks tend to increase their innovative capacity.





|www.ijirset.com |A Monthly, Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal| e-ISSN: 2319-8753| p-ISSN: 2347-6710|

#### Volume 14, Issue 5, May 2025

#### |DOI: 10.15680/IJIRSET.2025.1405379

Some studies have examined the relationship between knowledge sharing and innovation, but none to date has considered historical stages in the development of both concepts, which is the main purpose of this article. The importance of studying innovation and knowledge sharing together has been noted by several authors. Cavusgil, Calantone, and Zhao (2003) found that the greater the amount of tacit knowledge transferred is, the higher is the firm's innovation capability. Tacit knowledge sharing is essential for innovative capability because this is difficult to replicate by others. Knowledge sharing is a mechanism to convert tacit into explicit knowledge, and both types of knowledge are inputs to achieve innovation.

Camelo, García, Sousa, and Valle (2011) found in a survey of Spanish firms that knowledge sharing positively influenced innovation in organizations. This was also noted by Podrug, Filipovic, and Kovac (2017) in Croatian companies, where knowledge sharing increased innovative capability. Taminiau, Smit, and Lange (2009) found that the most fruitful route to innovation is informal knowledge sharing. Mura, Lettieri, Radaelli, and Spiller (2013) explained the way knowledge sharing and innovation are related. For the authors of this article, knowledge sharing-related behaviors positive influence the innovativeness of the sharers of knowledge in terms of propensity and capacity to promote and implement new ideas. Wang and Hu (2018) claimed that knowledge sharing is a mediator between collaborative innovation and organizational performance. It also has a mediatory role between subjective well-being and individual innovation (Wang, Yang, & Xue, 2017). There is also evidence that in clusters, knowledge sharing between firms can promote innovation (Connell, Kriz, & Thorpe, 2014). Kamasak and Bulutlar (2010) found that in-group knowledge sharing influenced exploitative innovation.

#### **III. METHODOLOGY**

This work employed systematic literature review approach, which has been widely utilized in qualitative research. This research approach was utilized because it minimises biases and ensures replicability. In terms of the actual methodology for the review, the proposed work followed the Protocol, Search, Appraisal, Synthesis, Analysis, and Reporting (PSALSAR) framework. The authors developed this method by adding Protocol and Reporting to the Search, Appraisal, Synthesis, and Analysis (SALSA) framework. The PSALSAR framework was utilized because unlike the other frameworks and methods, it is an explicit, transferable, and reproducible procedure to conduct systematic review. It also enables researchers to appraise both quantitative and qualitative content analysis of the literature review. Ideally, this method translates into six steps: Protocol (Setting the scope and determining the coverage and the area the review should cover. This helps to reduce the bias by conducting exhaustive literature searches); Search (Defining the search. This phase comprises of searching strategy and delivery. The essence of this is to help define required search string and identify the necessary databases to collect the relevant information.); Appraisal (This deals with screening of the selected literature to identify relevant papers for the review. It has two basic steps: selecting articles using inclusion and exclusion criteria, as well as quality assessment; Synthesis (This step comprised of both extraction and classification of relevant data from selected papers to derive knowledge and conclusions); Analysis (The analysis phase bordered on the assessment of synthesized data and the extraction of meaningful information and concluding the selected articles); and Reporting (The reporting phase of the review comprised of the narration as well as the presentation of the methods followed and results obtained from the selected literature).

framework. Consequently, the review utilized the ground rules introduced by Kitchenham and Bahoo et al. which covers all the elements of the framework with reduced steps and different descriptions. Thus, defining the review protocol, conducting the review, and reporting the review; cumulating into the following elements: (a) inclusions and exclusion criteria, (b) search strategy, (c) data source, and (d) sample selection analysis and reporting.





www.ijirset.com |A Monthly, Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal| e-ISSN: 2319-8753| p-ISSN: 2347-6710|

#### Volume 14, Issue 5, May 2025

#### |DOI: 10.15680/IJIRSET.2025.1405379



**Figure 1 Flow of Proposed Work** 

#### 3.1. Inclusion and exclusion criteria

The selection criteria define what to be included and what to be excluded in this review. The inclusion and exclusion criteria aim at identifying research that are relevant to the research question. Deciding the inclusion and exclusion criteria based on journals is critical, and all quality SLRs utilize these criteria. Thus, this review was confined to scholarly peer-reviewed journals and characterized by a wide array of empirical context, theoretical perspective, and methods. Again, this review deals with knowledge sharing at the individual level therefore, the unit of analysis is the impact of individual-level knowledge sharing. As a result of the multidisciplinary nature of knowledge sharing, the review is not limited to any discipline but all disciplines that deal with the subject. Additionally, the review generally excludes books and book chapters because they do not include original research.

#### **3.2. Search strategy**

Fifteen key words and search terms were used to cover the complete literature on the subject including; knowledge sharing enablers, knowledge sharing processes, knowledge sharing outcomes, barriers to knowledge sharing, impact of knowledge sharing, benefits of knowledge sharing, role of knowledge sharing, effects of knowledge sharing, influence of knowledge sharing, knowledge sharing consequences, knowledge sharing and innovation, knowledge sharing and performance, knowledge sharing and intellectual capital, knowledge sharing and organizational learning, and knowledge sharing implications to search for published papers studying knowledge sharing.

#### 3.3. Data source

The key words were used to conduct a search of scholarly literature from the database of the organization articles published which is uploaded by the author.

#### **IV. CONCLUSION**

Although several reviews on knowledge sharing have been conducted to get a better understanding of the concept, because of the essential role it plays, till date, no review has looked at articles in the light of prime research streams, contextual positions, and influential journals at the same time. This review was conducted to bring together scattered literature on knowledge sharing and scrutinize them to provide a better understanding of knowledge sharing and suggest emerging directions for future research. The paper has not only confirmed the importance of knowledge sharing in the competitive environment, but it has also identified gaps in knowledge and offered suggestions to close these gaps and move the concept forward. The findings (gaps) identified thus, provide a platform for further research into not only how to share knowledge but how to overcome the barriers to knowledge sharing to enjoy the benefit thereof.

#### REFERENCES

- 1. Ahmad, F. (2017). Knowledge-sharing networks: Language diversity, its causes, and consequences. Knowledge and Process Management, <u>24(2)</u>, 139–38. https://doi.org/10.1002/kpm.1539
- Ahmad, F., & Karim, M. (2019). Impacts of knowledge sharing: A review and directions for future research. Journal of Workplace Learning, <u>31(3)</u>, 207–230. https://doi.org/10.1108/JWL-07-2018-0096





|www.ijirset.com |A Monthly, Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal| e-ISSN: 2319-8753| p-ISSN: 2347-6710|

#### Volume 14, Issue 5, May 2025

#### |DOI: 10.15680/IJIRSET.2025.1405379

- Alavi, M., & Leidner, D. E. (2001). Knowledge management and knowledge management systems: Conceptual foundations and research issues. MIS Quarterly, <u>25</u> (1), 107–136. https://doi.org/10.2307/3250961
- Ali, U., Rehman, K. U., & Malik, M. Y. (2019). The influence of MHD and heat generation/absorption in a Newtonian flow field manifested with a Cattaneo-Christov heat flux model. Physica Scripta, <u>94(8)</u>, 085217. https://doi.org/10.1088/1402-4896/ab11ff
- Alon, I., Anderson, J., Munim, Z. H., & Ho, A. (2018). Internationalization of Chinese enterprises. Asia Pacific Journal of Management, <u>35(3)</u>, 573–605. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10490-018-9597-5
- Alvesson, M., & Karreman, D. (2001). Odd couple: Making sense of the curious concept of knowledge management. Journal of Management Studies, <u>38(7)</u>, 995–1018. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6486.00269
- Anand, A., Walsh, I., & Moffett, S. Does humility facilitate knowledge sharing? Investigating the role of humble knowledge inquiry and response. (2019). Journal of Knowledge Management, Emerald, <u>23(6)</u>, 1218–1244. 2019. https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-06-2018-0353
- Andersson, U., Angels, D., Ram, M., & Torben, P. (2016). Technology, innovation and knowledge: The importance of ideas and international connectivity. Journal of World Business, <u>51(1)</u>, 153–162. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2015.08.017
- Angels, D., Torben, P., Gooderham, P. N., Elter, F., & Hildrum, J. (2017). The effect of organizational separation on individual knowledge sharing in MNC. Journal of World Business, <u>52(3)</u>, 431–446. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2017.01.008
- 10. Archer, N. P., Ghasemzadeh, F., Jones, P., & Jordan, J. (1998). Knowledge orientations and team effectiveness. International Journal of Technology Management, <u>16(1-3)</u>, 152–161. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJTM.1998.002651
- 11. Adams, M., Day, G., & Dougherty, D. (1998). Enhancing new product development performance: An organizational learning perspective. *The Journal of Product Innovation Management*, **15**(5), 403–422.
- 12. Angel, D. (1991). High technology agglomeration and the labor market: The case of Silicon Valley. *Environment* and Planning A, **23**(10), 1501–1516.
- 13. Argote, L (2000). *The Psychological Foundations of Knowledge Transfer in Organizations*, San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- 14. Arora, A. (1995). Licensing tacit knowledge: Intellectual property rights and the market for know-how. *Economics* of *Innovation and New Technology*, **4**(1), 41–60.
- 15. Ashton, W. B., & Klavans, R. A. (1997). *Keeping abreast of science and technology: Technical intelligence for business*, Columbus, OH: Battelle Press.
- 16. Ball, S. (1995). Enriching student learning through innovative real-life exercises. *Education* + *Training*, **37**(4), 18–25.
- 17. Batten, D. (1995). Network cities: Creative urban agglomerations for the 21th century. *Urban Studies*, **32**(2), 313–327.
- 18. Belso, J., & Diez, I. (2018). Firm's strategic choices and network knowledge dynamics: How do they affect innovation? *Journal of Knowledge Management*, **22**(1), 1–20.
- Betancur, J. A., Villa-Espinal, J., Osorio-Gómez, G., Cuéllar, S., & Suárez, D. (2018). Research topics and implementation trends on automotive head-up display systems. *International Journal on Interactive Design and Manufacturing (IJIDeM)*, 12(1), 199–214. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s12008-016-0350-3</u>
- 20. Bosman, D. (1982). Management of forestry research to improve knowledge utilization. South African Forestry Journal, 120, 29–35.
- Brewer, D., & Tierney, W. (2012). Barriers to innovations in the US education. In B. Widavsky, A. Kelly, & K. Carey(Eds.), *Reinventing higher education: The promise of innovation* (pp. 11–40). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Camelo, C., García, J., Sousa, E., & Valle, R. (2011). The influence of human resource management on knowledge sharing and innovation in Spain: The mediating role of affective commitment. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 22(7), 1442–1463.
- 23. Cardinal, L., Allesandri, T., & Turner, S. (2001). Knowledge codifiability, resources, and science based innovation. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, **5**(2), 142–154.
- 24. Castaneda, D. I. (2015). Knowledge sharing: The role of psychological variables in leaders and collaborators. *Suma Psicológica*, **22**(1), 63–69.
- Cavusgil, S., Calantone, R., & Zhao, Y. (2003). Tacit knowledge transfer and firm innovation capability. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 18(1), 6–21.





www.ijirset.com |A Monthly, Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal| e-ISSN: 2319-8753| p-ISSN: 2347-6710|

#### Volume 14, Issue 5, May 2025

#### |DOI: 10.15680/IJIRSET.2025.1405379

- 26. Ceylan, C. (2013). Commitment-based HR practices, different types of innovation activities and firm inovation performance. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, **24**(1), 208–226.
- 27. Chanchetti, L., Diaz, S., Milanez, D., Leiva, D., deFaria, L., & Ishikawa, T. (2016). Technological forecasting of hydrogen storage materials using patent indicators. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, **41**, 18301–18310.
- 28. Chesbrough, H. (2012). Open Innovation. Research Technology Management, 55(4), 20–27.
- 29. Christensen, C., & Raynor, M. (2003). *The innovator's solution: Creativity and sustaining successful growth*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Coccoli, M., Maresca, P., & Stanganelli, L. (2017). The role of big data and cognitive computing in the learning process. *Journal of Visual Languages and Computing*, 38(c), 97–103.
- Cohen, W., & Levinthal, D. (1990). Absorptive capacity: A new perspective on learning and innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35(1), 128–152.
- 32. Connell, J., Kriz, A., & Thorpe, M. (2014). Industry clusters: An antidote for knowledge sharing and collaborative innovation. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, **18**(1), 137–151.
- 33. Connelly, C., Zweig, D., Webster, J., & Trougakos, J. (2012). Knowledge hiding in organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, **33**(1), 64–88.
- 34. Conroy, P. and Turnquist, L. (1989). Managing the introduction of new technologies: An AI case study. Paper presented at: Proceedings of International Conference on Microcomputers in Transportation, New York.
- 35. Crosswaite, C., & Curtice, L. (1994). Disseminating research results- the challenge of bridging the gap between health research and health action. *Health Promotion International*, **9**(4), 289–296.
- 36. Cummings, J. (2003). Knowledge sharing: A review of the literature. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- 37. Darroch, J., & McNaughton, R. (2002). Examining the link between knowledge management practices and type of innovation. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, **3**(3), 210–222.
- 38. De Jong, J., & Marsili, O. (2006). The fruit flies of innovations: A taxonomy of innovative small firms. *Research Policy*, **35**(2), 213–229.
- 39. Diercks, G., Larsen, H., & Steward, F. (2019). Transformative innovation policy: Addressing variety in an emerging policy paradigm. *Research Policy*, **4**(2), 880–894.
- 40. Eisenhardt, K (1989). Building theories from case study research. *The Academy of Management Review*, **14**(4), 532–550.
- 41. Mohanarajesh, Kommineni (2024). Investigate Methods for Visualizing the Decision-Making Processes of a Complex AI System, Making Them More Understandable and Trustworthy in financial data analysis. International Transactions on Artificial Intelligence 8 (8):1-21.
- 42. Farinha, I., Ferreira, J., & Gouveia, B. (2016). Networks of innovation and competitiveness: A triple helix case study. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*, 7(1), 259–275.
- 43. Feil, P., Lamers, J., & Hermann, L. (1995). Knowledge transfer in the field: Solving crop residue problems in Niger. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, **20**(1), 31–41.









# INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF INNOVATIVE RESEARCH

IN SCIENCE | ENGINEERING | TECHNOLOGY





www.ijirset.com