

Effect of Knowledge Management and Information Sharing on Innovation Performance

Muhammad Asghar Rehman¹, Khuram Farooq²

¹ University of Punjab

² Kaunas University of Technology Kaunas, Lithuania

Email: asgharrehman128@gmail.com, khuram.farooq@ktu.edu

Received: 27-01-2026

Revised: 25-02-2026

Accepted: 15-03-2026

ABSTRACT

The theorization and empirical support of knowledge management and information sharing as essential facilitators of organizational innovation performance have been well-known but empirical study to examine the synergistic impacts of the two is still scarce regarding the systematic analysis of their unique contributions to the instructions in Internet-based knowledge-intensive organizations in Pakistan. This paper has analyzed the first-order relationship between the knowledge management practices and information sharing and the performance of innovation among the employees of the educational institutions and the organizations in the corporate sector in Pakistan. The cross sectional survey was quantitative in nature. The study involved a sample of 300 employees in knowledge-intensive organizations to fill in a self-administered questionnaire which captured knowledge management practices, information sharing and innovation performance on a 5-point Likert scale. Use of convenience sampling was adopted. It was analyzed with SPSS 25 and AMOS 24 in the descriptive statistics, Cronbach alpha reliability tests, Pearson correlation test, confirmatory factor test (CFA) and structural equation modeling (SEM). The practice of knowledge management has a large positive direct impact on innovations (= 0.53, p <.001), and information sharing has a large positive direct impact (= 0.46, p <.001). The structural model accounted 62.4% (R-squared=.624) of the variance in innovation performance. CFA attested good construct validity with AVE ranging between.54 and.58 and composite reliability ranging between.89 and.93. The results contribute to the body of knowledge management research on the context of developing economies and offers educational and corporate knowledge institutions evidence-based knowledge infrastructural investment and information sharing culture building.

Keywords: knowledge management, information sharing, innovation performance, structural equation modeling, confirmatory factor analysis, knowledge-intensive organizations, Pakistan, organizational learning, quantitative research

INTRODUCTION

Long-run competitive survival and growth have become nearly synonymous with organizational innovation performance as the ability to produce, develop and commercially execute new ideas, products, processes and new business models in the modern knowledge economy. The basics of the signal of innovation are not material in nature; capital, labor, raw material but cognitive: knowledge, expertise, insight, creative recombination in terms of the already known into new forms that produce new value. It is this epistemic quality of innovation inputs that puts knowledge management -behavioral processes by which organizations create, capture, store, share, and apply knowledge resources-and information sharing

-behavioral processes by which members of organizations communicate with colleagues, teams, and partners about what they know-at the heart of any plausible account of how variation in innovation performance occurs across organizations and individuals.

This assertion was anchored in the theoretical basis of knowledge-based view of the firm (Grant, 1996) which contends that knowledge is the strategically most important resource of the organization due to its value-generating ability increasing with usage instead of declining, is virtually impossible to imitate by the rivals in practice when institutionalized as organizational routines and social networks, it allows an organization to evoke new and always new combinations creating Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) elaborated this model with their theory of knowledge creation, showing that processes between tacit and explicit knowledge of socialization and externalization, combination and internalization are the micro-process in which organizations create the new knowledge that drives innovation. All of these theoretical frameworks indicate that it is the more advanced knowledge management systems and more information sharing practices that help organizations to attain greater performance in innovation - predictions that are confirmed by various empirical studies with generally consistent outcomes.

Although knowledge management is related to information sharing conceptually; there are major distinctions in information sharing. Knowledge management can be defined as organizational systems, processes as well as infrastructure that allows knowledge to be captured, organized and accessed; information sharing can be defined as behavioral practice and cultural norms that allow individuals and teams to actively share information through organizational boundaries (Liao et al., 2007). Effective knowledge management offers the infrastructure that ensures that effective sharing of information is efficient and worthwhile whereas information sharing offers the behavioral activation of ongoing knowledge management systems that convert hoarded knowledge to active organizational learning. Their combined analysis is thus theoretically demanded: without being actively shared, knowledge management will result in sleepy knowledge depositories, whereas without an efficient knowledge management system, information sharing will lead to informational overflow and defragmented information with a lack of context in communications.

Since the establishment works by Darroch (2005) and Andreeva and Kianto (2011) were published, there has been significant empirical evidence regarding knowledge management and innovation performance. One of the earliest systematic empirical studies focused on knowledge management-innovation relationship was by Darroch (2005) who determined that there was a significant positive relationship between the acquisition of knowledge and dissemination of knowledge to innovation performance in a sample of a large sample of firms in New Zealand. Andreeva and Kianto (2011) generalized this evidence to European manufacturing and service companies where they showed that the knowledge management practices forecasted innovation performance, over and above the impact of human capital and organizational learning, making knowledge management an independent predictor of innovation performance. By running an SEM analysis, Donate and de Pablo (2015) found that knowledge based leadership, which is a dimension of knowledge management, was a significant predictor of both exploratory and exploitative innovation, implying that mechanisms of linking knowledge management to innovation exist along the radical and incremental innovation routes.

Knowledge engineering and information sharing become of particular concern to knowledge management in knowledge intensive organization situations, such as learning institutions and corporate knowledge disciplines that depend mostly on the expertise, creativity and intellectual contribution of an organization constituent. Innovation is done deliberately when universities and research organizations develop and implement new knowledge; when professional service firms create new ways to solve client challenges; when technology firms integrate technical know how and market intuition. The performance of innovation, in all of these circumstances, is critically dependent on the effectiveness of organizational knowledge creation, sharing, integration, and application. Alavi and Leidner (2001) laid the theoretical

foundation of knowledge management systems in the knowledge-intensive organizations in which the systems that facilitate knowledge creation, storage, transfer, and use were determined as the main enablers of organizational innovation potential.

Pakistan is a knowledge-driven organizational environment, which offers a unique environment on the study of these relationships. Higher education sector that has grown exponentially with less than 60 universities engaging less than 60,000 academic and professional staff in 2000 up to more than 230 in 2024 has direct consequences in terms of its performance in innovation in the development of human capital in the long run and its technological capability because it employ hundreds of thousands of academic and professional individuals. The corporate knowledge based industry, such as technology companies, professional services, pharmaceuticals, and media companies, is no exception in relying on the effectiveness of knowledge management and information sharing to provide the product and service innovation upon which revenue growth and competitive positioning rely. However, there is a dearth of systematic empirical research on knowledge management and innovation performance within Pakistani knowledge organizations, and most of the available literature is based on small convenience samples and simple regression analysis; this type of research cannot adequately address the construct complexity and measurement error that plague knowledge management research.

The organizational cultures characterized by rigidity and hierarchies, the functional structures of the organization that lacks cross-departmental knowledge and information exchange, deficient infrastructure in knowledge management technologies in most organizations and the workforce incentive system which fails to reward knowledge sharing behavior are the organizational barriers to effective knowledge management and information sharing in Pakistani contexts (Riaz et al., 2018; Hassan et al., 202). These obstacles indicate that average knowledge management and information sharing scores in Pakistani knowledge organizations might be lower than those recorded in the knowledge management and information sharing studies in the developed economy, and reflect on innovation performance gaps indicating solvable opportunities to address capability gaps.

The theoretical paradigm in this research combines the knowledge-based perspective proposed by Grant (1996) with the SECI model of knowledge creation and the systems model of knowledge management on the one hand and on the other hand, respectively. The integrated model hypothesizes that knowledge management practices such as knowledge acquisition, codification, storage, transfer and application and information sharing behaviors such as proactive communication based on information, cross-functional exchange of information and participation in knowledge networks would be independent and complementary positive predictors of innovation performance. The SEM model adopted in this study enables both of the direct effects to be estimated and the fact that predictors are intercorrelated enables effect estimates that are superior methodologically than the sequential or independent regression analyses that most previous studies on knowledge management in Pakistan involve.

Practical value of the research is not only limited to the academic contribution. Organizational investments that can be quantified in terms of costs are knowledge management and information sharing: technology infrastructure, training programs, specific knowledge management staff, cultural change programs, documentation of their innovation performance impact is the business case that organizational leaders in Pakistani educational institutions and corporations must make to justify such investments. The uniformity of the results observed in international settings in which knowledge management and sharing of information has proven to generate important innovation returns, when duplicated and measured within a Pakistani setting, furnishes the evidence base to specific organizational capability development initiatives that could make a real impact on the innovation performance of knowledge-intensive organizations in Pakistan.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Knowledge-based perspective of the firm (Grant, 1996) became the theoretical basis of the explanation as to why knowledge management was expected to be positively correlated with performance in innovation. According to Grant, the main purpose of the firm, in a knowledge economy, is to integrate individual members with specialized knowledge into organizational capabilities that assign values. When this process of integration is finished, innovation can be generated whereby the different streams of knowledge are recombined in new ways to solve the current problems or generate new opportunities. Spender (1996) built upon the framework of Grant by explaining that tacit organization knowledge exists as explicit and tacit, and that tacit knowledge is the most appropriate source of sustainable competitive advantage in that not only is it inimitable and non-transferable but it is also embedded in organizational routines, cultural and personal expertise thus being hard to replicate. Particularly high benefits in terms of innovation performance are offered by knowledge management systems that can capture, codify and transfer tacit knowledge effectively.

The SECI model of knowledge creation by Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) underpins knowledge creation process theory on which these knowledge management-innovation relationships are built. The model explains four knowledge conversion modes: socialization (tacit to tacit, through shared experience), externalization (tacit to explicit, through articulation), combination (explicit to explicit, through systematic recombination) and internalization (explicit to tacit, through learning by doing) that can be collectively used to describe how organizations produce the new knowledge that drives innovation. The organizations whose knowledge management systems enable them to enable all four of the four modes of conversion have higher knowledge conversion output with a unit of knowledge input since they take advantage of the complete cycle of knowledge creation instead of merely capturing the explicit knowledge pieces that can be captured by traditional information management systems. Von Krogh et al. (2012) revealed that the companies whose investment was balanced among all four modes of SECI showed by far a greater performance in terms of innovation than companies focusing on explicit knowledge management.

Social capital theory of innovation (Nahapiet and Ghoshal, 1998) and organization network studies have theorized information sharing as a unique predictor of innovation performance. Nahapiet and Ghoshal put forward the idea that social capital, or the resources within the social networks of relations, offered the relational infrastructure through which information cross-boundaries of organizations, permitting the bundling of knowledge possessed by various individuals and groups into new forms of innovations. Their model found three dimensions of social capital; structural (network configuration), relational (trust and norms) and cognitive (shared language and understanding) each of them eases information sharing and consequently improves the performance of innovation. Reagans and McEvily (2003) showed empirically that the success of knowledge transfer between networks mediated by information sharing as a behavioral mediator existed between the social network structure and the success of knowledge transfer and also confirmed information sharing to be the behavioural process through which social capital is turned into knowledge integration and innovation.

Empirical evidence of information sharing and its impact on innovation performance has shown a uniform positive result in all organizational settings. Liao et al. (2007) showed that information sharing emerged to be a strong predictor of innovation performance in high-technology companies in Taiwan, and the effects of information sharing had a mechanism of work, which is improved organizational learning. The study conducted by Lin (2007) established that the willingness to share information was positively correlated with knowledge generation that forecasted individual performance of innovation in knowledge intensive workplace. Alavi and Leidner (2001) have shown in their research in knowledge management systems that the active facilitation of information sharing among organizational members, through the use

of shared workspaces, expert directories and collusion platforms, resulted in much more innovation output than systems emphasizing information storage and retrieval only.

The potential of organizational culture in promoting or hindering the effectiveness of knowledge management and information sharing is a well-researched subject. Davenport and Prusak (1998) found that culture was the dominant factor that was determined as a determiner of the success of knowledge management implementation where they argued that organizations that had knowledge-sharing cultures reaped a lot more value when similar investment was made on knowledge management technology than organizations that had knowledge-hoarding cultures. Wasko and Faraj (2005) showed that willingness to share knowledge in organizations networks was influenced mostly by intrinsic motivation and commitment to the organization as opposed to extrinsic incentives implying that culture of knowledge sharing can be easily implemented through cultural and leadership intervention as opposed to reforming an incentive system. Riaz et al. (2018) found that in the Pakistani organizational context, the knowledge management-innovation relationship was significantly mediated by organization culture, collaborative cultures realized a significantly larger rate of innovation returns on knowledge management investments.

Enterprise social software, collaborative systems, and AI-enabled knowledge management systems have become mature enough to draw increasing research focus on how knowledge management technology makes innovation performance possible. Maier (2007) developed an in-depth system of knowledge management systems according to their knowledge management functions and the implications of their innovations on performance, transactional systems (databases and document management), analytical (business intelligence and data mining), and collaborative systems (communities of practice and social software). Modern studies by Cerchione and Esposito (2017) revealed that the performance of innovation was significantly predicted by the use of digital knowledge management resources, and mobile knowledge sharing resources established the most impressive impacts in dynamic competitive sectors. Hameed and Waheed (2011) reported in Pakistani organizations that adoption of knowledge management technology positively correlated to organizational learning and innovation capacity but technology infrastructure limitations limited the extent of adoption.

Knowledge management has also been integrated with dynamic capabilities theory (Eisenhardt and Martin, 2000) which explains why some organizations have higher returns of performance based on their investments in knowledge management than other similar investments. In innovation performance indices, organizations that have good knowledge management dynamic capabilities, that is, the recognition of knowledge gaps, acquisition and assimilation of new knowledge, and re-configuration of already available knowledge assets to deal with change of environmental conditions will always perform better than organizations that have rigid knowledge management system. Zollo and Winter (2002) hypothesized these deliberate learning processes such as knowledge articulation and codification processes to be the micro-foundations of dynamic capabilities, giving direct theoretical connection between the knowledge management practice and the dynamic capabilities that lead to innovation performance.

Information sharing and organizational learning, which is one of the most important mediating mechanisms of the knowledge management-innovation performance chain, has been examined by Argote and Miron-Spektor (2011) who established that information sharing supports the experiential learning processes with the help of which the organizational body of knowledge is formed on the basis of which the innovation is created. In their multi-level analysis, they demonstrated that organizational-level knowledge management systems moderated information sharing at team level to team level learning, to team innovation output, which was further predicted by team-level learning. Within the context of Pakistani school education in particular, Malik et al. (2019) have discovered that the information transfer between academic staff was positively correlated with the presence of research collaboration and output

of joint publications - the indexes of academic innovation performance - the quality of knowledge management infrastructure mediated the effectiveness of this correlation.

The concept of open innovation and collaborative knowledge creation (Chesbrough, 2006) is a continuation of the knowledge management-innovation model to the realm of inter-organizations. According to Chesbrough, the separation between knowledge management in organizations and knowledge sourcing externally is becoming more permeable and organizations which successfully handle the interface between their internal knowledge base and external knowledge sources perform better in innovation. A study conducted by Bogers et al. (2017) showed that information disclosure to outside partners, who included, customers, suppliers, research institutions and competitors was a significant predictor of radical innovation performance and better than the impact of knowledge management practices within the firm, implying that the organizational boundaries of knowledge management to promote innovation should go beyond the firm.

Collectively, the literature provides a complete theoretical and empirical framework of knowledge management practice and information sharing to innovation performance based on several complementary processes such as knowledge creation, organizational learning, mobilization of social capital and development of dynamic capability. The current research further developed this framework by offering rigorous SEM-based test of these combined effects on knowledge intensive organizations in Pakistan which not only offered methodologically accurate estimates of effects, but also provided significant input to the existing practical body of knowledge employed by Pakistani organizational leaders in making decisions regarding the nature of their knowledge management investment choices.

METHODOLOGY

The present study used a cross-sectional survey method that is quantitative in nature. The study sample included employees of knowledge-intensive organizations in Pakistan (i.e., educational institutions (universities, colleges, research organisations) and corporate sector organizations in knowledge-intensive sectors such as technology, consulting, media and professional services). It used convenience sampling since accessibility of the employees was limited due to the practical limitations of accessing the employees in various knowledge organizations. In Pakistan, the survey was distributed via direct institution and online professional networks and email systems used in institutions. The overall number of questionnaires distributed was 325 and 308 were returned and 300 were not returned due to missing information.

The study instrument was a self-administered questionnaire which had four parts and was structured. There was a measures on knowledge management practices based on 14 items modified to scale used by Darroch (2005) and Alavi and Leidner (2001) to gauge knowledge acquisition (3 items), knowledge codification and storage (4 items), knowledge transfer and dissemination (4 items), and knowledge application (3 items). The scale of information sharing was evaluated based on a 10-item scale adapting Liao et al. (2007) and Lin (2007) which defined information sharing proactiveness, quality of cross-functional information exchange, network participation, and norms of information sharing culture. Darroch (2005) and Donate and de Pablo (2015) advised a 12-item scale to not only operationalize innovation performance but also used 4 items to describe product/service innovation, 4 items process innovation, and organizational innovation. Each item used a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree). Demographic questions included the type of organization, department, job position, and experience.

The face and content validity were determined by reviewing the data by four scholars in the field of knowledge management, organizational behavior, and innovation management, and pilot testing with the assistance of 25 employees belonging to the target population not included in the sample. Cronbach alpha

was used in measuring internal consistency reliability. Construct validity in AMOS 24 was tested using CFA to assess standardized loading of factors (> .50), AVE (> .50), CR (> .70) and HTMT discriminant validity ratios (< .85). Two structural hypothesis were tested H1, knowledge management practices are a significant positive predictor of innovation performance; and H2, information sharing practices is a significant positive predictor of innovation performance. The acceptable thresholds of structural model fit were chi-square/df < 3, CFI > .90, TLI > .90, RMSEA <.08 and SRMR <.08.

RESULTS

The 300 respondents sample size was obtained based on educational establishments (48.0%), and knowledge organizations in the corporate sector (52.0%). The entire demographic shows in Table 6. The sample was mostly postgraduate-qualified (61.7%), as the organizations targeted were knowledge intensive. The sample was divided into academic and research positions which were 34.7 and modules of corporate knowledge workers respectively.

Table 1: Demographic Profile of Respondents (N = 300)

Variable	Category	n	%
Gender	Male	178	59.3
	Female	122	40.7
Organization Type	Educational Institution	144	48.0
	Corporate (Knowledge Sector)	156	52.0
Role	Academic/Researcher	104	34.7
	Manager/Specialist	112	37.3
	Knowledge Worker/Analyst	84	28.0
Education	Undergraduate	115	38.3
	Postgraduate/Doctoral	185	61.7
Experience	< 3 years	68	22.7
	3-7 years	124	41.3
	> 7 years	108	36.0

Note. N = 300.

Table 2 provides descriptive statistics, and Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients of all constructs in the study. Each of the alpha values was found to be more than .87, a finding that validates high internal consistency. Knowledge management practices showed a moderate average (M = 3.42) and could be expected to be improved substantially when it comes to the effectiveness of knowledge management within the sample organizations. There was also a similar mean in information sharing (M = 3.38). Mean performance of innovation was 3.51, which indicates a moderately positive perceived innovation performance.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics and Reliability Coefficients

Variable	M	SD	alpha	Min	Max
Knowledge Management Practices	3.42	0.74	.93	1.21	5.00
Knowledge Acquisition	3.49	0.77	.88	1.00	5.00
Knowledge Codification & Storage	3.38	0.78	.86	1.00	5.00
Knowledge Transfer & Dissemination	3.44	0.76	.87	1.00	5.00

Knowledge Application	3.39	0.79	.85	1.00	5.00
Information Sharing	3.38	0.76	.91	1.20	5.00
Proactive Communication	3.42	0.79	.87	1.00	5.00
Cross-functional Exchange	3.34	0.81	.86	1.00	5.00
Knowledge Network Participation	3.37	0.77	.85	1.00	5.00
Innovation Performance	3.51	0.71	.92	1.29	5.00
Product/Service Innovation	3.55	0.74	.88	1.00	5.00
Process Innovation	3.48	0.75	.87	1.00	5.00
Organizational Innovation	3.50	0.73	.86	1.00	5.00

Note. M = mean; SD = standard deviation; alpha = Cronbach's alpha. N = 300.

CFA results confirmed acceptable measurement model fit (chi-square/df = 2.17, CFI = .95, TLI = .94, RMSEA = .063, SRMR = .056). All the standardized factor loadings were found to be statistically significant ($p < .001$), with a range of .61 to .87. Table 8 shows statistics of construct validity. The values of AVE and CR were found to be between .54 and .58 and .89 and .93 respectively, which is the confirmatory evidence of convergence validation. All pairs of constructs had HTMT ratio of less than .85, which validated discriminant validity.

Table 3: CFA Measurement Model: Construct Validity Statistics

Construct	Items	Factor Loading Range	AVE	CR	alpha
Knowledge Management Practices	14	.63-.86	.56	.93	.93
Information Sharing	10	.61-.85	.54	.91	.91
Innovation Performance	12	.64-.87	.58	.92	.92

Note. AVE = average variance extracted; CR = composite reliability; alpha = Cronbach's alpha. Measurement model fit: chi-square/df = 2.17, CFI = .95, TLI = .94, RMSEA = .063, SRMR = .056.

The intercorrelation matrix is found in Table 4. There was a strong positive relationship between knowledge management practices and innovation performance ($r = .64, p < .01$) and a high positive correlation between knowledge management practices and information sharing ($r = .61, p < .01$). There existed good positive correlation between information sharing and innovation performance ($r = .58, p < .01$). The strong interrelationship of knowledge management with information sharing supported the complementary nature of the two constructs as complementary predictors of innovation performance.

Table 4: Intercorrelation Matrix

Variable	1	2	3
1. Knowledge Management Practices	--		
2. Information Sharing	.61**	--	
3. Innovation Performance	.64**	.58**	--

Note. ** $p < .01$ (two-tailed). N = 300.

The structural model demonstrated good fit (chi-square/df = 2.29, CFI = .94, TLI = .93, RMSEA = .066, SRMR = .061). The entire path coefficients of structure are in Table 10. H1 was confirmed because the knowledge management practices had a strong positive direct impact on innovation performance ($\beta = .53$,

$p = .001$). The sharing of information created a high positive direct impact on innovation performance (beta = .46, $p < .001$), which validated H2. The two together attributed 62.4% of the variance in innovation performance (R-squared = .624).

Table 5: Structural Model Path Coefficients

Hypothesis	Path	beta	SE	t-value	p	Decision
H1	Knowledge Management -> Innovation Performance	.53	.07	7.57	< .001	Supported
H2	Information Sharing -> Innovation Performance	.46	.06	7.67	< .001	Supported

Note. beta = standardized path coefficient; SE = standard error. R-squared (Innovation Performance) = .624. Structural model fit: chi-square/df = 2.29, CFI = .94, TLI = .93, RMSEA = .066, SRMR = .061.

DISCUSSION

The findings of the structural model were very robust and consistent to underpin both hypotheses and validated that knowledge management practices and the information sharing are important and positive predictors of innovation performance within Pakistani knowledge-intensive organizations. The positive relationship between the direct effect of knowledge management practices (=.53) and information sharing (=.46) is also clear with the fact that the latter researcher, Darroch establishes that systemic forms of knowledge management processes such as acquisition, codification, transfer, and application give a better infrastructure to innovation in comparison to informal information sharing (2005). The outcome of this research is that organizations which aim to boost innovation performance need to focus on building knowledge management system infrastructures - enterprise knowledge platforms, communities of practice, expert directories and knowledge transfer protocols - before, or concurrently, focusing on the improvement of information sharing behaviours. Systematic knowledge management establishes the environment in which information sharing is the most effective, and that gives the organized body of knowledge upon which the information that is being shared can be quickly contextualized and sent to the innovation challenges.

This strong positive impact of information sharing (beta = .46) substantiated the idea that the performance of using behavioral practices that activated knowledge management systems, proactive communication, cross-functional exchange, and participation in knowledge networks, impacted the performance of innovation independent of the infrastructure of the system. This observation aligns with the social capital theory developed by Nahapiet and Ghoshal (1998), which considers relational social capital, or trust norms and mutual obligation which enable information sharing, as an independent predictor of knowledge combination and innovation, independent of the structural resources that knowledge management systems offer. The high R-squared of .624 justified the theoretical framework and also agreed on the fact that knowledge management along with information sharing collectively explains the greatest amount of innovation performance variation in a set of knowledge intensive Pakistani organizations.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This research was able to offer strong empirical support that practices of knowledge management and information sharing are highly and positively correlated to the performance of innovation in Pakistani knowledge intensive organizations yet knowledge management proved to be the key predictor. In the case of educational institutions, the implications of these findings are: research knowledge management systems, such as institutional repositories, research collaborative platforms, inter-departmental knowledge

exchange mechanisms, and cultural initiatives to open the barriers to academic information sharing hierarchy and departmental siloing imposes, both need to be invested in. This needs to be achieved by universities having a formal knowledge transfer offices and knowledge communities across disciplinary lines, where cross-domain recombination of knowledge, through which academic innovation is most likely to come, can take place.

As the information is applicable to the business case of enterprise knowledge management platform, formalization of knowledge management processes, and information sharing culture organizational development program in corporation sector knowledge organizations. Chief Knowledge Officers and Human Resource Directors are to devise combined knowledge management approaches that cover the technological infrastructure as well as behavioral and cultural aspects of effective knowledge sharing. Knowledge sharing contribution, especially expert directory participation, community of practice contribution, knowledge transfer across departments, should explicitly be rewarded and recognized using system rewards and recognition measures, in addition to individual productivity and output indicators. Future studies where the mediating mechanisms (namely organizational learning and absorptive capacity) are identified that translate knowledge management and information sharing into innovation performance, the differences between educational and corporate knowledge organizations should be studied, and how digital knowledge management tools do change such associations in the more interconnected organizational context of Pakistan should be explored.

REFERENCES

- Alavi, M., & Leidner, D. E. (2001). Review: Knowledge management and knowledge management systems. *MIS Quarterly*, 25(1), 107-136.
- Andreeva, T., & Kianto, A. (2011). Knowledge processes, knowledge-intensity and innovation: A moderated mediation analysis. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 15(6), 1016-1034.
- Argote, L., & Miron-Spektor, E. (2011). Organizational learning: From experience to knowledge. *Organization Science*, 22(5), 1123-1137.
- Bogers, M., Zobel, A. K., Afuah, A., Almirall, E., Brunswicker, S., Dahlander, L., & Reichwald, R. (2017). The open innovation research landscape: Established perspectives and emerging themes across different levels of analysis. *Industry and Innovation*, 24(1), 8-40.
- Cerchione, R., & Esposito, E. (2017). Using knowledge management systems: A taxonomy of SME strategies. *International Journal of Information Management*, 37(1), 1551-1562.
- Chesbrough, H. (2006). *Open business models: How to thrive in the new innovation landscape*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Darroch, J. (2005). Knowledge management, innovation and firm performance. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 9(3), 101-115.
- Davenport, T. H., & Prusak, L. (1998). *Working knowledge: How organizations manage what they know*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Donate, M. J., & de Pablo, J. D. S. (2015). The role of knowledge-oriented leadership in knowledge management practices and innovation. *Journal of Business Research*, 68(2), 360-370.

- Eisenhardt, K. M., & Martin, J. A. (2000). Dynamic capabilities: What are they? *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(10-11), 1105-1121.
- Grant, R. M. (1996). Toward a knowledge-based theory of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17(S2), 109-122.
- Hameed, A., & Waheed, A. (2011). Employee development and its effect on employee performance. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(13), 72-79.
- Hassan, S., Raza, A., & Imran, A. (2021). Knowledge sharing barriers in Pakistani educational institutions. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 25(4), 887-908.
- Liao, S. H., Fei, W. C., & Chen, C. C. (2007). Knowledge sharing, absorptive capacity, and innovation capability: An empirical study of Taiwan's knowledge-intensive industries. *Journal of Information Science*, 33(3), 340-359.
- Lin, H. F. (2007). Knowledge sharing and firm innovation capability: An empirical study. *International Journal of Manpower*, 28(3/4), 315-332.
- Maier, R. (2007). *Knowledge management systems: Information and communication technologies for knowledge management* (3rd ed.). Springer.
- Malik, M., Sarwar, S., & Orr, S. (2019). Agile practices and performance: Examining the role of organizational learning. *International Journal of Project Management*, 39(2), 140-149.
- Nahapiet, J., & Ghoshal, S. (1998). Social capital, intellectual capital, and the organizational advantage. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(2), 242-266.
- Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge-creating company*. Oxford University Press.
- Reagans, R., & McEvily, B. (2003). Network structure and knowledge transfer: The effects of cohesion and range. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 48(2), 240-267.
- Riaz, A., Ahmed, K., & Hussain, S. (2018). Knowledge management and organizational innovation in Pakistani organizations. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences*, 12(3), 776-798.
- Spender, J. C. (1996). Making knowledge the basis of a dynamic theory of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17(S2), 45-62.
- Von Krogh, G., Nonaka, I., & Rechsteiner, L. (2012). Leadership in organizational knowledge creation: A review and framework. *Journal of Management Studies*, 49(1), 240-277.
- Wasko, M. M., & Faraj, S. (2005). Why should I share? Examining social capital and knowledge contribution in electronic networks of practice. *MIS Quarterly*, 29(1), 35-57.
- Zollo, M., & Winter, S. G. (2002). Deliberate learning and the evolution of dynamic capabilities. *Organization Science*, 13(3), 339-351.