Educational Administration: Theory and Practice
2022, 28(2), 318-323
ISSN: 2148-2403
https://kuey.net/

Knowledge Sharing and Knowledge Creation: Dynamics, Enablers, and Organizational Implications

Anand Chauhan*

*Assistant professor, Department of Management Studies, Deenbandhu Chhotu Ram University of Science and Technology, Sonepat, Haryana

Citation: Anand Chauhan (2022). Knowledge Sharing and Knowledge Creation: Dynamics, Enablers, and Organizational Implications, *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 28(2) 318-323
Doi: 10.53555/kuey.v28i02.10754

ABSTRACT

Knowledge has emerged as the most crucial resource for organizations, serving as the foundation for innovation, flexibility, and enduring competitive advantage. This article examines the relationships between knowledge sharing, which can be defined as the transfer of tacit and explicit knowledge among individuals or groups, and knowledge creation which is the development of new insights and practices via social and cognitive interaction. Based on underlying concepts like Nonaka and Takeuchi SECI model, social capital theory, knowledge-based views of the firm and community of practices, the study reviews the literature and identifies the mechanisms, enablers and impediments which impact on these processes. The review emphasizes the critical importance of organizational culture, leadership, motivation, and technology in promoting knowledge dynamics while also acknowledging ongoing challenges like knowledge hoarding, isolated structures, and information overload. It considers the new trends, such as digital transformations, open innovation, and increasing demand of remote and hybrid jobs. By combining theoretical knowledge with practical practice, this study argues that knowledge sharing and creation are complementary processes, which collectively impact organizational learning and innovation ability. The conclusions are that organizations must develop trust based organizational cultures and deploy effective knowledge systems and boundary-based collaborations to fully exploit knowledge as a strategic asset. Recommendations are made to both the researcher and practitioners to improve their knowledge and practice in the knowledge management field.

1. Introduction

The economy of the 21st century is marked by high- pace technology change, globalization and intense competition in economy. In this context, knowledge—rather than physical assets or raw materials—has become the most vital resource for achieving success in organizations. Organizations are now competing not just on their efficiency or size, but increasingly on their capability to generate, exchange, and apply knowledge more swiftly and effectively than their rivals. As Drucker (1993) famously noted, we inhabit a "knowledge society," where the ability to produce and utilize knowledge is key to long-term competitiveness and survival.

At the heart of organizational knowledge dynamics are two important processes: knowledge sharing and knowledge creation. Knowledge sharing refers to the spread and exchange of knowledge, experience, and patron analyses between groups of people and individuals. This is important in making sure that knowledge does not remain within a given silo but is shared in the entire organization. Knowledge has always been considered as the important resource to improve organizational performance and innovation. Knowledge sharing refers to exchange of tacit and explicit knowledge among and between individuals, groups and organizations (Wang & Noe, 2010; Alavi & Leidner, 2001). Tacit knowledge is the one that is the hardest to verbalize and is related to personal experiences, skills and instincts (Polanyi, 1966). Compared to implicit knowledge, explicit knowledge can be articulated more readily which means it can be recorded, shared and reused across a number of platforms including documents and databases and digital tools (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995).

Knowledge sharing is the exchange of information, skills and experiences between and among individuals and groups and enables companies to utilize the knowledge that exists in dispersed form and eliminates duplication of efforts. This involves both explicit knowledge that can be committed to paper and encoded in systems and a tacit knowledge, which is closely tied to personal experiences and more difficult to share. On the other hand, knowledge creation is concerned with creation of new information, approaches, or inventions

by combining, transforming and putting old information to use. Collectively, these processes contribute to organizational learning, flexibility and innovation.

A well-known model of knowledge prefiguring in this field is the SECI model developed by Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995), which shows how tacit and explicit knowledge can flow into each other via the processes of socialization, externalization, combination, and internalization.

Despite their significance, organizations face ongoing difficulties in fostering knowledge sharing and creation. Cultural challenges, such as the tendency to hoard knowledge, structural barriers like departmental silos, and technological issues including ineffective knowledge management systems can obstruct the seamless flow of knowledge. Conversely, positive internal culture (e.g., trust), transformational leadership, appropriate incentives, and the application of collaborative digital platforms have been shown to also facilitate such processes. The growing trend of remote and hybrid work, alongside the emergence of open innovation ecosystems, further complicates and enriches the methods through which knowledge is shared and created.

This paper investigates these dynamics by focusing on three main objectives: 1. To review and integrate the theoretical principles of knowledge sharing and creation. 2. To examine the mechanisms, facilitators, and obstacles that affects these processes within organizations. 3. To extract insights from case studies and offer practical suggestions for managers. In conducting this exploration, the study will contribute to both academic and managerial knowledge since it will be able to demonstrate how organizations can turn knowledge into strategic asset that promotes innovation and secures long-term success.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Theoretical Foundations

There are a number of key theoretical frameworks that form the basis of investigation of knowledge sharing and knowledge generation. The SECI model introduced by Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) that encompasses Socialization, Externalization, Combination, and Internalization presents a dynamical character of the interactions of tacit and explicit knowledge to generate a new one. The dynamism of this repetitive process underscores the inter-dependence of knowledge sharing and knowledge generation.

One such approach is social capital theory (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998), which focuses on the strength of relationships, trust, and social networks as factors that can easily enable the knowledge transfer. Similarly, the knowledge-based understanding of the firm (Grant, 1996) argues that the crux of strategic value has always been in the knowledge and that organizations only exist to serve the purpose of the integration of specific knowledge. Studies report that high social capital boosts the innovative outcomes by weakening the obstacles to collaboration (Adler & Kwon, 2002; Inkpen & Tsang, 2005).

The concept of communities of practice (Wenger, 1998) emphasizes the social and practice-oriented nature of knowledge. These informal groups promote learning through the sharing of experiences, the development of a collective identity, and the co-creation of new practices. Collectively, these theories establish a thorough framework for examining knowledge dynamics. Brown and Duguid (1991) assert that organizational learning frequently arises not from formal structures but from such communities, where tacit knowledge is freely exchanged.

2.2 Knowledge Sharing: Enablers and Barriers

Knowledge sharing is influenced by cultural, technological, and motivational elements. Trust and transparency promote a willingness to share, while supportive leadership and aligned incentives strengthen this behavior. The dynamics of knowledge within an organization are greatly impacted by its culture. A culture that values trust, openness, and collaboration motivates individuals to share their knowledge (De Long & Fahey, 2000).

Technological tools—such as intranets, collaborative platforms, and enterprise social media—facilitate knowledge exchange across different geographic and organizational boundaries. Digital tools significantly improve the extent and reach of knowledge sharing. Knowledge management systems (KMS) facilitate the storage, retrieval and organization of explicit knowledge (Davenport & Prusak, 1998). Platforms like enterprise social media, wikis, and collaborative tools such as Slack or Microsoft Teams offer new channels for both tacit communication (through informal conversations) and explicit documentation (Treem & Leonardi, 2013). Research indicates that having a technological foundation alone is not enough without cultural congruence and incentives (Alavi & Leidner, 2001). Nevertheless, obstacles remain. Knowledge hoarding, often stemming from fears related to power loss or job security, can hinder sharing. Organizational silos and a lack of incentives further obstruct knowledge exchange. Particularly, tacit knowledge is perhaps hard to transfer because it is of an experiential and contextual nature. It is important to identify these impediments so that effective measures are employed.

2.3 Knowledge Creation: Mechanisms and Contexts

The generation of knowledge arises from integrating various viewpoints, conducting experiments, and engaging in continuous learning. Common methods include cross-disciplinary teamwork, brainstorming sessions, and innovation labs. The SECI model demonstrates how implicit knowledge can be made explicit,

merged, and absorbed to create new insights. The culture within an organization is crucial for facilitating knowledge generation. Work environments that encourage experimentation, accept failure, and reward innovative thinking promote creativity. Additionally, leadership is significant—transformational leaders who convey a clear vision, empower their team, and support risk-taking are more likely to nurture settings that foster knowledge creation.

2.4 Emerging Trends

Digital transformation, encompassing AI, big data, and analytics, presents new possibilities for discovering knowledge while also posing challenges to conventional sharing methods (Shollo & Galliers, 2016). The process of knowledge sharing is changing through open innovation and hybrid working environments. Enterprise social media and collaborative solutions enable the sharing of explicit knowledge but create a set of barriers to sharing tacit knowledge. Open innovation frameworks, where companies work together with outside partners, broaden the scope of knowledge generation. Increasingly, organizations are utilizing external communities for knowledge development within open innovation and crowd sourcing, which blurs the lines of organizational boundaries (Chesbrough, 2003). The emergence of remote and hybrid working arrangements has changed the way knowledge is communicated, with digital tools serving as key facilitators, yet they also raise issues regarding the transfer of tacit knowledge (Leonardi, 2021).

3. Methodology / Approach

This research uses a conceptual and integrative review research design, whereby, existing literature, theoretical frameworks and case studies are merged in order to suggest answers to questions regarding the processes of knowledge sharing and creation. Three main stages apply in the methodology applied:

- **Literature Review:** An analysis of peer-reviewed articles, books, and conference proceedings was conducted to extract theoretical frameworks, empirical results, and conceptual discussions. Significant emphasis was placed on foundational works in knowledge management as well as recent research related to digital transformation and hybrid work arrangements.
- **Comparative Case Study**: Case studies in different organizations-Toyota, IBM, Google, open-source software communities and hybrid working environments were analyzed to illustrate how knowledge processes are applied in a realistic environment. These are examples that were considered due to their importance in the literature and in applying to modern challenges.
- **Thematic Synthesis**: Summaries of findings on theory and practice were put into categories (e.g., culture, leadership, technology, motivation, structure) to identify the factors that help and hinders, as well as the implications it has on management. In this way, it will give a detailed understanding of the processes of the development of knowledge whereas the latter technique only looks at the dynamics separately and independently of one another.

The research is qualitative and exploratory. Its value is in combining existing theories and building new ones, rather than focusing on empirical data. By connecting theory with practical application, the study offers practical insights and sets the stage for future empirical research.

4. Main Discussion

The processes of knowledge sharing and knowledge creation are separate, but they rely on each other and influence organizational learning and innovation. This part explores their interactions by looking at important themes: cultural facilitators, leadership, technology, motivation, organizational structure, and emerging challenges.

4.1 Culture as the Foundation

Organizational culture consistently stands out as the most vital facilitator of knowledge processes. Cultures that promote trust, transparency, and teamwork encourage the sharing of knowledge, while those that support experimentation and accept failure spur creation. A psychological safety concept (Edmondson, 1999) is also critical here--employees who feel that they can express their ideas or admit making mistakes will happily share their knowledge and become innovative. Unlike them, other cultures that are defined by fear, absolute hierarchies, or extremely competitive environment inhibit openness. Employees can also adopt knowledge hoarding in ways of providing a defensive strategy when they perceive knowledge to be a source of power as opposed to shared resource. Thus, culture acts as the enabler as well as deterrent, promoting the willingness of people to participate in knowledge dynamics. A culture of trust is also well known as a key pillar to effective knowledge sharing (De Long & Fahey, 2000; Cabrera & Cabrera, 2005).

4.2 Leadership and Knowledge Dynamics

Leadership significantly influences the establishment of knowledge practices. Transformational leaders, who convey a clear vision, empower their team members, and serve as examples, are especially successful in promoting knowledge sharing and innovation (Bass, 1990). By acknowledging and incentivizing collaborative actions, leaders affirm the importance of knowledge sharing as a valued practice. Leadership is also crucial in facilitating cross-functional teamwork and bridging gaps between departments. Knowledge champions or brokers can enhance the exchange of insights across different areas, while support from top management demonstrates a strategic commitment to knowledge initiatives. In the absence of leadership endorsement, knowledge programs frequently struggle to gain support. Transformational and knowledge-focused leadership styles have been associated with improved knowledge processes. Leaders who present an inspiring vision, promote experimentation, and appreciate teamwork encourage both the sharing and creation of knowledge (Bryant, 2003; Donate & de Pablo, 2015).

4.3 Technology as Enabler and Limitation

Digital platforms are essential for enhancing knowledge processes at scale. Knowledge management systems, intranets, and collaborative applications include Microsoft Teams, Slack, or Confluence, which enables employees to create, share and receive knowledge. Enterprise social media is a platform that enables fewer formal communications, where tacit knowledge can be exposed in digital spaces (Treem& Leonardi, 2013). Still, it is not the technology that is the magic bullet. The overemphasis on the codification of knowledge may result in simplification and in a short period of time turn into obsolete repositories. Tacit knowledge cannot be completely transferred by digital means because it is based on experiences, intuition and contexts. Therefore, successful organizations integrate technological tools with in-person or real-time interactions that foster understanding and relational exchange.

4.4 Motivation and Incentives

Motivation has been identified to play one of the most significant parts in nurturing a knowledge sharing behavior. Intrinsic motivation, which is prompted by factors like altruism, professional pride, and enthusiasm to learn, often foster sharing of knowledge (Deci & Ryan, 1985). External rewards and any other incentives such as reward and recognition can increase sharing but they may conversely promote transactional types of interactions that reduce intrinsic motivation. Knowledge sharing requires individual motivation. Internal motives, such as altruism, pleasure in helping other people and the necessity of creating a reputation, usually override external incentives (Bock et al., 2005). The self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000) states that the needs of autonomy, competence, and relatedness enhance a sustainable participation in the knowledge-sharing activities. However, well-structured extrinsic incentives—such as systems for recognition or rewards linked to performance—can effectively support intrinsic motivations when managed appropriately (Cabrera, Collins, & Salgado, 2006). Hence, a balanced system of incentives is essential. Acknowledging contributors, providing chances for career growth, and visibly valuing shared knowledge can bolster intrinsic motivations while demonstrating the organization's commitment. Peer recognition, storytelling, and cultural reinforcement often yield greater effectiveness than mere financial incentives.

4.5 Structure and Boundary-Spanning

Organizational frameworks affect how easily knowledge is exchanged. Organizations that are highly siloed or structured hierarchically hinder communication, whereas networked or team-oriented structures promote collaboration across boundaries. Cross-functional teams, rotational roles, and communities of practice broaden the array of viewpoints, encouraging both sharing and innovation. Boundary-spanning is particularly essential for the generation of new knowledge. Fresh insights frequently arise at the convergence of various fields. Leaders can promote this by establishing roles for knowledge brokers or crafting projects that demand interdisciplinary cooperation. Partnerships with external entities—such as customers, suppliers, educational institutions, or even rivals—further boost the potential for innovation through open innovation strategies (Chesbrough, 2003).

4.6 Emerging Challenges

Digital transformation and hybrid style of working are altering the course of knowledge sharing. Telework enables the transfer of written knowledge through digital operations and hinders the circulation of implicit knowledge which is better achieved through immediate proximity and overlapping after-hours greetings. As a result, companies should develop hybrid solutions to integrate delayed reporting with live teamwork. Also, in the digital environment, there can be an issue related to information overload. Employees might struggle to see valuable information in the middle of distractions and this can result in a lack of engagement. Efficient knowledge management entails not only sharing information but also filtering, and contextualizing it to maintain its relevance.

5. Case Examples and Illustrations

5.1 Toyota: The SECI Model in Action

Toyota is recognized as a leader in the development of knowledge and organizational learning. At the company level, knowledge sharing and generation occurs at different levels in the operations of the company. Shop-floor "hansei" (reflection) meetings encourage staff to articulate insights into clear problem statements and solutions, which are then shared across teams. Apprenticeship-style learning further enhances the transfer of tacit knowledge. Toyota's success in continuous improvement (kaizen) is rooted in its capacity to transform tacit insights into explicit routines, which are then reintegrated through practice.

5.2 IBM: Leveraging Technology for Knowledge Networks

IBM utilized intranet-based communities of practice and large-scale "Innovation Jams" to promote global collaboration. These digital events involved employees, clients, and partners in co-developing new solutions, many of which were turned into commercial products. The case scenario outlined above illustrates the fact that to a great extent enterprise platforms and crowdsourcing can transform knowledge sharing and its building across boundaries.

5.3 Google: Innovation through Psychological Safety

Google encourages knowledge sharing and generation by fostering the culture of psychological safety which is a key element of high-performing teams. It has a policy of the 20 percent time, which allows the employees to work on innovative projects in addition to their hire duties, the result of which is such products as Gmail. By making openness, autonomy and experimentation a part of institutional regularities, Google integrates the dynamics of knowledge into daily work activities.

5.4 Open-Source Software Communities

Community based knowledge creation, like Linux, is an example of distributed knowledge production beyond the corporate boundary. Peer review, voluntary collaboration, and transparency make the contributors share the knowledge freely and open it to improvement. The intrinsic motivations such as learning and reputation keep one track. These communities show the potential of open innovation ecosystems.

6. Managerial Implications and Recommendations

- **Cultivate a culture of trust and openness:** The response must entail development of psychologically safe environments where employees will engage and give their idea and learn about their mistaking without being punished because of the mistakes. Other ways to promote this culture include after-action reviews and leaders who portray openness.
- **Align leadership approaches with knowledge objectives:** Leaders must enable their organizations and instruct them to cooperate with one another, as well as act as brokers of knowledge. Knowledge brokers and champions are able to assist in developing collaborative work across boundaries and disciplines.
- **Utilize technology as a support, not a replacement:** Utilize technology as a supporting medium and not as a replacement to personal interaction. Managers must make sure that such tools are simple to use, and fit in the pre-existing work and processes.
- **Create balanced incentive structures:** Incentive systems must be put in place to reward contributions but not result in sharing as transactions. Participation in peer reviews and the possibility of career promotion usually bring good outcomes.
- **Encourage collaboration across boundaries:** Collaboration within interdisciplinary teams, rotations and engagement with external organizations expands the horizon and promotes knowledge generation.
- **Adjust to remote and hybrid work environments:** Organizational strategies should find means to combine successfully both asynchronous and synchronous collaborating, which is in turn supported with the practice that allows transferring tacit knowledge.
- **Ensure continuous learning is institutionalized:** The knowledge processes should become everyday routines involving training, innovation labs and reflection. Managers have a very important role of acting as custodians in keeping knowledge active and up-to-date.

Conclusion

Knowledge is now recognized as the most strategic asset of contemporary organizations and it is generalized to impact on achievement, competitive advantage, and long-term survival. This paper has examined two processes of knowledge sharing and knowledge creation utilizing theoretical framework, empirical findings and practical examples to demonstrate their mutual relation, as well as the significance of these processes in an organization. Knowledge sharing builds on the existing knowledge and knowledge creation generates new knowledge. Together they reinforce learning and flexibility in the organization. However, both the processes

are reliant on facilitators including culture, leadership, motivation, technology, and organization layouts and at the same time have impediments such as knowledge-hoarding cultures. Case examples indicated that effective companies consider knowledge as an interactive process that has to be shared, transformed and applied, and not so much to be conserved. Managerial implications suggested the need to encourage trust-based cultures, unified leadership, generous incentives and dynamic modes of approach in hybrid works. In concise terms, companies, which integrate knowledge sharing and creation into their strategic plan and cultural structure, are in a better position to innovate and adapt in complex environments. Knowledge cannot just be managed; it must be implemented, performed and ever-redefined.

References

1) Adler, P. S., & Kwon, S. W. (2002). Social capital: Prospects for a new concept. *Academy of Management Review, 27*(1), 17–40.
2) Alavi, M., & Leidner, D. E. (2001). Knowledge management and knowledge management systems: Conceptual foundations and research issues. *MIS Quarterly, 25*(1), 107–136.
3) Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. Organizational Dynamics, 18(3), 19–31.
4) Bock, G. W., Zmud, R. W., Kim, Y. G., & Lee, J. N. (2005). Behavioral intention formation in knowledge sharing: Examining the roles of extrinsic motivators, social-psychological forces, and organizational climate. *MIS Quarterly, 29*(1), 87–111.
5) Brown, J. S., & Duguid, P. (1991). Organizational learning and communities of practice: Toward a unified view of working, learning, and innovation. Organization Science, 2(1), 40–57.
6) Bryant, S. E. (2003). The role of transformational and transactional leadership in creating, sharing and exploiting organizational knowledge. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 9*(4), 32–44.
7) Cabrera, Á., & Cabrera, E. F. (2005). Fostering knowledge sharing through people management practices. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 16*(5), 720–735.
8) Cabrera, E. F., Collins, W. C., & Salgado, J. F. (2006). Determinants of individual engagement in knowledge sharing. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 17*(2), 245–264.
9) Chesbrough, H. W. (2003). *Open innovation: The new imperative for creating and profiting from technology*. Harvard Business School Press.
10) Davenport, T. H., & Prusak, L. (1998). *Working knowledge: How organizations manage what they know*. Harvard Business School Press.
11) Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior. Springer.
12) De Long, D. W., & Fahey, L. (2000). Diagnosing cultural barriers to knowledge management. *Academy of Management Executive, 14*(4), 113–127.
13) Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry, 11*(4), 227–268.
14) 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.
15) Drucker, P. F. (1993). Post-capitalist society. HarperCollins. Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. Administrative Science Quarterly, 44(2), 350–383.
16) Grant, R. M. (1996). Toward a knowledge-based theory of the firm. Strategic Management Journal, 17(S2), 109–122.
17) Inkpen, A. C., & Tsang, E. W. K. (2005). Social capital, networks, and knowledge transfer. *Academy of Management Review, 30*(1), 146–165.
18) Nahapiet, J., & Ghoshal, S. (1998). Social capital, intellectual capital, and the organizational advantage. Academy of Management Review, 23(2), 242–266.
19) Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge-creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*. Oxford University Press.
20) Polanyi, M. (1966). *The tacit dimension*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.
21) Shollo, A., & Galliers, R. D. (2016). Towards an understanding of the role of business intelligence systems in organisational knowing. *Information Systems Journal, 26*(4), 339–367.
22) Treem, J. W., & Leonardi, P. M. (2013). Social media use in organizations: Exploring the affordances of visibility, editability, persistence, and association. *Communication Yearbook, 36*, 143–189.
23) Wang, S., & Noe, R. A. (2010). Knowledge sharing: A review and directions for future research. *Human Resource Management Review, 20*(2), 115–131.
24) Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge University Press.