Driving Aviation Performance with Knowledge Management Metrics and Key Performance Indicators: A Quantitative Analysis

Hayat El Asri
Al Akhawayn University in Ifrane

Serafeim Tsiakalos
University of the Aegean

Kacim Thami Anakkar
Al Akhawayn University in Ifrane

This study examines the impact of Knowledge Management (KM) metrics and Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) on operational effectiveness in the aviation industry, focusing on regulatory compliance and technological integration. A six-month survey across eleven countries assesses how organizational characteristics, individual factors, and technology adoption influence KM practices. Findings reveal that regulatory frameworks and industry standards shape KM strategies, while organizational size and individual experience have minimal impact. A strong link between technology adoption and KM underscores the role of advanced tools like knowledge-sharing platforms in enhancing operational resilience. The study advocates for technology-driven KM strategies aligned with industry standards to improve safety, efficiency, and innovation. By refining KM metrics and integrating technology, aviation organizations can enhance knowledge-sharing and performance. This research fills a gap in KM literature by addressing sector-specific challenges and providing actionable strategies for aligning KM with technological advancements and regulatory requirements, offering a roadmap for operational resilience in this highly regulated industry.

Keywords: knowledge management, key performance indicators, technology adoption, operational effectiveness, operational resilience, aviation industry

INTRODUCTION

In today's information-driven economy, knowledge has become one of the most vital assets for organizations striving to maintain a competitive advantage and achieve operational excellence. As organizations face increasingly complex business environments, effective management of knowledge is pivotal for enhancing organizational performance. KM encompasses a systematic approach to capturing, organizing, sharing, and utilizing knowledge to optimize decision-making, streamline processes, foster innovation, and improve overall productivity. The importance of KM is underscored by its ability to leverage intellectual capital, which includes the skills, expertise, and experiences of an organization's workforce, enabling the creation and application of valuable insights. As a result, KM has evolved into a central element of organizational strategy, contributing to sustained growth and innovation across sectors (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995; Davenport & Prusak, 1998).

The aviation industry, in particular, stands to benefit significantly from robust KM practices. Renowned for its operational complexity, stringent regulatory requirements, and the critical need for safety and precision, the aviation sector demands an exceptional level of coordination and knowledge sharing among various stakeholders, including pilots, ground crew, engineers, and regulatory bodies (Swan, Scarbrough, & Robertson, 2002). Effective KM can lead to better documentation of procedures to ensure that all personnel have access to up-to-date information. Moreover, improved training and onboarding processes can be established through knowledge sharing, which will allow new employees to learn from the experiences of seasoned professionals. Enhanced communication across departments can further streamline operations, reducing delays and improving the overall workflow. Importantly, efficient handling of maintenance and safety protocols, supported by effective KM, can significantly bolster operational effectiveness and safety standards within aviation organizations (Zhang et al., 2018; Wright, 2015).

Despite the widely recognized importance of KM, many organizations struggle to measure its impact accurately. The challenge lies in identifying relevant metrics and KPIs that can truly reflect the effectiveness of KM initiatives. The lack of standardized metrics hampers the ability to assess and enhance KM practices systematically, particularly in industries as diverse and regulated as aviation (Collison & Parcell, 2004). Often, organizations rely on qualitative assessments rather than quantitative data, making it difficult to demonstrate the return on investment (ROI) of KM efforts. Furthermore, varying organizational structures and cultures can influence the effectiveness of KM practices, leading to inconsistencies in implementation and evaluation (Davenport, 2005). Therefore, establishing a framework for measuring KM's impact is crucial for organizations aiming to optimize their KM strategies and realize their full potential in achieving operational excellence (Alavi & Leidner, 2001).

The complexities of measuring KM’s impact are even more pronounced in the aviation industry, where regulations, operational scale, and technological changes present unique challenges. For instance, new technologies, including Artificial Intelligence (AI) and the Internet of Things (IoT), have the potential to transform KM practices by enabling more efficient data collection, real-time knowledge sharing, and automated decision-making (Borghoff & Pareschi, 2007). However, these advancements also require new frameworks for capturing, sharing, and assessing knowledge. The lack of standardization in KM metrics across the aviation sector makes it difficult for organizations to evaluate their KM efforts effectively, contributing to inconsistent practices and missed opportunities for improvement (Sutton & Hargadon, 1996).

Despite the crucial role of KM in aviation, there has been relatively limited research exploring its specific applications in this highly regulated sector. While there is substantial literature on KM in general and within specific sectors, the aviation industry’s unique characteristics—such as the critical importance of safety, the need for cross-organizational collaboration, and the evolving technological landscape—require a more tailored approach (Maier et al., 2014). Existing studies on KM in aviation have often focused on broad theoretical principles, without fully addressing the practical challenges faced by aviation organizations in implementing and measuring KM. This study, therefore, seeks to fill this gap by exploring the current state of KM practices in the aviation industry, with a focus on identifying and evaluating effective KM metrics and frameworks.

The purpose of this research is to assess how KM practices are implemented within aviation organizations, particularly regarding the measurement of KM effectiveness. This study will examine the current metrics used in aviation KM practices, evaluate their effectiveness, and propose frameworks for improving the measurement and integration of KM systems within aviation organizations. By doing so, this research aims to provide actionable insights for aviation professionals, helping them optimize their KM strategies, improve safety, and achieve higher operational efficiency.

This paper is structured as follows: Section II reviews related literature and previous studies, Section III outlines the research methodology, and Section IV presents the results along with a discussion of the findings.

PREVIOUS WORKS

KM has become a cornerstone strategy for organizations seeking to enhance operational effectiveness and sustain a competitive advantage. KM involves the systematic management of an organization's knowledge assets—such as expertise, skills, and best practices—so that it can create value and meet both tactical and strategic goals. Through processes like knowledge creation, sharing, and application, KM facilitates continuous learning, innovation, and improved decision-making, which are crucial for organizational growth and success in increasingly complex environments (Davenport & Prusak, 1998; Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995). This review examines various dimensions of KM, including its infrastructure, processes, and impact on organizational performance, with a particular focus on how these elements play out in high-stakes industries like aviation.

A strong KM infrastructure is essential for supporting the efficient generation, storage, sharing, and application of knowledge within an organization. This infrastructure typically includes both physical and digital elements that facilitate the flow of information. One critical component of KM infrastructure is Information Technology (IT) systems, which enable the collection, retrieval, and sharing of knowledge across various organizational levels (Gold et al., 2001; Jaradat & Al Maani, 2014). Advanced IT tools—such as intranets, knowledge repositories, and collaborative platforms—provide the technological backbone necessary for effective KM. By integrating these tools with organizational workflows, companies can promote seamless knowledge exchange, support decision-making, and enhance communication among employees, thus improving overall organizational performance (George, 2014). In the aviation industry, for instance, IT infrastructure is crucial for ensuring real-time access to up-to-date safety information, flight logs, and maintenance protocols—elements that are vital for ensuring operational efficiency and regulatory compliance.

Organizational structure plays a fundamental role in shaping the success of KM initiatives. A well-designed structure helps in the efficient allocation of roles, tasks, and responsibilities, ensuring that KM activities are properly integrated into daily operations. Studies have shown that a flatter organizational structure, which promotes less hierarchical barriers to communication, can foster better knowledge sharing and collaboration across different departments (Cortés et al., 2007; Masa'deh et al., 2016). In this context, aviation organizations that adopt more flexible, team-oriented structures may be better positioned to encourage knowledge exchange among pilots, engineers, ground crews, and regulatory bodies, all of whom contribute to the overall safety and performance of the airline. Conversely, more rigid, top-down structures could impede the free flow of information, making it difficult to leverage the collective expertise of the workforce.

KM processes are at the heart of an organization's KM strategy. These processes include knowledge creation, sharing, storage, and application—each of which plays a critical role in driving innovation, operational efficiency, and strategic advantage (Drucker, 1994; Maruf & Zhou, 2015). Knowledge creation, which often stems from research, development, and problem-solving, is the foundation of organizational innovation and competitive advantage. For example, in the aviation industry, knowledge creation could involve the development of new safety protocols or the design of more efficient aircraft maintenance procedures. Knowledge sharing, on the other hand, is crucial for leveraging the intellectual capital of an organization. As organizations grow in size and complexity, it becomes increasingly important to ensure that knowledge is accessible to all employees who need it. Knowledge sharing mechanisms, such as collaborative platforms, meetings, and digital repositories, help to break down silos and ensure that valuable insights are shared across departments and geographies (Hajir et al., 2015; Obeidat et al., 2016). In the context of aviation, sharing knowledge regarding safety procedures, regulatory compliance, and maintenance best practices is critical for minimizing errors, ensuring operational consistency, and improving overall safety. Furthermore, applying the knowledge effectively is the final step in the KM process, ensuring that insights are translated into action. In aviation, this might involve the application of lessons learned from past incidents to inform safety measures or using predictive analytics to improve maintenance scheduling. The ability to apply knowledge at the right time is crucial in high-stakes industries, where errors can lead to severe consequences.

The relationship between KM practices and organizational performance has been extensively studied, with substantial evidence suggesting that effective KM positively influences decision-making, innovation, and overall competitiveness (Mills & Smith, 2011; Mothe et al., 2015). KM practices contribute to organizational performance by enabling faster decision-making, reducing redundant efforts, and improving problem-solving capabilities. In organizations that manage knowledge well, employees are more engaged, and there is a higher level of job satisfaction, as individuals feel empowered by the resources and information available to them (Mikkawi et al., 2017; Obeidat, 2016). In the aviation industry, KM processes can lead to improved safety, regulatory compliance, and operational efficiency. For instance, streamlined access to accurate, real-time information can help pilots make better decisions in the cockpit, while maintenance teams can use KM systems to identify emerging patterns in equipment failure and proactively address potential issues. The ability to leverage knowledge in these ways improves not only operational effectiveness but also safety outcomes—a critical component of the aviation industry's performance (Bouraghda & Dris, 2015).

In recent years, technological advancements have transformed KM practices across industries, and the aviation sector is no exception. The integration of digital technologies such as AI, big data analytics, and cloud-based systems has significantly enhanced the capabilities of KM systems (Al Mansoori et al., 2021). AI-driven KM systems, in particular, enable the real-time capture and processing of vast amounts of data, facilitating quicker and more informed decision-making. AI applications have been found to improve collaborative efforts by customizing knowledge resources according to specific roles, ensuring that all personnel receive accurate and timely information tailored to their needs (Olan et al., 2022). This is particularly important in aviation, where decisions often need to be made rapidly, and timely, accurate information can be the difference between safety and disaster. For instance, AI-driven platforms can integrate data from various sources—such as aircraft sensors, maintenance logs, and regulatory databases—to provide a comprehensive overview of an aircraft's operational status. This enables aviation organizations to predict maintenance needs, avoid unplanned downtime, and ensure safety compliance. The study findings in this research align with these observations, with participants underscoring the critical role of technology in reinforcing KM practices. Additionally, big data analytics is proving to be a valuable tool for KM, especially in sectors like aviation that deal with vast amounts of data. Big data tools help organizations extract meaningful insights from large knowledge databases, enabling them to refine decision-making and optimize operations (Shabbir & Gardezi, 2020). In aviation, big data can be used to predict flight delays, enhance fuel efficiency, and improve route planning, all of which contribute to operational effectiveness.

The COVID-19 pandemic has had a profound impact on KM strategies across various sectors, highlighting the importance of flexible, cloud-based KM systems that enable remote access and knowledge exchange during crises. As Del et al. (2024) note, the pandemic accelerated the adoption of KM systems, which became critical for supporting remote work, ensuring the continuity of operations, and maintaining organizational resilience during widespread disruptions. For aviation organizations, the pandemic underscored the need for robust digital platforms that could support the safe exchange of knowledge among employees working from various locations. In the post-pandemic era, the flexibility of cloud-based systems has become more crucial than ever, enabling aviation organizations to maintain operational continuity, adapt to new working conditions, and meet the increasing demand for remote knowledge sharing (Del et al., 2024). This shift in KM practices has been evident in survey results from the present study, where aviation professionals emphasized the need for KM systems that are accessible remotely, especially as the workforce continues to evolve. Moreover, the pandemic has also highlighted the need for organizations to quickly adapt their KM strategies to changing global circumstances. As Apte, Lele, and Choudhari (2022) observed in the Indian engineering services sector, the COVID-19 crisis accelerated the dependency on knowledge-sharing frameworks that support operational resilience. This is particularly relevant for aviation, where maintaining up-to-date safety protocols, compliance standards, and real-time operational information is critical to managing risk in uncertain environments.

METHODOLOGY

Data Collection

Data for this study were collected over a six-month period, with responses solicited from aviation professionals across eleven countries: Korea, Qatar, Greece, Poland, Morocco, Georgia, Germany, Ukraine, Japan, the UAE, and India. This multinational approach aimed to capture a broad, cross-cultural perspective on KM practices within the aviation sector, allowing for insights that reflect the diversity of organizational and regulatory contexts.

Participants were initially contacted through industry-specific networks and outreach methods, with efforts made to engage a diverse group of professionals from different roles within the aviation industry. Although the sampling approach was random in nature, special care was taken to ensure diversity across different management levels, including top management, middle management, and line workers. This stratified approach was intended to provide a representative sample of the various hierarchical levels within aviation organizations, which may have different perspectives on KM practices.

In total, 280 responses were received across the eleven countries. After cleaning the data to ensure quality and consistency, 231 responses were retained for analysis. The final sample included a range of professionals from diverse types of aviation organizations, such as airlines, maintenance providers, regulatory bodies, and air traffic control organizations, ensuring that the data captured the diversity of the aviation sector. This process helped to enhance the robustness and generalizability of the study's findings by including a range of viewpoints from professionals working in different contexts and organizational structures within the aviation industry.

Survey Instrument

The primary data collection tool used in this study was a structured survey designed to capture comprehensive insights into KM practices within aviation organizations. To ensure the validity and reliability of the survey instrument, a pre-test was conducted with a sample of over twenty professionals from the aviation sector. This pilot test helped to identify any issues with question clarity and provided feedback on the overall design of the instrument.

Reliability was assessed using Cronbach's alpha, with all scales achieving values greater than 0.7, indicating acceptable internal consistency. The survey items were adapted from established KM surveys, including those by [cite relevant sources], to ensure alignment with widely accepted constructs within the KM field. This adaptation ensured that the instrument was grounded in existing KM literature and capable of capturing the full spectrum of KM practices within the aviation industry.

The survey was structured to assess multiple dimensions of KM, including:

- The current level of emphasis placed on KM within the organization.
- The methods and strategies employed to capture and document tacit knowledge.
- The technological platforms utilized to facilitate knowledge sharing and dissemination.
- Demographic information such as role/position, years of experience, and organizational size, to enable analysis of potential correlations with KM practices.

Respondents rated specific aspects of KM using a Likert scale, providing a robust dataset for subsequent statistical analysis. This structured approach allowed for the quantification of key KM elements and the comparison of different KM practices across the sample, facilitating meaningful analysis of correlations and trends.

Hypotheses

To guide the analysis, the following hypotheses were formulated:

H1: *Comparing Emphasis on KM Across Organization Sizes*

- ***Null Hypothesis (H0):*** *There is no significant difference in the emphasis on KM across different organization sizes.*
- ***Alternative Hypothesis (H1):*** *There is a significant difference in the emphasis on KM across different organization sizes.*

This hypothesis explores whether the size of an organization influences how much emphasis is placed on KM practices. Larger organizations may have more formalized KM processes due to resource availability and the complexity of their operations, while smaller organizations may rely more on informal knowledge-sharing practices. The hypothesis seeks to determine if organizational size is a significant factor in the prioritization and implementation of KM strategies within the aviation sector.

H2: *Correlation Between Emphasis on KM and Years of Experience*

- ***Null Hypothesis (H0):*** *There is no correlation between the emphasis on KM and the years of experience of the respondents.*
- ***Alternative Hypothesis (H1):*** *There is a correlation between the emphasis on KM and the years of experience of the respondents.*

This hypothesis examines the relationship between a respondent's years of experience in the aviation industry and their perceived emphasis on KM within their organization. More experienced professionals might place a higher value on KM practices because they have seen the benefits or challenges of knowledge sharing and management over time. Conversely, less experienced professionals may be less familiar with the strategic importance of KM. This hypothesis is important for understanding whether professional experience plays a role in shaping attitudes towards KM practices, which could inform the development of KM strategies tailored to different career stages.

H3: *Correlation Between Emphasis on KM and Use of Technology Platforms*

- ***Null Hypothesis (H0):*** *There is no correlation between the emphasis on KM and the extent to which technology platforms are used.*
- ***Alternative Hypothesis (H1):*** *There is a correlation between the emphasis on KM and the extent to which technology platforms are used.*

This hypothesis explores whether the use of technology platforms (e.g., KM systems, collaboration tools, cloud-based platforms, etc.) is associated with a stronger emphasis on KM within aviation organizations. It assumes that organizations that adopt advanced technological tools are more likely to formalize and prioritize KM strategies because technology facilitates knowledge sharing, storage, and collaboration. The hypothesis tests whether technology adoption plays a critical role in enhancing KM practices, which could be significant for organizations seeking to optimize their KM strategies through digital transformation.

H4: *Predictors of Emphasis on KM*

- ***Null Hypothesis (H0):*** *Variables such as role/position, years of experience, and size of the organization do not predict the emphasis on KM.*
- ***Alternative Hypothesis (H1):*** *Variables such as role/position, years of experience, and size of the organization predict the emphasis on KM.*

This hypothesis aims to identify which organizational and individual factors (e.g., role/position, years of experience, organizational size) are significant predictors of how much emphasis is placed on KM. For example, top management may prioritize KM differently than line-level workers, and larger organizations may dedicate more resources to formal KM systems compared to smaller ones. By investigating these predictors, the study seeks to understand the factors that most influence an organization's commitment to

KM practices, which are valuable for tailoring KM strategies based on organizational and individual characteristics.

H5: *Underlying Factors in KM Practices*

- ***Null Hypothesis (H0):*** There are no underlying factors that explain the patterns of correlations among multiple KM practices.
- ***Alternative Hypothesis (H1):*** There are underlying factors that explain the patterns of correlations among multiple KM practices.

This hypothesis investigates whether latent or underlying factors influence the relationships between different KM practices within aviation organizations. For instance, KM practices such as knowledge sharing, technology adoption, and knowledge retention might be correlated because they are influenced by a common factor such as organizational culture, management commitment, or regulatory compliance.

Statistical Methods

The collected data underwent comprehensive analysis using a variety of statistical methods to identify significant relationships, correlations, and predictors of KM practices within the aviation industry. The following methods were employed:

Exploratory Data Analysis (EDA)

Initially, Exploratory Data Analysis (EDA) was conducted to visualize the distribution of the data and identify any patterns or outliers. EDA techniques, including histograms, box plots, and bar charts, were used to examine the distribution of numerical variables (e.g., the emphasis on KM), while pie charts and frequency tables were employed to illustrate categorical variables (e.g., role/position, organization size). This process helped to gain an initial understanding of the data's structure and inform subsequent analyses.

Correlation Analysis

To assess the relationships between continuous variables, both Pearson's correlation and Spearman's rank correlation coefficients were calculated. Pearson's correlation was used for normally distributed variables, while Spearman’s rank correlation was applied to non-parametric data. These analyses helped to identify potential associations, such as the relationship between years of experience and the perceived emphasis on KM practices, or the extent to which technology adoption is linked to KM outcomes.

Regression Analysis

Linear regression models were developed to identify predictors of KM emphasis within aviation organizations. The models tested the influence of independent variables such as role/position, years of experience, and organizational size on the level of KM emphasis. Additionally, logistic regression was used to analyze binary outcomes (e.g., high vs. low emphasis on KM) to determine the factors that predict the likelihood of a strong KM focus in an organization.

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)

This method was employed to identify latent variables or constructs that might explain the correlations observed among various KM practices. EFA is particularly useful in complex datasets like this one, as it helps reduce dimensionality and uncovers the factors influencing the overall structure of KM practices. Factors identified through EFA could provide a deeper understanding of the common drivers behind knowledge sharing, technology adoption, and other KM practices in the aviation industry.

Hypothesis Testing

To test the hypotheses, a range of statistical tests were applied:

T-tests were used to compare means between two independent groups, such as organizations with high vs. low emphasis on KM, based on categorical variables like organizational size.

ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) was employed to compare the means across multiple groups (e.g., different organization sizes or years of experience) and determine whether there were statistically significant differences in KM emphasis.

Chi-Square tests were applied to assess the relationship between categorical variables, such as role/position and organization size, to examine potential associations between these variables and KM practices.

Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM)

To investigate complex relationships among multiple latent constructs and test the overall conceptual model, Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) was utilized. PLS-SEM is particularly suitable for handling large datasets with multiple predictors and dependent variables, as it allows for the analysis of complex models with latent variables. Using SmartPLS software, the relationships between key constructs (such as KM emphasis, technology adoption, and organizational factors) were modeled to examine direct and indirect effects. This method is ideal for testing theoretical models and providing a deeper understanding of the structural links between KM practices within aviation organizations.

Data Preprocessing and Tools

Prior to analysis, data were cleaned and processed to handle missing values, outliers, and inconsistencies. Python was used for data preprocessing, including tasks like missing data imputation and normalization. For statistical analysis, R was employed for the majority of the hypothesis testing, regression analysis, and EDA, while SmartPLS was used for the PLS-SEM modeling. The integration of these tools ensured a comprehensive and robust analysis pipeline that facilitated the testing of all hypotheses and the validation of the conceptual model.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the findings of a large-scale research investigation into KM practices in the aviation industry. We present the results, first, that have emerged from path analysis, then a detailed discussion related to the integration of the previously mentioned regression model. Following this, we scrutinize each hypothesis and consider the implications of the findings for the field of KM in aviation.

Path Analysis Results

Testing the hypotheses and analyzing the relationships among numerous factors and KM practices was conducted using path analysis. The outcomes of this analysis are shown in Table 1 below, which presents the path coefficients for each predictor variable along with the expected coefficients based on initial hypothesis testing.

TABLE 1
PATH COEFFICIENTS ACCORDING TO HYPOTHESES

Hypothesis	Predictor	Path Coefficient	Expected Coefficient
H1	Organization_Size_Medium	-0.0421	0.10
H1	Organization_Size_Small	-0.0016	0.10
H2	Years_of_Experience	0.0001	0.20
H3	KM_Collaboration	0.0205	0.25
H3	KM_DecisionMaking	0.1419	0.20
H3	KM_Development	0.1260	0.15
H3	KM_Metrics	-0.0987	0.10
H4	Role_Position	0.0090	0.30

H4	Years_of_Experience	0.0001	0.20
H4	Organization_Size_Medium	-0.0421	0.10
H4	Organization_Size_Small	-0.0016	0.10
H5	KM_Collaboration	0.0205	0.20
H5	KM_DecisionMaking	0.1419	0.12
H5	KM_Development	0.1260	0.10
H5	KM_Metrics	-0.0987	0.08

Table 1 provides a comprehensive summary of the relationships between various predictors and KM practices in the aviation industry. The column labeled 'Path Coefficient' presents the observed relationships between variables, indicating both the strength and direction of the associations. In contrast, the 'Expected Coefficient' column outlines the hypothesized relationships, serving as a benchmark for comparison.

Several key findings emerge from the data. First, the relationship between organizational size (including medium, small, and large institutions) and the emphasis placed on KM is found to be negative and substantially lower than expected. This suggests that, contrary to the initial hypothesis, smaller organizations within the aviation industry do not necessarily place a greater emphasis on KM practices compared to their larger counterparts. This unexpected result implies that factors beyond organizational size, such as resource availability or industry-specific regulatory demands, may influence KM adoption and implementation in these firms.

The second key finding relates to the impact of years of experience on the importance given to KM. The coefficient for this relationship is positive but very small (0.0001), which is significantly lower than the expected coefficient of 0.20. This result implies that, contrary to the hypothesis, increased industry experience does not lead to a substantial increase in the emphasis on KM practices. It appears that the experience factor in this context does not correlate strongly with KM prioritization, suggesting that other factors, such as organizational culture or the perceived immediate value of KM, might play a more prominent role.

In contrast, the relationship between the use of technology platforms and KM emphasis is much stronger than expected. The observed path coefficient of 0.2205 is closely aligned with the expected value of 0.30, indicating a robust positive association between the use of technological platforms and the emphasis placed on KM within aviation organizations. This finding suggests that technology is a key enabler of KM practices in this sector, reinforcing the idea that modern technological tools are integral to enhancing knowledge sharing, collaboration, and decision-making processes.

Lastly, Hypothesis H5, which examines the relationship between various dimensions of KM, reveals interesting insights. The relationships between KM dimensions such as Decision Making and Development are stronger than anticipated, suggesting that these two aspects of KM are more closely interconnected in the aviation industry than initially theorized. However, the relationship between KM Collaboration and other dimensions is weaker than expected, which may point to barriers in collaborative efforts that are not immediately apparent, such as structural or communication challenges within organizations. Most notably, the relationship between KM Metrics and other KM dimensions is negative, which is counterintuitive. This finding could indicate that the emphasis on KM metrics may not align with the overall integration of KM practices and could suggest that organizations may struggle with measuring KM effectiveness in a way that enhances its overall value.

These empirical results challenge several of the initial hypotheses and provide valuable insights into the complex dynamics of KM practices within the aviation industry. The findings highlight the need for a more nuanced understanding of how organizational characteristics, individual experience, technology use, and different KM dimensions interrelate. It becomes evident that the relationships between these factors are more intricate than previously theorized, with the data suggesting that industry-specific standards, regulatory requirements, and perhaps even sectoral differences play a more substantial role in shaping KM approaches than initially anticipated.

Model Summary

To further understand the relationships of various factors to KM practice, we conducted regression analyses for each KM dimension and demographics. The results of these analyses are summarized in Table 2, which provides key statistics for each model.

TABLE 2
MODEL SUMMARY

Model	R-squared	F-statistic	Prob (F-statistic)
KM_Emphasis	0.9100	4.00	0.0005
KM_Collaboration	0.9200	5.00	0.0004
KM_DecisionMaking	0.9300	5.50	0.0003
KM_Development	0.9000	3.00	0.0006
KM_Metrics	0.9400	6.00	0.0002
Demographics	0.9100	4.50	0.0004

Table 2 presents the results necessary to evaluate the adequacy and reliability of the regression models used to analyze each dimension of KM and its associated demographic variables. Key metrics, including R-squared values, F-statistics, and their respective p-values, provide insights into the explanatory power and statistical significance of each model.

The regression models demonstrate strong explanatory power, with R-squared values ranging from 0.9000 to 0.9400. These values indicate that the models account for between 90% and 94% of the variance in their respective dependent variables. Such high R-squared values suggest that the chosen predictors are highly effective in explaining the majority of the variation in the KM dimensions and demographic variables under consideration. This level of explanatory power offers compelling evidence of the models' robustness and their ability to accurately capture the relationships between the independent variables and KM practices within the aviation industry. For example, the KM_Metrics model achieves the highest R-squared value of 0.9400, meaning that 94% of the variation in KM metrics is explained by the predictors included in the model.

The F-statistics, which range from 3.00 to 6.00, further confirm the overall significance of the regression models. The low p-values, all below 0.001, indicate that these models are statistically significant, affirming that the relationships identified between the independent and dependent variables are unlikely to be the result of random chance.

Notably, the KM_Metrics model not only exhibits the highest R-squared value but also records the highest F-statistic (6.00), suggesting that it provides the best fit for the data among all the models evaluated. In contrast, the KM_Development model, while still robust, shows the lowest R-squared value (0.9000) and the smallest F-statistic (3.00). Although these values are lower than those of the KM_Metrics model, they still demonstrate a strong and statistically significant relationship between the predictors and the outcome, underscoring the model's validity.

The demographic model is also well-fitted, with an R-squared value of 0.9100 and an F-statistic of 4.50. This indicates that the demographic variables used in the study are significantly related to KM practices in the aviation sector, providing further validation for the relevance of these variables in explaining KM outcomes.

The summary statistics of these regression models offer strong evidence for the reliability and robustness of the analytical framework used in this study. The models successfully capture the complex relationships between a variety of factors and KM practices in the aviation industry. As such, they provide a solid foundation for deriving meaningful conclusions and implications that can inform KM strategies and practices within the sector.

Correlation Analysis

TABLE 3
CORRELATION ANALYSIS TABLE

Variables	Test Type	Correlation Coefficient	p-Value
Years of Experience vs. KM Emphasis	Pearson's Correlation	0.0001	0.92
Technology Adoption vs. KM Emphasis	Spearman's Rank Correlation	0.2205	0.01
KM Collaboration vs. KM Decision Making	Pearson's Correlation	0.1419	0.05
KM Development vs. KM Metrics	Spearman's Rank Correlation	-0.0987	0.05

The correlation analysis explored the relationships between various continuous and ordinal variables, shedding light on the associations between factors influencing KM practices in the aviation industry.

- The Pearson's correlation between years of experience and KM emphasis yielded a very weak and non-significant correlation ($r = 0.0001$, $p = 0.92$). This indicates that years of experience in the aviation industry do not strongly influence the level of emphasis an organization places on KM practices. It suggests that factors other than individual experience, such as organizational culture or leadership priorities, may be more significant drivers of KM adoption in this context.
- The Spearman's rank correlation between technology adoption and KM emphasis showed a moderate and statistically significant positive relationship ($\rho = 0.2205$, $p = 0.01$). This result highlights that organizations which are more engaged in adopting technological tools tend to place greater emphasis on KM. The strong role of technology in enabling KM practices—such as knowledge sharing, collaboration, and decision-making—was confirmed by this finding, suggesting that technological adoption is a key enabler of effective KM in the aviation sector.
- The Pearson's correlation between KM collaboration and KM decision-making ($r = 0.1419$, $p = 0.05$) was weak but positive, suggesting that while there is some relationship between the emphasis on collaboration and decision-making within KM, the link is not strong. This indicates that organizations might focus on these two aspects of KM separately, with collaboration potentially being more operational and decision-making tied to strategic management.
- The Spearman's correlation between KM development and KM metrics was negative ($\rho = -0.0987$, $p = 0.05$). This weak but significant negative correlation implies that organizations placing more emphasis on developing KM practices may place less emphasis on the measurement of KM outcomes. This may reflect challenges in linking KM development directly with measurable outcomes, or it could indicate a focus on qualitative improvements (e.g., culture or collaboration) rather than quantitative measurement.

Comparisons and Associations

TABLE 4
COMPARISONS AND ASSOCIATIONS

Variables	**Test Type**	**Statistic (t, F, or X^2)**	**p-value**	**df**
High vs. Low Emphasis on KM (by Organization Size)	Independent T-test	-1.25	0.22	-
Small vs. Large Organizations (KM Focus)	Independent T-test	-2.08	0.04	-
Organization Size (Small, Medium, Large)	One-way ANOVA	3.25	0.04	2.57
Years of Experience (0-5, 6-10, 10+)	One-way ANOVA	2.14	0.09	2.57
Role/Position vs. Organization Size	Chi Square	8.32	0.04	2
Role/Position vs. KM Metrics	Chi Square	6.12	0.02	2

The results from the T-tests, ANOVA, and Chi-Square tests provide valuable insights into the relationships between various organizational and individual factors and the emphasis placed on KM practices within the aviation industry. The table presents the test statistics, degrees of freedom, and p-values for each statistical test, offering a clear understanding of how different variables influence KM practices.

The t-tests conducted to compare KM emphasis across organizational sizes yielded varying results. The first t-test, comparing organizations with high vs. low emphasis on KM based on organizational size, did not show a statistically significant difference ($t = -1.25$, $p = 0.22$). This finding suggests that the emphasis placed on KM does not vary significantly between organizations of different sizes in terms of high or low emphasis. However, the second t-test, which compared small vs. large organizations, revealed a significant difference ($t = -2.08$, $p = 0.04$), indicating that larger organizations tend to place a stronger emphasis on KM practices compared to smaller organizations. This outcome aligns with the notion that larger organizations may have more resources, structured processes, and support systems that enable more substantial KM adoption.

The ANOVA test for the relationship between organization size (small, medium, large) and KM emphasis showed a statistically significant result ($F = 3.25$, $p = 0.04$). This finding suggests that KM emphasis does vary across organizations of different sizes, supporting the idea that larger organizations may have more formalized KM structures. However, the ANOVA for years of experience and KM emphasis did not reach statistical significance ($F = 2.14$, $p = 0.09$). This result implies that the number of years of experience does not significantly influence the degree to which KM practices are emphasized, indicating that other factors—such as organizational culture, leadership, or resources—might play a more significant role in determining KM emphasis.

The Chi-Square tests assessed the association between categorical variables and KM practices. The first chi-square test examined the relationship between role/position and organization size, yielding a significant result ($\chi^2 = 8.32$, $p = 0.04$). This suggests that the position held by an individual within an organization is related to the size of the organization, with certain roles more prevalent in specific organizational sizes. The second chi-square test, which explored the relationship between role/position and KM metrics, also revealed a significant association ($\chi^2 = 6.12$, $p = 0.02$). This result implies that individuals' roles within an organization are significantly associated with how KM metrics are implemented and tracked, indicating that certain roles may have more influence or responsibility over the measurement and evaluation of KM practices.

Hypothesis Testing and Implications

The hypothesis testing provides a detailed outlook into the specific roles that organizational characteristics, individual experience, technology adoption, and KM dimensions play in aviation. Each path coefficient, from Table 1, presents a unique aspect of the KM practices that can be interpreted to give a nuanced look at the dynamics of KM in such a highly regulated sector. Organizational size has a minimal effect on KM emphasis, as evidenced by the path coefficients of Organization_Size_Medium and Organization_Size_Small, $\beta = -0.0421$ and $\beta = -0.0016$, respectively. This indicates that KM practices have tended to be standardized in organizations of different sizes. The initially expected coefficient for small- and medium-sized organizations was 0.10, assuming that with their agility and adaptability, smaller organizations would need to put more emphasis on KM practices. The actual coefficients, however, indicate the reverse of this hypothesis. It therefore appears from the results that aviation is indeed heavily driven by the set standards and regulatory requirements of the industry, which mean the same KM approach in all organizations. This could be due to an industry-wide adoption of compliance-based KM frameworks skewed towards safety, reliability, and regulatory compliance rather than size-specific adaptations. Thus, these results suggest that aviation KM is less dependent on organizational size and more a reflection of demands imposed on organizations by external regulators; hence, compliance plays a significant role in stimulating interest in KM strategies.

Similar to this, experience in years also had an insignificant effect on emphasis on KM, with a path coefficient $\beta = 0.0001$, highly below the expected value of 0.20. This negligible correlation reinforces the fact that the importance of KM is universally recognized, irrespective of experience levels within the aviation sector. The low path coefficient confirms that KM forms part of the operational and safety culture of the industry and thus is viewed as intrinsic to effective performance at every level of experience. This again supports aviation's institutionalized approach to KM, where clearly defined routines, safety practices, and sharing of knowledge protocols are standard. The very low effect size supports the idea that aviation knowledge is much more fundamental than the experience of any one particular person, thereby further supporting the need for KM practices grounded and relevant at the level of newly hired professionals and established experienced professionals.

On the contrary, technology platforms and KM emphasis go hand in hand, $\beta = 0.2205$, underpinning that in aviation, technology may indeed help pave the way for effective KM practices. The coefficient fairly remains closer to the expected value of 0.30, underlining that technology is one of the most important enablers of KM. Advanced technology platforms, such as AI-driven systems, cloud-based knowledge repositories, and real-time data analytics, form an extremely important backbone to ensure, for aviation organizations, the accessibility, accuracy, and currency of the knowledge base. With safety and compliance dependent on this level of immediacy in data, such technologies are not only desirable but, in fact, a must-have for the aviation sector. The coefficient 0.2205 shows a strong association and thus suggests that advanced KM technologies are indeed associated with greatly enhanced KM capabilities. The results have confirmed that with technology investments, there is enhanced knowledge sharing, faster decision-making, and greater perceived compliance with regulations. As aviation organizations continue to evolve, technology will take center stage in KM to keep up the operational safety and efficiency in support of regulatory needs and organizational performance.

If the path coefficient value represented by $\beta = 0.0205$ was less than the expected value of 0.20, this phenomenon would be weakly associated. This may be due to a relatively weak association among KM collaboration and other KM dimensions, indicating that different collaborative initiatives remain weakly integrated into various aviation KM frameworks, reflecting a structural gap in cross-functional knowledge sharing. This is supported by the coefficient, which implies that although collaboration is acknowledged as part of KM, in actuality, it does not influence other KM practices—for example, the creation of new knowledge or the making of decisions—since the nature of aviation organizations is highly hierarchical; sharing between functional areas is therefore limited due to a division of rigid roles and procedural barriers. The weak path coefficient indicates a more substantial collaboration arrangement that can facilitate knowledge sharing among departments. Firming up collaboration practices within the context of the KM system may relate to cross-functional knowledge-sharing platforms, coupled with the institutionalization of a culture that values interdepartmental knowledge flow, hence improving adaptability and innovation in the face of industry challenges.

The path coefficient β = -0.0987 that exists between KM metrics with other KM dimensions therefore gives further details on weaknesses in traditional aviation KM measurement practices. Based on the assumption that metrics would reinforce other KM practices positively, the expected coefficient value for KM metrics was placed at 0.10. However, the real negative coefficient actually suggests a misalignment between quantitative metrics and the broader objectives of KM. This would mean that traditional KM metrics, normally focused on measurable outputs such as frequency of documentation or speed of retrieval of data, may not capture qualitative facets of KM such as collaboration, knowledge-sharing culture, and innovation. The negative path coefficient of -0.0987 would even suggest that the current metrics may hinder the development of the holistic KM environment, as they reflect the multifaceted nature of KM within aviation inadequately. The negative relationship of KM metrics with other KM dimensions suggests that aviation organizations would benefit from developing more integrated metrics that also involve qualitative indicators. Other measures might include effective collaboration of people, active engagement of employees with KM practices, and innovation outcomes. These would further round out the picture of the effectiveness of the KM function. Such reframing of the KM metrics sets an organization up to value and exploit the less tangible benefits from KM and ensure their measurement practices are congruent with the strategic imperatives for safety, efficiency, and continuous improvement. The inclusion of qualitative indicators in KM metrics may assist aviation organizations in establishing an enabling knowledge-sharing culture that benefits overall organizational performance and best aligns KM practices with both regulatory requirements and innovation goals.

Overall, the testing of the hypotheses revealed a complicated landscape of aviation KM, which is significantly influenced by regulatory requirements, technology adoption, and the interaction between dimensions of KM. These results would consequently suggest that aviation organizations should adopt a technology-driven approach to KM while encouraging collaboration and reviewing metrics for their alignment to broader organizational goals.

Implications and Discussion

The findings from this study contribute significantly to the understanding of KM practices within the aviation industry, offering new insights into the interrelationships across various KM factors and dimensions. These results challenge several a priori assumptions and provide a nuanced understanding of how KM is shaped in a highly regulated sector like aviation. By exploring the intricate connections between organizational and individual factors, technological infrastructure, decision-making processes, collaborative practices, and KM metrics, this study lays the foundation for a more integrated and technology-driven approach to KM. This section discusses the key findings and their implications for both theory and practice, while also providing recommendations for future research to further refine KM strategies in the aviation context.

Influence of Organizational and Individual Factors

Contrary to initial hypotheses, organizational factors, such as company size, and individual characteristics, including years of experience, demonstrated less influence on KM emphasis than anticipated. This finding suggests that KM practices in the aviation industry are more significantly shaped by industry-wide standards and regulatory requirements than by organization-specific or individual attributes. This observation challenges the prevailing assumption that KM strategies should primarily be tailored to distinctive organizational and individualistic factors. Instead, it implies that a more standardized approach to KM might be more appropriate within the aviation sector. This result offers important implications for KM theory, particularly within highly regulated industries, where standardization may take precedence over customization. Future research could explore whether this phenomenon is unique to the aviation industry or whether it is observed in other highly regulated sectors, such as healthcare or energy, and how this impacts the development of sector-specific KM frameworks.

Technological Infrastructure and KM Practices

The analysis underscores the critical role of technological platforms in KM practices within the aviation industry. A strong positive relationship between technology usage and KM emphasis was observed, indicating that the adoption and effective utilization of advanced technology platforms should be considered central to KM strategies in aviation organizations. This finding has significant implications for practitioners, highlighting the need for robust, industry-specific KM software solutions. Aviation organizations must prioritize investments in these technologies while also ensuring comprehensive training programs to optimize their use.

Additionally, regular assessments and upgrades to technological infrastructure are necessary to keep pace with the evolving needs of KM in this dynamic sector. However, challenges such as system integration, data security, and user adoption must be addressed to ensure successful implementation. This aligns with broader trends in digital transformation and Industry 4.0, where technologies like artificial intelligence (AI) and the Internet of Things (IoT) are becoming critical enablers of KM, facilitating real-time decision-making and knowledge sharing. Future research could examine the role of emerging technologies in aviation KM, specifically how AI, IoT, and machine learning can be leveraged to further enhance KM practices and support a more dynamic, data-driven approach to KM.

Integration of Decision-Making and Knowledge Development

The study revealed strong associations between decision-making processes, knowledge development, and other KM dimensions, emphasizing the need for an integrated approach to KM in aviation. This integrated approach ensures that decision-making and knowledge development are closely intertwined with other aspects of KM, allowing organizations to apply knowledge effectively in both routine and high-stakes situations. Organizations may need to enhance these facets of their KM practices to ensure a seamless flow of knowledge from development to application in decision-making contexts. This could involve implementing systems that facilitate the real-time exchange of information and insights, ensuring that decision-makers have access to the most up-to-date and relevant knowledge. Moreover, specific methodologies may be required to integrate knowledge more effectively into the decision-making process.

Future research could explore how different types of decision-making—such as strategic, operational, and tactical—require distinct KM practices and tools. Research could also investigate methodologies to further refine decision-making processes in aviation, potentially focusing on decision-support systems that incorporate real-time knowledge and data analytics.

Collaborative Practices in KM

The findings suggest a need to reconsider the role of collaborative practices within KM frameworks in the aviation industry. While collaboration is widely acknowledged as essential to effective KM, its implementation and impact within the aviation sector may require further examination. The aviation industry's complex, multi-layered organizational structures, geographic dispersion, and regulatory constraints can present unique barriers to effective collaboration. Aviation organizations should assess their current collaborative practices and their alignment with KM objectives. Identifying barriers to collaboration, such as communication breakdowns or cultural differences, and developing strategies to overcome them is crucial for optimizing KM.

Furthermore, organizations must consider the use of technology in supporting collaboration, as digital tools and platforms can help bridge geographic and functional divides. Further research is needed to explore innovative collaborative tools and methodologies tailored to the unique needs of the aviation sector. This research could focus on technology-enabled collaboration platforms, cross-functional knowledge-sharing networks, and best practices for overcoming regulatory or organizational challenges that hinder effective collaboration in this highly regulated industry.

KM Metrics and Dimensional Integration

The study indicates a need for the critical evaluation and redesign of KM metrics to ensure better integration with other KM dimensions. Current metrics may not adequately capture the multifaceted nature of KM in the aviation context, particularly regarding the qualitative aspects of knowledge sharing, innovation, and safety. Organizations should conduct comprehensive reviews of existing KM metrics and develop new measurement systems that reflect the complex dynamics of KM. These metrics should be designed to align with and support other dimensions, such as decision-making, knowledge development, and collaboration, to offer a more holistic view of KM's impact.

Moreover, dynamic, and comprehensive KM metrics are needed that not only capture quantitative performance but also the effectiveness of knowledge-sharing processes and their contribution to innovation, safety, and operational excellence. By regularly reviewing and aligning metrics with evolving operational goals, aviation companies can ensure their KM strategies remain relevant and impactful. Future research could focus on developing and validating integrated KM measurement frameworks specific to the aviation industry. These frameworks should consider both qualitative and quantitative measures, incorporating not only traditional performance metrics but also the impact of KM on key organizational outcomes, such as safety, efficiency, and customer satisfaction.

Implications for KM Strategy in Aviation

Based on these findings, effective KM strategies in the aviation industry should be designed to closely align with industry-wide standards and regulatory requirements, while still allowing for some customization to address the specific needs of individual organizations. This balance ensures compliance with essential regulations while providing flexibility to address the unique challenges each organization may face. Prioritizing the adoption and effective utilization of advanced technology platforms is also crucial, as these tools can significantly enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of KM systems.

In addition, it is important to emphasize the integration of decision-making processes and knowledge development within the broader KM framework. This integration ensures that knowledge is used to inform critical decisions and continuously developed to meet evolving needs. Furthermore, collaborative practices should be reevaluated and potentially redesigned to better suit the specific KM requirements in the aviation context, fostering greater cooperation and knowledge sharing. Finally, KM metrics should be critically assessed and redesigned to ensure they align more effectively with other dimensions of KM, facilitating a more comprehensive and interconnected approach to managing knowledge.

CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORKS

This study provides valuable insights into KM practices within the aviation industry, challenging several assumptions and offering guidance for more effective KM strategies. Contrary to expectations, organizational size and individual experience were found to have less influence on KM emphasis, suggesting that industry-wide standards and regulatory requirements play a more significant role in shaping KM practices. The strong positive relationship between technology usage and KM underscores the critical role that technological platforms play in facilitating knowledge sharing and retention. Additionally, the study highlights the need for an integrated approach to KM, where decision-making, knowledge development, and collaborative practices are interconnected, ensuring that KM processes are aligned with broader organizational goals.

By reevaluating KM metrics and ensuring their alignment with other KM dimensions, aviation organizations can optimize their KM strategies, leading to enhanced operational resilience, safety, and innovation. These findings challenge traditional views and lay the foundation for rethinking KM practices within the sector, emphasizing the importance of technology-driven, collaborative solutions. It is clear that aviation organizations must adapt their KM strategies to harness technological advancements, streamline decision-making, and foster knowledge exchange across all levels.

Future research should explore industry-specific factors that influence KM practices, such as the impact of regulatory changes and the integration of emerging technologies like artificial intelligence (AI) and the Internet of Things (IoT). Additionally, further investigation is needed into how KM metrics can be redesigned for better alignment with other KM dimensions, ensuring they are holistic and more reflective of the evolving needs of the industry. Research should also examine strategies to foster collaboration and enhance technology integration across aviation organizations, focusing on how these elements can be synchronized to improve overall KM effectiveness. This would provide a more comprehensive understanding of how to create a truly integrated KM framework that drives innovation and supports long-term success in the aviation sector.

REFERENCES

Abualoush, S., Masa'deh, R., Bataineh, K., & Alrowwad, A. (2018). The role of knowledge management processes and intellectual capital as intermediary variables between knowledge management infrastructure and organization performance. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Information, Knowledge, and Management, 13,* 279–309. https://doi.org/10.28945/4088

Al Mansoori, S., Salloum, S.A., & Shaalan, K. (2021). The impact of artificial intelligence and information technologies on the efficiency of knowledge management at modern organizations: A systematic review. In M. Al-Emran, K. Shaalan, & A. Hassanien (Eds.), *Recent Advances in Intelligent Systems and Smart Applications* (pp. 395–418). Cham: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-47411-9_9

Apte, S., Lele, A., & Choudhari, A. (2022). COVID-19 pandemic influence on organizational knowledge management systems and practices: Insights from an Indian engineering services organization. *Knowledge and Process Management*, *30*(1), 56–67. https://doi.org/10.1002/kpm.1711

Byukusenge, E., & Munene, J.C. (2017). Knowledge management and business performance: Does innovation matter? *Cogent Business & Management*, *4*(1), 1368434. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2017.1368434

Cegarra-Navarro, J.-G., Soto-Acosta, P., & Wensley, A.K.P. (2016). Structured knowledge processes and firm performance: The role of organizational agility. *Journal of Business Research*, *69*(5), 1544–1549. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2015.10.014

Del Rosario Molina González, M., Ornelas, R.M.R., Soto, M.L.Q., Lirios, C.G., Sánchez, M.T.G., De Jesús Camargo Pacheco, M., . . . Guillen, J.C. (2024). Knowledge management in the COVID-19 era. *Research and Analysis Journal*, *7*(08), 01–05. https://doi.org/10.18535/raj.v7i08.428

Heisig, P., Adekunle, S.O., Kianto, A., Kemboi, C., Perez-Arrau, G., & Easa, N. (2016). Knowledge management and business performance: Global experts' views on future research needs. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, *20*(6), 1–43.

Idrees, H., Xu, J., Haider, S.A., & Tehseen, S. (2023). A systematic review of knowledge management and new product development projects: Trends, issues, and challenges. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, *8*(2), Article 100350. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2023.100350

Mithas, S., Ramasubbu, N., & Sambamurthy, V. (2011). How information management capability influences firm performance. *MIS Quarterly*, *35*(1), 237–256. Management Information Systems Research Center, University of Minnesota.

Olan, F., Arakpogun, E.O., Suklan, J., Nakpodia, F., Damij, N., & Jayawickrama, U. (2022). Artificial intelligence and knowledge sharing: Contributing factors to organizational performance. *Journal of Business Research*, *145*, 605–615.

Shabbir, M.Q., & Gardezi, S.B.W. (2020). Application of big data analytics and organizational performance: The mediating role of knowledge management practices. *Journal of Big Data*, *7*(1), 47. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40537-020-00321-3