GLOBAL ACADEMIC RESEARCH INSTITUTE

COLOMBO, SRI LANKA

GARI International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research

Author: H. D. Rathnayake, D. Herath

IIC University of Technology, Cambodia; ESOFT Metro Campus, Sri Lanka

A COMPREHENSIVE JOURNAL ANALYSIS ON THE ENTANGLEMENT OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE ON KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT PRACTICES WITHIN ORGANIZATIONS

Rathnayake H.D., Herath D.

IIC University of Technology, Cambodia;

ESOFT Metro Campus, Sri Lanka

ABSTRACT

It is an undeniable truth that an organization's ability to survive depends on its ability to manage its intellectual capital and measure knowledge, which highlights the fact that KM has developed into a valuable resource for commercial organizations. Numerous studies have been published on the impact of organizational culture on knowledge management. The goal of this research is to evaluate, summarize, compare, and contrast all of the published studies in one location and to develop a cogent theoretical framework that pinpoints the cultural factors that affect knowledge management. 26 published reviews are found, evaluated, and analyzed through an inductive procedure. The results of the systematic journal review are based on trends found by comparing diverse scholars' points of view from research done in various situations. The characteristics of organizational culture that are most frequently mentioned are 1) trust, 3) communication, 4) rewards, 5) collaboration, 6) organization structure and 6) leadership. Researchers' findings about the impact of rewards schemes on knowledge management are conflicting. The study further confirmed that flat organizational structures, clear rewards, transformational leadership, and a culture of team cooperation enhance knowledge management, and that it is the responsibility of leaders to uphold employee trust, which in turn influences knowledge management.

Keywords: organizational culture, knowledge management

INTRODUCTION

The rapid changes of the economy enforced the business to restructure and build a global identify which supported through the organizational knowledge and KM (Knowledge Management) claimed as invisible power in any business organization. It is inevitable that organization survival depends on proper management of intellectual capital and measuring knowledge which emphasizes that KM has become an asset and wealth to the business organization.

The creation and dissemination of the knowledge has become imperative in this competitive business world to exist in the business and to gain the sustainable competitive advantage. The organizational knowledge thrives the performance of organization in various ways. There is a visible growth of knowledge workers past decade who capture, creates, and share knowledge in organization. The employees or the knowledge workers has a strong relationship between them and the organization culture which boosts the knowledge dissemination. The organizational culture has an influence of the culture of the society and the employers who builds the organizational

culture which practices by the employees. OC (Organizational culture) creates upon the components of, values, norms, taken for granted assumptions, traditions, and behavior patterns, that further supports the organizational learning. The organizational culture closely intersects with knowledge management which creates more opportunities for increasing the organization performance.

It is visible that KM has impact on any business that influences by the OC. The purpose of conducting systematic review is to ascertain the OC factors that influences the KM in organization by appraising, summarizing, comparing, contrasting the existing studies in a single place. This systematic journal review finding would support the organizations to focus on unerring OC factors to enhance the KM which leads in increasing the organization performance. The research has chosen 26 different approached research articles published between the years 2003 and 2020.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Knowledge Management

Initially KM was defined as methodical approach which applied to capture, organize, manage, and disseminate the knowledge in organization which then boost the office work, cut down the cost of rework, and practice from lesson learnt (Nonaka & Tekuechi, 1995). The KM incorporates with structured method of acquire, develop codify or share the knowledge in the perspective of improving the organization competitiveness, organizational learning, and the organizational performance (Tsoukas & Vladimirou, 2001). The knowledge management definition further elaborated as systematic plan of synchronizing the organization structure, employees and processes leading towards innovation and resus (Dalkir, 2011). The same articles reveals that this can be enabled promoting the organizational learning through create, share, apply the organizational knowledge and improving the corporate knowledge with feeding best practices and lesson learnt.

Oganisational culture

The organizational culture of any organization directly impacts on its employee's performance and knowledge dissemination. The culture has defined through various key factors identified by Morgan (1977), 1) said and unsaid values, 2) straightforward behavior of the individuals, 3) different customs and rituals, 4) historical stories and myths, 5) informal language used within the group, 6) metaphors and symbols, and 7) individual interaction within the groups and external groups. The culture also can realize as the common understandings which are not stated that individuals and groups shared among them, and the common understandings can further be described as beliefs, paradigms, attitude, norms, and values (Sathe, 1985).

Oganisational culture and the knowledge management

According to the research conducted by De Long & Fahey (2000), it appears that there are four ways the OC effects on KM. The four ways as claimed in the findings are 1) the assumptions of OC and subcultures define the required knowledge and is worth managing , 2) the culture describes the relationship among individual and organizational knowledge with who has the control of knowledge, and who can share, 3) the way that knowledge will be used based on the social interaction created by the culture, and 4) culture define the new knowledge to be accomplished, created and disseminated in the organization.

The organization managers can be benefited from the prosperity of the organization by utilizing their knowledge in the organization which depends on how OC nourishing the KM. OC must support

by specifying the relationship among employees and breaking the obstacles towards KM. The OC components as such interpersonal trust, communication among employees, information systems, rewards and organization structure should be organized proper way to succeed in KM (Al-Alawi, 2007). The organization survival always depends on the organization norms, values and beliefs which consider as the components of the OC and OC has effect on KM. The OC needs to in line with the organization vision and future where the organizational values, beliefs and norms need to be rearranged in order ensure successful KM in the automobile industry (Ghods et al. ,2013).

According to Giritli et al. (2013) the OC effects on the KM based on subcomponents of the OC which are 1) inventory organizational culture, 2) organizational culture profile, 3) six-dimensional model and concurrent values model, 4) organizational profile questionnaire and, 5) values framework. Whereas as Wang & Wang (2016) claimed in their research the advantages that the organization can get through KM while maintaining a positive OC orientation as 1) employees feel free and like in exploring things, 2) senior management always encourage employees in creating, sharing and application of knowledge right 3) Lower the constrain of sharing knowledge among employees, and 4) employees are encourage for learning and innovation through rewarding.

Based on the aforesaid findings it depicts that the relationship between organizational culture and knowledge management is essential in any organization. Poor management of OC brings negative impact towards the organization due to not taking place KM. However, the research findings depicts that the OC depends on the organization which is differ and most researchers defined contradict OC factors effect on KM. As described previously in this section, understanding the various factors effect on KM is crucial specially in banking sector which less research findings could present due to lack of research conducted related to subject area and in banking sector. gather relating sector. Further, the cultural perspectives or the knowledge management practices are not very clear as the research tend to conduct only qualitative or quantitative research without the use of mixed method. Therefore, the purpose of this research to understand the influences of organizational culture when practicing proper knowledge management in banking sector to gain benefits over the competition.

Quantitative research article findings

The scholars have identified different OC factors, categories and dimensions that impact on KM where some scholars have expanded the findings by defining the KM process through different stages and examined the impact of OC. Following mentioned scholars have used the quantitative research to conduct their researchers in different contexts.

According to the research conducted in Bangladesh for the service sector the researchers initially identified four OC factors that has effect on knowledge sharing and through the research results, that emphasized 1) trust, 3) communication between staff and 3) leadership has positive influence towards the knowledge sharing and specifically, the other factor of OC, 4) reward system has no relationship on knowledge sharing in service sector organisations (Islam et.al, 2011). The research was conducted based on engineering consultant of Austria and Germany has identified the cultural antecedents of 1) intrinsic motivation, 2) personal responsibility, 3) trust from top management, and 4) output orientation presented as the OC factors that has effect

on the KM of organizations (Mueller, 2012). As stated in the research findings of Kaffashpoor et. al (2013), which was conducted selecting 14 Mashhad Municipality, in Iran, the KM plays a substantial role in any organization where KM leads in improving the organizational performance. The researchers have identified the OC factors that impact on KM as, 1) strategy, 2) leadership, 3) organizational culture, and 4) organizational structure. Among abundant factors of OC Mahmoud et al. (2014), has identified 1) workgroup support, 2) information technology and 3) social interaction factors have more influence on sharing knowledge which the research conducted to a university in Malaysia. Researchers further discovered 4) reward systems in the OC have no significance in sharing knowledge. Additionally, the researchers exposed that knowledge sharing is high among academic staff employees who are having the responsibility of academic administration. Both individuals and groups in organization tend to share the knowledge internally and externally where the OC components such as 1) leadership, 2) trust, and 3) communication has affected on knowledge sharing in any organization and that emphasized in the research conducted focusing the workplaces in Malaysia (Japri et. al, 2014).

The research conducted to find the impact of OC on knowledge sharing in selected banks of Sri Lanka, exposed that certain OC factors as such 1) trust, 2) collaboration, 3) communication among staff, 4) information system, 5) reward systems, 6) organizational structure, 7) management practices, 8) shared vision and 9) employee union have influenced on knowledge sharing (Pushpamali, 2015). The research conducted in Malaysia by some of researchers have identified that from OC, organizational climate dimensions, that effects on the knowledge sharing (knowledge collecting and knowledge donating), 1) affiliation has clearly connection with knowledge donating and knowledge collecting, 2) fairness has no significant connection with knowledge donating and knowledge collecting. Further, the researchers emphasized that the two OC dimensions of trust affect as 3) cognitive trust influences knowledge donating where 4) affective trust influences knowledge collection (Jain et al., 2015). The various OC typologies identified by Cavaliere & Lombardi (2015), which influences the knowledge sharing in multinational corporations. The OC typologies identified as 1) innovative, 2) competitive, 3) bureaucratic and 4) community where the research findings proved that 1) involvement of the top management can creating interpersonal relationship, 2) emphasize the positive side of the bureaucracy, and 3) encouraging employees promote knowledge sharing.

The collaborative OC can consider as an influencing OC which promotes the knowledge sharing and that has been emphasized in the research conducted by Ahmed et al. (2016), through the facets of the collaboration culture have picked as 1) trust, 2) teamwork, and 3) empowerment. The research was conducted targeting the business organizations listed in the stock exchange of Pakistan. The research which Suppiah & Sandhu (2017), directed to identify the OC influences on transmitting the tacit knowledge by focusing the different cultures and which improves the KM. The OC has demonstrated through the competing value framework and the results demonstrated that 1) clan culture which has provided a platform for team development, has a positive affect on KM, 2) the hierarchical culture which has complex organization operating procedure shows negative impact on KM, and 3) market culture also holds the KM where the focus of the culture goes for improving the rivalry and productivity (Suppiah & Sandhu, 2017).

Three cultural dimensions as 1) results-oriented, 2) tightly controlled and 3) job-oriented have identified by Chang & Lin (2018), in the research conducted across different companies in Taiwan, which has been then tested for the impact of cultural dimension on KM process where creation, storage, transfer, and application have considered as the dependent variables. The study revealed that above mentioned cultural dimensions have positive and strong connection with the KM processes. Hence, that leads employee satisfaction along with employee retention.

Employee performance can be increased through the reward systems where Rohim & Budhiasa (2019), researchers wanted to confirm that the influence of rewards on knowledge sharing in their research which conducted in Indonesia. The study deemed the rewards as the financial rewards that covers the remuneration and that included the performance allowances paid to the employees. The study further focused on the clan culture, adhocratic culture, hierarchical culture, and market culture remuneration rewards and its impact on knowledge sharing. The results showed that 1) clan culture creates a strong bond between remuneration and the knowledge sharing, 2) adhocracy culture does not create a platform that remuneration would influence the knowledge sharing, 3) hierarchical culture has negative influence in linking the remuneration and the knowledge sharing and 4) market culture shown moderate affect in connecting the remuneration in knowledge sharing but it further explained that the researchers identified the clan culture has direct impact on knowledge sharing.

There can be different OC factors to be consider as the prerequisites in knowledge creation and sharing where research findings of Stojanovic-Aleksic et al. (2019), proves that OC and organisation 1) organic structure encourage the knowledge creation, but knowledge sharing is stimulated only by the OC factors. However, the researchers also identified that both 2) OC and 3) organizational structure determine KM. The research has conducted covering different industries in Republic of Serbia. The knowledge transfer and the factors effect on knowledge transfer from OC has researched by Muhammad et al. (2019), and the OC factors identified in the research as 1) trust among colleagues, 2) communication between organizational staff, 3) information systems, 4) formation of the reward system, and 5) structure of the organization.

The researchers further highlighted that the OC is playing a major role in promoting, sharing, and spreading knowledge in organizations. As claimed by Ahmed et al. (2020), OC can be considered in three perspective that includes 1) employees' satisfaction, 2) good leadership, and 3) organizational support that has influence on knowledge sharing (dimensions of knowledge sharing identified as innovation, collaboration, communication, trust, loyalty, and ethics) and researchers further acknowledged that among identified three OC perspectives, employees' satisfaction and good leadership has more impact on knowledge sharing. The organization culture together with the organization structure has support organization knowledge sharing. Based on the research findings of Waqas et al. (2020), which conducted in banking sector, the 1) supportive culture created by the top management and 2) the learning and development culture, determines the knowledge sharing where collaborative culture has adverse influence towards the knowledge sharing. Moreover, the organization structural effect has identified as if the structure is more centralized and formalized it intensifies the knowledge sharing. The researchers further, exposed that the rewarding systems motivate individuals in the

organization to improve knowledge sharing.

Qualitative research article findings

Very fewer number of scholars have attempted in conducting qualitative research under the chosen topic and the secondary research findings presented below.

The OC changes could directly impact on the KM where Mason & Pauleen (2003), have conducted the research based on the perspectives of the middle managers on KM in New Zealand organizations. The researchers explored the barriers of KM as 1) organizational culture, 2) leadership, and 3) education where drivers of KM have recognized as 1) competition, 2) peer pressure, and 3) increase the productivity. Additionally, the OC factors identified under the sub factors of 1) trust, 2) culture, 3) communication, 4) sharing 5) organizational culture, and 6) organization structure (Mason and Pauleen, 2003).

The research findings of Rzdca (2017) depicts that the OC factors such as 1) Team collaboration, 2) Open communication, 3) Trust, 4) Experimentation, and 5) Autonomy have effect on KM in small IT companies in Poland. The study further emphasized as presented in the Hofstede cultural aspects the national culture has low impact on KM in small companies (Rzdca, 2017). Qualitative research conducted by Memon et. al (2020), shows that it is required to encourage employees to share the ideas between employees based on the social interactions, and has suggested that it is needed to nurture proper leadership that creates better culture which encourages the knowledge transferring. The OC factors that affect on the KM has identified in this research which conducted covering the banks in Pakistan as 1) less adaptability to new technology, 2) lack of awareness of the need of KM, 3) not using a formal language, and 4) less employee empowerment (Memon et. al, 2020).

Systematic journal review findings

Through a case study analysis conducted by Gan et. al (2006) have constructed the OC factors of 1) collaboration, 2) mutual trust, 3) learning, 4) leadership and 5) incentives and rewards has significance influence on the KM in amongst the Multimedia Super Corridor companies in Malaysia.

The OC categories has identified as 1) Orientation to knowledge (Shared ownership which has on knowledge, Prioritizing the knowledge, Critical attitude that is having toward existing knowledge), 2) Orientation to people (Trust, Care, Openness, teamwork, Cohesiveness), and 3) orientation to work (Entrepreneurship, Positive outlook), by Zheng (2009), that correspondingly effects on KM in terms of effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability. Each OC categories has different impact on KM and its different terms based on the study results provided. Based on the literature review analysis conducted by Figurska (2012), it appeared that the OC factors of 1) trust, 2) corporate, and 3) learning has impact on KM, which the research was conducted in order to emphasis the importance of KM in knowledge-based economy. A meta-analysis conducted by Jacks et. al (2012) based on 56 articles through various scholars who conducted quantitative and qualitative research which led to present the findings as OC factors of 1) power, 2) openness and 3) trust have impact on KM.

Based on the previous research analysis conducted by Al Saifi (2015), has revealed in the findings that extensive knowledge on OC direct that 1) artifacts, 2) espoused 3) beliefs and values, and 4) assumption have impact on KM which further explained the knowledge creation, sharing and application relies on identified components of OC.

The research findings of Qamari (2015) has emphasized that four dimensions of OC, 1) trust, 2) communication, 3) leadership, and 4) reward has positive affect in sharing knowledge in the organizational contexts.

Based on the factor analysis conducted by Seyedyousefi et. al (2016), has identified that OC factors of 1) knowledge-oriented organizational culture, 2) flexibility, 3) support, 4) cooperation, 5) trust, 6) learning, 7) power and 8) reliability having and impact of KM.

METHODOLOGY / METHODS

The purpose of the study is to identify the OC factors influence on KM where the method used as systematic literature review through inductive approach which the literature findings are integrated and evaluated to provide the findings. Further, the entire method of conducting the research divided into four main phrases as 1) defining the purpose of conducting the research, 2) deciding the research approach where the systematic review through inductive has chosen, 3) analyzing data was done the chosen 26 articles among the mix of qualitative, quantitative and systematic review articles that are published between year 2003 and 2020, and 4) finally, the data findings appraised, summarized, compared, and contrasted through the patterns identified(Snyder, 2019).

DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Based on the findings it appeared that out of 26 articles, most of the researches conducted in Pakistan and Malaysia where other researches were conducted in New Zealand, Poland, Bangladesh, Austria and Germany, Iran, Sri Lanka, Taiwan, Indonesia, and Republic of Serbia countries covering various industries. The data analysis conducted based on the identification of the patterns on findings of OC factors through 26 articles chosen. The common patterns of OC identified as 1) Trust, 2) Culture, 3) Communication, 4) Organisation Culture, 5) Organisation Structure, 6) Rewards, 7) Learning, 8) Leadership, 9) Power, 10) Information Technology, 11) Empowerment, and 12) Team collaboration. In addition to aforesaid factors, it appeared that some researchers referred to OC frameworks such as 1) Edgar Schein's Cultural Model and 2) Competing values framework. The table 01, illustrated the chosen of different OC factors in conducting qualitative, quantitative, and systematic review/ Meta-Analysis

.

Table 01: Similar OC factors presented in the research articles

Identified Patterns	Qualitative	Quantitative	Systematic Review/ Meta-Analysis
Trust	(Mason and Pauleen, 2003); (Rzdca, 2017)	(Islam, 2011); (Mueller, 2012); (Japri et.al, 2014); (Pushpamali, 2015); (Jain et al., 2015); (Cavaliere and Lombardi, 2015);	(Gan et. al, 2006); (Zheng, 2009); (Jacks et. al, 2012); (Qamari, 2015); (Seyedyousefi et. al, 2016); (Saifi, 2015); (Figurska, 2012)

		(Muhammad et al., 2019)	
Culture	(Mason and Pauleen, 2003)	(Waqas et al., 2020)	
Communicatio n	(Mason and Pauleen, 2003); (Rzdca, 2017)	(Islam, 2011); (Japri et.al., 2014); (Pushpamali, 2015); (Muhammad et al., 2019); (Stojanovic-Aleksic et al., 2019)	(Qamari, 2015)
Organisation Structure	(Mason and Pauleen, 2003)	(Kaffashpoor et. al, 2013); (Pushpamali, 2015); (Stojanovic-Aleksic et al., 2019); (Muhammad et al., 2019)	
Rewards		(Islam, 2011); (Mahmoud et al., 2014); (Pushpamali, 2015); (Mueller, 2012); (Rohim and Budhiasa, 2019); (Ahmed et. al, 2020)	(Gan et. al, 2006); (Qamari, 2015)
Learning		(Waqas et al., 2020)	(Gan et. al, 2006); (Seyedyousefi et. al, 2016); (Figurska, 2012)
Leadership		(Islam, 2011); (Kaffashpoor et. al, 2013); (Japri et.al, 2014); (Ahmed et. al, 2020)	(Gan et. al, 2006); (Qamari, 2015)
Power			(Qamari, 2015); (Seyedyousefi et. al, 2016)
Information Technology		(Mahmoud et al., 2014); (Pushpamali, 2015); (Muhammad et al., 2019)	
Empowerment	(Memon et. al, 2020)	(Ahmed et al., 2016)	
Collaboration	(Rzdca, 2017)	(Pushpamali, 2015); (Ahmed et al., 2016)	(Gan et. al, 2006); (Zheng, 2009)
Competing values framework		(Suppiah and Sandhu, 2017); (Rohim and Budhiasa, 2019)	

Table 02: Dissimilar OC factors presented in the research articles

Apart from aforementioned findings same authors also have instigated some other OC factors also could influence KM as elaborated in the Table 02.

Research Type	Author	OC Factors
Quantitative	(Mason and Pauleen, 2003);	sharing
	(Rzdca, 2017);	Experimentation, and Autonomy
	(Memon et. al, 2020);	lack of awareness of the need of KM, and not using a formal language,
Systematic review/ Meta-analysis	(Zheng, 2009);	1) Orientation to knowledge (Shared ownership which has on knowledge, Prioritizing the knowledge, Critical attitude that is having toward existing knowledge), 2) Orientation to people (Care, Openness, Cohesiveness), and 3) orientation to work (Entrepreneurship, Positive outlook),
	(Jacks et. al, 2012);	openness
	(Seyedyousefi et. al, 2016);	flexibility, support, cooperation, and reliability
	(Figurska, 2012);	corporate
Quantitative	(Mueller, 2012);	intrinsic motivation, personal responsibility, and output orientation
	(Kaffashpoor et. al, 2013);	strategy
	(Mahmoud et al., 2014);	workgroup support and social interaction
	(Pushpamali, 2015);	management practices, shared vision and employee union
	(Jain et al.., 2015);	affiliation and fairness
	(Ahmed et. al, 2020);	employees' satisfaction, and organizational support

The research analysis further recognized certain dissimilar OC factors presented among the 26 articles. The quantitative research conducted by Cavaliere and Lombardi (2015), has identified dissimilar OC factors compared to aforesaid factors as 1) innovative, 2) competitive, 3) bureaucratic and 4) community where Chang and Lin (2018), also identified dissimilar OC factors as1) results-oriented, 2) tightly controlled and 3) job-oriented. Further, analysis emphasized that OC culture factors chosen from Edgar Schein's Cultural Model to test the affect on KM (Saifi, 2015).

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

The analysis results depict the most frequently chosen OC factors by qualitative, quantitative, and systematic review/ Meta-analysis researchers as the trust, communication, rewards, collaboration, organization structure and the leadership have high influence on KM.

The OC factor trust has been tested in all three research types that emphasizes the influence on KM which two qualitative, seven quantitative and seven systematic review/ Meta-analysis research articles emphasized the trust factor and its influence (Mason and Pauleen, 2003; Rzdca, 2017; Islam, 2011; Mueller, 2012; Japri et.al, 2014; Pushpamali, 2015; Jain et al., 2015; Cavaliere and Lombardi, 2015; Muhammad et al., 2019; Gan et. al, 2006; Zheng, 2009; Jacks et. al, 2012; Qamari, 2015; Seyedyousefi et. al, 2016; Saifi, 2015; Figurska, 2012). The trust has mainly three categories as 1) trust in peers, 2) trust supervisors, and 3) trust in management, which identified through interpersonal and institutional nature (Cho and Park, 2011), and it's the role of leaders in the organization to ensure the trust is established in a way the KM happens successful which proved in the research findings of Kim and Mauborgne (2003), that trust influence knowledge creation and sharing.

The OC factor communication, has more influence on knowledge sharing than the whole process of KM. However, the findings showed that two qualitative, five quantitative and one systematic review/ Meta-analysis research articles weighted communication as OC factor which affects on KM (Mason and Pauleen, 2003; Rzdca, 2017; Islam, 2011; Japri et.al, 2014; Pushpamali, 2015; Muhammad et al., 2019; Stojanovic-Aleksic et al., 2019; Qamari, 2015). Employees need to be provided proper guidance and support in obtaining, producing, and sharing knowledge as employees' fear of communication negatively alters on KM (Crawford et al., 2006).

The next OC factor identified as rewards that make affect on KM in organizational context. The fact proven in six quantitative and two systematic review/ Meta-analysis research articles presented and none of the qualitative researchers opted picking rewards as OC factor that influence KM (Islam, 2011; Mahmoud et al., 2014; Pushpamali, 2015; Mueller, 2012; Rohim and Budhiasa, 2019; Ahmed et. al, 2020; Gan et. al, 2006; Qamari, 2015). Further, among the quantitative researchers, Islam (2011) and Mahmoud et al. (2014), emphasized that reward systems have no significance relationship with KM where all the other research findings presented in this study, those researchers have identified and conformed that there is positive and significant relationship between rewards and KM. It is required to provide a broader view on rewards based on the categories of intrinsic and extrinsic as the findings shows contradicts results produced by researchers. Most researchers have identified that among intrinsic and extrinsic the intrinsic rewards have positive significance towards knowledge creation, sharing and application where no significance relation towards KM when consider the extrinsic rewards (Nazish et. al, 2019; Todorova and Mills, 2014).

The organization structure of an organization defines the commanding and reporting paths of the organization where one qualitative, and four quantitative researchers believed that organization structure as OC factor that influences KM (Mason and Pauleen, 2003; Kaffashpoor et. al, 2013; Pushpamali, 2015; Stojanovic-Aleksic et al., 2019; Muhammad et al., 2019). However, the articles published based on the systematic review/ Meta-analysis review, the researchers have not selected organization structure as OC factor that impact on KM. Mainly organization structure can be

divided as horizontal and hierarchical, in which it depicts that horizontal organization structure favors the KM compared to hierarchical organization structure (Liebowitz,2000). The reason behind success of having horizontal structure in KM can be further considered as that the knowledge created in center and when sharing the knowledge, it is convenient in passing through a smaller number of layers than high number of layers in hierarchical structure.

Every organization requires appropriate leadership to success in the business further, it emphasized that KM is also depends on good leadership (Islam, 2011; Kaffashpoor et. al, 2013; Japri et.al, 2014; Ahmed et. al, 2020; Gan et. al, 2006; Qamari, 2015) which proven in the findings of four quantitative and two systematic review/ Meta-analysis. Among different leadership styles it shows that transformational leadership has significance relationship on KM specially compared to transactional leadership (Nazish et. al, 2019). The leadership styles can be further considered in a different perspective as Directive (leader controls the situation by own) and delegating (letting employees to work as individuals and as a team), in which more supportive leadership style towards KM can be considered as delegating compared with directive (Singh, 2008).

Collaboration or Team collaboration can emphasis as another OC factor which affects on KM and identified by one qualitative researcher, two quantitative and systematic review/ Meta-analysis researchers (Pushpamali, 2015; Gan et. al, 2006; Rzdca, 2017; Ahmed et al., 2016; Zheng, 2009). The KM is a process that boost through the collaboration which KM is required create shared context among the employees and that needs to be enabled through team meeting and stablish clear communication channels (Clarke and Cooper, 2000).

This research analysis depicted that there are a fewer number of researchers picked following mentioned OC factors also have effect on KM.

The focus on the national culture as OC factor it can be view through collectivism and individualism where it shows no significant effect of individualism on KM but there is a positive relationship among collectivism and KM (Goswami and Agrawal, 2020), which the national culture factor has been chosen in one qualitative and quantitative research (Mason and Pauleen, 2003; Waqas et al., 2020). It is inevitable of the organizational learning where the organizational learning is required for the growth of any organization and this has identified as OC factor which influence the KM by on quantitative and three systematic/Meta-analysis review researchers (Waqas et al., 2020; Gan et. al, 2006; Seyedyousefi et. al, 2016; Figurska, 2012). Organisational learning can be divided as exploitative learning and exploratory learning in which both the learning s are having positive impact on KM (Yu, 2017).

Every OC has the influence of power where the researchers have identified that power as a component of OC and further it affects on KM in organizational context and that has proven through two systematic review/ Meta- analysis researchers where there was no evidence found that qualitative and quantitative researchers focused on power factor (Qamari, 2015; Seyedyousefi et. al, 2016). The power in OC can be consider as an enabler and barrier for KM in which power structure of the organization could lead more independence among peers and they involve in KM but not with the other people in the organization (Soenen and Moingeon, 2000).

Information Technology plays a major role in current organisations which the three qualitative researchers have identified Information technology as OC factor that impacts on KM (Mahmoud et

al., 2014; Pushpamali, 2015; Muhammad et al., 2019). Further, it depicted that no quantitative and systematic review/meta-analysis researchers chosen information technology as OC factor in their researches. However, information technology involves in all the steps in KM and has positive relationship towards KM (Azad and Ebrahimi, 2014). Employee empowerment has also concerned as OC factor which influence the KM and focused by one qualitative and quantitative researchers where no systematic review/meta-analysis researcher picked this as OC factor be tested (Memon et. al, 2020; Ahmed et al., 2016).

The Competing value framework introduced by Cameron and Quinn based on the competing value captured by the organization which was tested by two quantitative researcher, and which was not selected in qualitative and systematic review/meta-analysis researchers (Suppiah and Sandhu, 2017; Rohim and Budhiasa, 2019). According to the model the OC has divided into 4 main cultures as 1) Hierarchy culture – the operations of the organization carried out smoothly and has inward focus where the mainly depend on the organization structure and has less respond to change, 2) Clan culture- this culture is value responsive and has inward focus, which based on the team work and highly responsive for change, 3) Adhocracy culture- outward looking culture always focus on innovation, face challenges and faster development of the organization can be expected , 4) Market culture- outward looking culture has mainly focus on suppliers and the customers in order to enhance the market position of the company (Cameron and Quinn, 1999).

Researchers have further focused on dissimilar OC factors in their research that impact on KM. However, it appeared to be not chosen by most of the research and therefore not analyzed those factors further.

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

It is inevitable that any organization's performance depends on the way they manage the organization knowledge. Therefore, the study was conducted to find the OC factors that influence KM in organizations through systematic journal review. The research conducted with chosen 26 journal articles in qualitative, quantitative, and systematic review/Mata-analysis findings. Further, it depicted that most Pakistani and Malaysian researchers chosen similar topics related to the study reveals that most of the researchers have chosen 1) trust, 3) communication, 4) rewards, 5) collaboration, 6) organization structure and the 6) leadership as the OC factors that influence KM. Further, the same researchers also focused on following OC factors too that influence KM where 1) national culture, 2) learning, 3) power, 4) Information Technology, 5) empowerment and 6) components of Competing value framework however was not chosen very often. Therefore, the study confirms that among various OC factors 1) trust, 3) communication, 4) rewards, 5) collaboration, 6) organization structure and 6) leadership are needed to be highly considered and controlled in KM gain maximum performance of the organization. In addition to this it emphasized the organizations top management is having greater responsibility of creating a suitable culture for their employees for KM. It appeared that flat organization structure more suitable for KM than the hierarchical structure, where defining clear commanding and reporting path would support employees to establish strong communication paths and it is leader's role to build trust among different levels which

makes KM easy. It is necessary for creating OC where successful team collaboration is established for KM. Moreover, it accentuated that KM further supported through transformational leadership in organizational context. Nevertheless, though some research findings displayed that it doesn't have a relationship among rewards, providing intrinsic rewards will motivate employees for KM.

It should be noted that the above OC factors identified through the systematic journal review which influence KM have not been tested empirically. Hence it is recommended to investigate the OC factors further by conducting empirical study to prove the true OC factors influence on KM. The identified other OC factors which are not similar to any other researchers' findings also needed to be tested.

REFERENCES

Ahmed, F., Shahzad, K., Aslam, H., Bajwa, S., & Bahoo, R. (2016). The role of collaborative culture in knowledge sharing and creativity among employees. Semantic scholar.

Al Saifi, S. A. (2015). Positioning organisational culture in knowledge management research. Journal of Knowledge Management, 19(2), p164–189.

Al-Alawi, A., Al-Marzooqi, N. and Mohammed, Y. (2007), "Organizational culture and knowledge sharing: critical success factors", Journal of Knowledge Management, 11(2), p22-42.

Azad, N & Ebrahimi, Z. (2014). The impact of information technology facilities on knowledge management lifecycle. Management Science Letters, 4(10), p2301-2306.

Cavaliere, V., & Lombardi, S. (2015). Exploring different cultural configurations: how do they affect subsidiaries' knowledge sharing behaviors? J. Knowl. Manag., 19, p141-163.

Chang, C.L., Lin, T.C., (2015) "The role of organizational culture in the knowledge management process", Journal of Knowledge Management, 19(3), p433-455

Cho, Y. J., & Park, H. (2011). Exploring the Relationships Among Trust, Employee Satisfaction, and Organizational Commitment. Public Management Review, 13(4), 551–573.

Clarke P. and Cooper, M. (2000). Knowledge Management and Collaboration. CiteSeerX. https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.21.7183&rep=rep1&type=pdf.

Crawford, C., Strohkirch, C., Hays, F. (2006). The Critical Role of Communication in Knowledge Organizations: Communication Apprehension As A Predictor Of Knowledge Management Functions. Journal of Knowledge Management Practice. 7(4).

Dalkir, K. (2011). Knowledge management in theory and practice (second edition). Usa: the mit press

De Long, D.W., and Fahey. (2000). Diagnosing Cultural Barriers to Knowledge Management. researchgate.net. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/230557514_Diagnosing_Cultural_Barriers_to_Knowledge_Management.

Figurska, I. (2012). Cultural aspects of knowledge management. Human Resources Management & Ergonomics. 6 (2), p66-77.

Gan, G., Ryan, C., Gururajan, R. (2006). The effects of culture on knowledge management practice: a qualitative case study of msc status companies. Kajian Malaysia. 14 (1), p97-116.

Ghods, M.A., Salehi, S., Rezvani, M., and Farid, H. (2013). Identifying the Impact of Organizational Culture on Knowledge Management. researchgate.net. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265641274_Identifying_the_I

mpact_of_Organizational_Culture_on_Knowledge_Management.

Giritli, H., Oney-Yazici, E., Topçu-Oraz, G., Acar, E., (2013). The Interplay between Leadership and Organizational Culture in the Turkish Construction Sector. In International Journal of Project Management, 31(2), p228-238.

Goswami, A. K., Agrawal, R. K., & Goswami, M. (2020). Influence of national culture on knowledge management process: literature review and research agenda. Benchmarking: An International Journal, 28(4), p1186–1212.

Islam, Z., Hasan, I., Ahmed, S.U., & Ahmed, S. (2011). Organizational Culture and Knowledge Sharing: Empirical Evidence from Service Organizations. O&M: Decision-Making in Organizations eJournal.

Jacks, T., Wallace, S., & Nemati, H. (2012). Impact of Culture on Knowledge Management: A Meta-Analysis and Framework. Journal of Global Information Technology Management, 15(4), p8–42.

Jain, K., Sandhu, M., & Goh, S. (2015). Organizational climate, trust and knowledge sharing: insights from Malaysia. Journal of Asia Business Studies, 9, p54-77.

Japri, S.E., Lim, S., & Heng, C. (2014). The relationship between organizational culture and knowledge sharing in organization. Semantic scholar

Kaffashpoor, A., Shakoori, N., & Sadeghian, S. (2013). Linking organizational culture, structure, Leadership Style, strategy, and organizational effectiveness: Mediating role of knowledge management. Semantic scholar

Kim, W.C. and R. Mauborgne (2003) 'Fair process: management in the knowledge economy', Harvard Business Review, January–February, p127–38.

Liebowitz □Jay. (2000),"Building Organizational Intelligence "Washington □D.C.: CRC Press□p45.

Mahjoub, Wajeh, (2002),"Scientific Research and Curricula", Baghdad, Library Directorate of Printing and Publishing.

Mahmoud, M., Rasli, A., Othman, M., & Abdulahad, B.M. (2014). The effect of organizational culture on knowledge sharing among academic staff holding an administrative position in university. Journal of Management Info, 3.

Memon, S. B., Qureshi, J. A., & Jokhio, I. A. (2020). The role of organizational culture in knowledge sharing and transfer in Pakistani banks: A qualitative study. Global Business and Organizational Excellence. Global Business and Organizational Excellence, 39(1), p1-10.

Morgan, G. (1977). Bureaucratic organisations. In Research accesses, edited by C. Borowns, P. Guillet de Monthoux, and A. McCullough. Sweden:THS Co., p138-150

Mueller, J. (2012). "Knowledge sharing between project teams and its cultural antecedents", Journal of Knowledge Management, 16(3), p435-447.

Muhammad, S., Giri, R., Madad, A., & Ahsan, A. (2019). The influence of organizational cultural characteristics on knowledge transfer across one Belt - one Road: a case of Chinese companies involved in the China-Pakistan economic Corridor (cpec). Semantic scholar

Nazish, A., Aslam, S., Farooqi, Y. (2019). Impact of rewards and full range leadership styles on knowledge management practices. Pakistan business review. 20 (4), p802-814.

Nonaka, I. and Takeuchi, H. (1995) The Knowledge-Creating Company: How Japanese Companies Create the Dynamics of Innovation. Oxford University Press, New York.

Pushpamali, N. (2015). "A Study of the Organizational Culture for Knowledge Sharing in Selected Banks Branches", Semantic scholar

Qamari, I.N. (2015). Implementation of organizational culture to drive unified knowledge sharing.

Rohim, A., & Budhiasa, I.G. (2019). Organizational culture as moderator in the relationship between organizational reward on knowledge sharing and employee performance. Journal of Management Development, 38, p538-560.

Sathe, V. (1985). Culture and coproate realities, 1st ed. Homewood, IL: Richard S Irwin.

Seyedyousefi, N., Hosseini Fard, S. M., & Tohidi, F. (2016). The Role of Organizational Culture in Knowledge Management. Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences. 7(5), p412-416.

Singh, S. K. (2008). Role of leadership in knowledge management: a study. Journal of Knowledge Management, 12(4), 3–15.

Soenen, G and Moingeon, B. (2000). Knowledge management: taking power dynamics seriously. warwick. https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/wbs/conf/olkc/archive/olk4/papers/soenen.pdf.

Stojanovic-Aleksic, V., Nielsen, J.E., & Boskovic, A. (2019). Organizational prerequisites for knowledge creation and sharing empirical evidence from Serbia. J. Knowl. Manag., 23, p1543-1565.

Suppiah, V. & Sandhu, M.S. (2011). Organizational culture's influence on tacit knowledge sharing behaviour, Journal of Knowledge Management, 15(3), p462-477.

Todorova, N., Mills, A. (2014). The Impact of Rewards on Knowledge Sharing. CONF-IRM 2014 Proceedings. 27.

Tsoukas, H. and Vladimirou, E. (2001) `What is Organizational Knowledge?', Journal of Management Studies 38(7), p973.

Wang, Y. M., Wang, Y. C., 2016. Determinants of Firms' Knowledge Management System Implementation: An Empirical Study. In Computers in Human Behavior, 64, p829-842.

Yu, C.-P. (2017). The effect of organizational learning and knowledge management innovation on SMEs' technological capability. EURASIA Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 13

Zheng, W. (2009), "The knowledge-inducing culture: an integrative framework of cultural enablers of knowledge management", Journal of Information and Knowledge Management (JIKM), 8 (3), p 213-227