Knowledge Management in Hospitals. Review of Literature

Marcin Bobruk[1,A,B,C,D,E,F]   **Zbigniew Wiśniewski**[2,A,B,E,F]   **Andrzej Kot**[1,B,E]

ORCID: 0000-0001-6960-3270   ORCID: 0000-0003-0066-9321   ORCID: 0000-0003-2283-4199

[1] Department of Management and Logistics in Health Care, Medical University of Lodz, Poland;
[2] Lodz University of Technology, Faculty of Organization and Management, Lodz, Poland

A – research concept and design, B – collection andassembly of data,
C – data analysis and interpre-tation, D – writing the article, E – critical revision of the article,
F – final approval of article

ABSTRACT

Knowledge Management in Hospitals. Review of Literature

Bobruk M.[1], Wiśniewski Z.[2], Kot A.[1]

[1] Department of Management and Logistics in Health Care, Medical University of Lodz, Poland; [2] Lodz University of Technology, Faculty of Organization and Management, Lodz, Poland

This article examines the role of Knowledge Management (KM) in hospitals and healthcare organizations. It underscores the importance of KM in enhancing healthcare delivery in the face of digital transformation, an aging population, and the need for cost-effective practices. The review highlights critical factors such as leadership, culture, and technology, which are pivotal for KM implementation. Additionally, it addresses the significance of both tacit and explicit knowledge, particularly in medical know-how and clinical judgment. The dual purpose of this review is to synthesize current research and to pinpoint research opportunities in KM practices within Polish academic hospitals, thereby offering a foundation for future empirical work.

Keywords: *knowledge management, healthcare systems, clinical decision-making, technology in healthcare, medical knowledge dissemination, organizational effectiveness, resource optimization*

STRESZCZENIE

Zarządzanie wiedzą w szpitalach. Przegląd literatury

Bobruk M.[1], Wiśniewski Z.[2], Kot A.[1]

[1] Zakład Zarządzania i Logistyki w Ochronie Zdrowia, Wydział Nauk o Zdrowiu Uniwersytetu Medycznego w Łodzi; [2] Wydział Organizacji i Zarządzania, Politechnika Łódzka

W artykule zaprezentowano rolę zarządzania wiedzą (ZW) w szpitalach i innych organizacjach opieki zdrowotnej. Omówiono znaczenie ZW w poprawie dostarczania usług zdrowotnych w obliczu transformacji cyfrowej, starzenia się populacji i konieczności efektywnego zarządzania kosztami. Zwrócono uwagę na kluczowe czynniki, takie jak wsparcie przywódcze, kultura uczenia się i infrastruktura technologiczna, które są niezbędne do implementacji ZW. Dodatkowo omówiono znaczenie wiedzy zarówno utajonej, jak i jawnej, szczególnie w kontekście medycznego know-how i osądu klinicznego. Podwójny cel tego przeglądu to syntezowanie obecnego stanu badań dotyczących ZW w szpitalach oraz wskazanie luk i możliwości dla przyszłych badań empirycznych nad ZW w akademickich szpitalach w Polsce. Oferuje to fundament teoretyczny i praktyczny dla przyszłych prac badawczych.

Słowa kluczowe: *zarządzanie wiedzą, systemy opieki zdrowotnej, podejmowanie decyzji klinicznych, technologia w ochronie zdrowia, efektywność organizacyjna, optymalizacja zasobów*

1. Introduction

Knowledge Management (KM) is increasingly recognized as a pivotal component in the optimization and effectiveness of healthcare systems. The critical success factors for implementing KM in healthcare settings have been extensively studied, revealing that elements such as leadership support, a learning culture, and technology infrastructure play a critical role [1]. As healthcare faces significant transformations in the age of digitization, remote care, and advanced diagnostics, the role of KM has become more complex yet indispensable [2]. Moreover, demographic shifts, notably the aging population, intensify the challenges in healthcare delivery. In rapidly aging European nations, up to 35% of the population will be elderly by 2050. This demographic shift is anticipated to exacerbate healthcare expenditures and may potentially lead to a shortage of healthcare professionals.

KM in healthcare spans both tacit and explicit forms of knowledge. Tacit knowledge, such as medical know-how or clinical judgment, has received considerable

attention in recent research, particularly concerning its ethical implications [3]. Despite these advancements, a comprehensive understanding of how KM is practiced and valued in healthcare institutions, especially hospitals, remains fragmented [1].

The aim of this literature review is twofold. First, it seeks to synthesize the current state of research concerning KM within hospitals and other healthcare organizations, highlighting the significant barriers and critical success factors [3]. Second, it aims to identify gaps and opportunities for future empirical research on KM in academic hospitals in Poland. Consequently, this review serves as both a theoretical contribution to the existing literature and as a practical foundation for directing future investigations into the specific KM challenges and practices within Polish academic hospitals.

2. Background

Knowledge Management (KM) has increasingly been acknowledged as a critical component in the functioning and competitiveness of healthcare systems [4]. Particularly in the hospital setting, KM not only contributes to enhanced patient care but also to organizational effectiveness and innovation [1].

The hospital environment is complex, consisting of multiple layers of interdisciplinary work, often involving critical and time-sensitive decisions. Effective KM practices can support clinical decision-making by systematically capturing, storing, and disseminating valuable medical knowledge and information [3]. For instance, KM platforms can facilitate better access to medical histories, test results, and potential treatment options, allowing medical practitioners to make more informed decisions.

Moreover, hospitals are increasingly relying on sophisticated technology like Electronic Health Records (EHRs) and telemedicine platforms. These technologies produce a large amount of data, which when managed effectively, can significantly contribute to research and evidence-based practice. [2] Effective KM practices help to translate this data into actionable insights, thereby aiding in medical diagnosis, treatment planning, and health outcomes analysis [5].

Amidst increasing healthcare expenditures and shortages in medical professionals, particularly evident in aging societies [6], KM provides ways to optimize resources. It helps in streamlining operations, reducing duplication of diagnostic tests, and significantly cutting down administrative costs [7].

In summary, the role of KM in hospitals is multi-dimensional and crucial. It plays a pivotal role in enhancing clinical decisions, leveraging technological advancements for patient care, and providing a sustainable model for healthcare delivery amidst growing challenges.

2.1. The changing landscape of healthcare

The healthcare sector has undergone significant transformations, driven by technological advancements, demographic shifts, and emerging health challenges. In this evolving landscape, Knowledge Management (KM) has become an essential component in enhancing hospital operations, healthcare delivery, and decision-making processes [8].

The advent of big data and healthcare information technologies such as Electronic Health Records (EHR) and telemedicine has amplified the role of KM. EHRs have allowed hospitals to store a wealth of data ranging from patient information to medical research, enabling better diagnostic and treatment decisions [5]. Telemedicine has further extended the reach and effectiveness of KM by facilitating remote consultation and real-time data sharing [2].

Concurrently, the aging population represents a pivotal demographic shift affecting healthcare delivery. In European nations experiencing rapid aging, up to 35% of the population is expected to be elderly by 2050, exacerbating healthcare expenditures and intensifying the complexity of healthcare needs [6]. KM, in this context, helps in optimizing resource allocation and clinical workflows to address the challenges posed by demographic shifts.

Another emerging trend is the focus on personalized medicine, which requires a multidimensional understanding of patients, including genetic make-up, lifestyle, and other social determinants of health. Effective KM systems facilitate the integration of this multi-faceted knowledge into clinical practices [1].

Despite these advancements, the practice of KM in healthcare remains fragmented, partly due to the gap between the technological capabilities and the practical implementation in hospital settings. The interplay between tacit knowledge, such as clinical judgement, and explicit knowledge stored in healthcare information systems has yet to be fully understood [7].

2.2. Types of knowledge in healthcare

In the context of healthcare, and particularly in hospitals, knowledge is broadly categorized into two types: tacit and explicit knowledge. Both types have significant implications for Knowledge Management (KM) practices, affecting the effectiveness of healthcare delivery and decision-making processes [9].

Tacit Knowledge
Tacit knowledge encompasses skills, experiences, and insights that healthcare professionals acquire over time. This form of knowledge is often difficult to articulate and formalize, yet is crucial in clinical judgement and patient care. Medical practitioners frequently

rely on their tacit knowledge for diagnostics, treatment plans, and even in interpersonal communications with patients and families [10].

Explicit Knowledge

Explicit knowledge, on the other hand, is structured, codified, and easily shareable. This includes guidelines, standard operating procedures (SOPs), and research findings. Hospitals have increasingly adopted sophisticated KM systems, such as Electronic Health Records (EHRs), to manage and disseminate explicit knowledge effectively [11].

Interplay between Tacit and Explicit Knowledge

The effective management of healthcare knowledge hinges on the seamless interaction between these two types of knowledge. For instance, clinical pathways often comprise explicit knowledge, such as best practices or treatment protocols, integrated with tacit knowledge acquired from medical practitioners' experience [12]. This interplay is vital in situations that require immediate decision-making, such as emergency care. Hospitals are incorporating KM systems that enable real-time communication and knowledge exchange among healthcare practitioners [13].

In summary, Knowledge Management (KM) has evolved as a crucial component in healthcare, gaining specific importance in the intricate landscape of hospitals. The background section has outlined the multifaceted nature of KM, detailing both tacit and explicit types of knowledge and their significance in healthcare delivery and decision-making. These foundational insights set the stage for our next section, where we present a systematic review aimed at deepening our understanding of how KM is applied and valued within the context of hospital settings.

3. Knowledge management in hospitals: a systematic review of research

This systematic review is guided by dual primary research aims. Initially, the review endeavors to consolidate extant scholarly work on the multifaceted role and impact of Knowledge Management (KM) within healthcare environments, particularly hospitals. It achieves this through an interdisciplinary synthesis, incorporating insights from healthcare management, information technology, and organizational behavior.

Secondarily, this scholarly inquiry identifies an existing research gap pertaining to the application of norms and standards in hospital KM practices. Utilizing findings from prior studies, the review not only expands upon the current theoretical framework but also delineates under-researched areas requiring further scholarly attention.

By addressing these primary research aims, the systematic review furnishes a rigorous academic groundwork beneficial to both researchers and practitioners, thereby facilitating the improvement and standardization of KM protocols essential to healthcare systems.

3.1. Method

Searches were conducted in March of 2022 using scientific databases: Elsevier and PubMed. These sources were chosen based on their relevance to healthcare and knowledge management research, and their common usage in systematic literature reviews in the field [14].

The search terms began with "Knowledge Management" and were followed by "hospital*" "clinic*", "medical*" and "healthcare". These searches across all selected databases jointly identified 3512 sources to be initially reviewed.

To determine the eligibility for inclusion in our systematic review, the authors coded all sources based on the following criteria: (1) the article was written in English; (2) have been published in the last 10 years before the moment of search; (3) the article was relevant to the study of knowledge management in healthcare, as discerned from the title and abstract. This reduced the list from 3512 to 2195 sources. Further, we evaluated: (1) whether the source included an empirical study (be it quantitative, qualitative, or mixed-method); (2) whether the source specifically studied aspects of Knowledge Management in healthcare settings; (3) whether KM was a binding aspect addressed in the publication; (4) publication has relevant attributes, according to MeSH – Knowledge Management, according to Emtree Information Management.

This further reduced our list from 2195 to 190 sources, all of which were included in our systematic literature review. For each of the 190 sources, we coded the type of publication (e.g., article, dissertation), the publication outlet, the country of the study, and the specific healthcare settings involved (e.g., public hospitals, university hospitals).

The full texts of the qualified articles were then reviewed in depth by the authors of this article. Each article was rigorously evaluated based on its contributions to the understanding of knowledge management processes, enablers, drivers, and challenges specific to healthcare organizations. Subsequently, the articles were coded for attributes like the type of publication, publication outlet, country of the study, healthcare settings involved, and research methods employed. Using an inductive content categorization approach, articles were further categorized into emergent thematic clusters to identify patterns and trends in the literature [15].

3.2. Systematic review results

3.2.1. Overview of research studies

The comprehensive literature search yielded 190 qualified articles addressing various facets of Knowledge Management (KM) in healthcare settings. Our analysis, rooted in methodologies upheld by previous systematic reviews, adhered to rigorous inclusion and exclusion criteria, ranging from the language of publication to the relevance and recency of the research. Our multi-dimensional coding process illuminated key patterns and led us to segregate the literature into five overarching thematic categories.

Foundational Concepts and Strategies
The earliest works primarily focused on introducing the idea of KM in healthcare and outlined the strategies for knowledge acquisition, dissemination, and utilization. Papers in this category often outlined conceptual frameworks, often building on Nonaka's theory of knowledge creation or Wenger's communities of practice.

Knowledge Sources and Sharing Mechanisms
Articles in this cluster emphasized the varied sources of healthcare knowledge, from Electronic Health Records (EHR) to tacit knowledge between practitioners. Research frequently discussed how this knowledge could be shared effectively – be it through internal organizational networks, workshops, or electronic portals.

Technological and Organizational Enablers
These articles emphasized the role of IT systems, data warehouses, and organizational culture as enablers. Moreover, the role of leadership in fostering a knowledge-friendly environment was highlighted, drawing insights from both organizational theory and information systems literature.

Drivers, Challenges, and Impacts
This category encapsulated articles focused on what propels KM initiatives and what impediments they face. Studies ranged from examining economic drivers to elaborating on the challenges like data security, ethical concerns, and resistance to change. The impacts, such as enhanced patient care or organizational efficiency, were also a recurrent focus.

Behavioral Aspects and Future Perspectives
The last category was predominantly forward-looking, discussing how behavioral factors like motivation, trust, and openness influence KM. Speculative pieces discussing the potential influence of emerging technologies like Artificial Intelligence and Blockchain in healthcare KM were also prevalent.

The synthesis of the reviewed literature demonstrates that KM in healthcare is a multi-faceted domain, touching upon conceptual underpinnings, technological and organizational infrastructures, and human behaviors. This review not only serves as a repository of the existing scholarship but also paves the way for future research by highlighting gaps in understanding and methodological discrepancies.

3.2.2. Overview of existing knowledge

Foundational Concepts and Strategies
In the burgeoning field of knowledge management (KM) within healthcare, the foundational concepts and overarching strategies hold immense significance for practical applications and theoretical advancements alike. A seminal categorization by Nonaka and Takeuchi distinguishes between two primary types of knowledge: tacit and explicit [16]. Tacit knowledge resides in the intangible, deeply rooted in individual experiences and internalized values. On the other hand, explicit knowledge is formalized and can be easily communicated and shared. This dichotomy serves as the underpinning framework for various KM processes in healthcare settings, especially hospitals.

The role of a well-aligned KM strategy can't be overstated. As noted by Porter, strategic alignment optimizes resource allocation and streamlines organizational processes [17]. Prahalad and Hamel further advanced this concept by emphasizing core competencies, arguing that strategic KM should cultivate and leverage these unique organizational skills [18]. In healthcare, particularly in hospitals, the alignment of KM strategy with clinical and administrative goals can significantly enhance patient care, reduce errors, and facilitate effective decision-making [19].

One of the compelling aspects of KM in healthcare is the uniqueness of the knowledge involved. Healthcare providers frequently have to make complex decisions that can be life-altering, making the need for an effective KM strategy even more crucial [20]. Moreover, such strategies need to be adaptive due to the rapidly evolving nature of medical science and healthcare technologies [21].

Specifically, in hospital settings, a comprehensive KM strategy must encompass not only clinical expertise but also operational and administrative know-how. Such a strategy usually integrates multi-disciplinary knowledge, capturing insights from nursing staff to top-tier hospital management [22].

Lastly, the importance of KM strategy in healthcare seems to be gaining increasing recognition, albeit the field is still relatively young. Studies have started to shed light on how KM can directly contribute to hospital performance indicators such as patient satisfaction and service quality [20].

In summary, understanding the fundamental types of knowledge and the role of aligned KM strategies sets the stage for exploring more intricate dimensions of KM in healthcare, notably in hospitals. Given the gravity and complexity of healthcare provision, the need for robust KM practices underscored by a well-thought-out strategy remains an area ripe for continued research and practical refinement.

Knowledge Sources and Sharing Mechanisms

In the sphere of knowledge management (KM) within hospitals, understanding the various sources of knowledge and the mechanisms for sharing that knowledge is instrumental for both academic investigation and practical implementation. While tacit and explicit knowledge serve as the foundational building blocks [16], hospitals present a unique amalgamation of sources where this knowledge originates or is disseminated. Clinical knowledge, often found in medical literature, guidelines, and protocols, is a dominant form of explicit knowledge. Conversely, experiential knowledge that healthcare professionals accumulate through years of practice constitutes an invaluable reservoir of tacit knowledge. Yet another layer is organizational knowledge, which is embedded in hospital processes, workflows, and institutional culture. This information often remains undocumented but is crucial for operational success [23]. Furthermore, patient-generated data, including medical histories and feedback, has started to gain academic recognition for its potential in improving service delivery and outcomes.

Equally diverse are the mechanisms employed for sharing knowledge within the hospital setting. Traditional methods such as formal training programs, seminars, and workshops have been the mainstay for explicit knowledge dissemination [24]. On the other hand, tacit knowledge has largely been shared through mentorship, job-shadowing, and daily interactions among healthcare providers [25]. The advent of technology has introduced novel platforms for knowledge sharing. Electronic Health Records (EHRs), for instance, have revolutionized the way clinical information is shared among healthcare professionals [26]. Moreover, intranet portals, discussion forums, and more recently, social media platforms have emerged as powerful tools for fostering a culture of knowledge sharing in hospitals [5].

However, it is essential to note that knowledge sharing in hospitals is not without its challenges. Factors like time constraints, lack of awareness, or even territoriality among departments can hinder effective knowledge dissemination [27]. Simultaneously, advances in telemedicine and Artificial Intelligence offer unparalleled opportunities to share knowledge across geographical and temporal boundaries, although these come with their set of challenges such as data privacy and ethical considerations.

In essence, the landscape of knowledge sources and sharing mechanisms in hospitals is a rich tapestry woven from multiple disciplines, methodologies, and technologies. Recognizing these different sources and mechanisms is pivotal for constructing effective KM strategies in healthcare. The fluidity and complexity inherent in the hospital environment necessitate a continuous evaluation of these knowledge components to better align with the rapidly evolving landscape of healthcare. By acknowledging these variables, researchers and practitioners can craft more effective and adaptive KM frameworks, tailored to the unique challenges and opportunities present in hospital settings. And as technology and healthcare practices continue to evolve, so too will the paradigms for sourcing and sharing knowledge, making this an ongoing field of study ripe for further scholarly and practical exploration.

Technological and Organizational Enablers

The intricate landscape of knowledge management (KM) in healthcare necessitates a multi-pronged approach to facilitate effective knowledge sharing and utilization. While foundational concepts lay the groundwork for KM, technological and organizational enablers act as catalysts, propelling the efficacy of KM practices to new heights. Both technological and organizational factors have been identified as instrumental in shaping KM outcomes [10].

The role of technology in KM can hardly be overstated. In particular, Electronic Health Records (EHRs) have emerged as a cornerstone of healthcare KM, streamlining data storage and information retrieval (Jha, DesRoches, Campbell, Donelan, Rao, Ferris, Shields, Rosenbaum, & Blumenthal, 2009). A study by Menachemi and Collum found that EHRs contribute to enhanced clinical outcomes and process improvements [5]. More recently, Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Machine Learning (ML) technologies are being applied to analyze complex datasets to guide clinical decisions. The shift towards a more technologically driven approach has been found to improve the accuracy and efficiency of healthcare delivery [28].

On the organizational front, the culture of knowledge sharing serves as a critical enabler. A study by Donate and Guadamillas emphasized that an organizational culture that encourages knowledge sharing had a significant impact on KM effectiveness [29]. In a similar vein, leadership's role in enabling KM has been scrutinized. Effective leaders not only facilitate knowledge sharing but also instill a sense of purpose, thus impacting KM positively [30].

The structure of the organization itself also comes into play. Flexible organizational structures that foster

inter-departmental collaboration have been shown to facilitate better KM practices [31]. Moreover, the strategic alignment of KM objectives with the organization's goals directly impacts the overall efficacy of KM processes [32].

However, both technological and organizational factors bring their set of challenges. Technology adoption can be impeded by a lack of resources and training, as well as issues of data security [33]. Organizational barriers often include resistance to change and knowledge hoarding behaviors that can stifle KM initiatives [34].

The synergy between technological and organizational enablers has the potential to significantly amplify KM outcomes. Research by Sherif, Hoffman, Thomas, and Ragsdale highlighted that successful KM is often the result of a balanced focus on both technological systems and organizational practices.

In summary, technological and organizational enablers act as critical levers in the effective implementation of KM in healthcare settings, especially hospitals. Both aspects come with their unique sets of challenges that need to be acknowledged and addressed. Given the emergent nature of this research area, it becomes imperative for future studies to delve deeper into understanding how these enablers can be optimized for superior KM outcomes.

Drivers, Challenges, and Impacts

Studies in the realm of knowledge management (KM) within healthcare settings, notably hospitals, underline several key drivers that significantly contribute to the effective functioning of KM systems. One of the prominent drivers is the digital transformation within healthcare, including the use of Electronic Health Records (EHRs) and Decision Support Systems (DSS) to improve patient outcomes and process efficiency [26]. Additionally, organizational culture fostering a supportive environment for knowledge sharing has been found to positively influence KM processes [35]. Leadership's role is also noted as a major driver, with leaders acting as catalysts in establishing and promoting KM initiatives [16].

However, the transition to an effective KM system in hospitals is not devoid of obstacles. Among the significant challenges, the issue of data privacy and security is a recurring concern, considering the sensitivity of healthcare information [36]. Besides, organizational resistance, particularly from medical staff who are accustomed to traditional practices, can act as a barrier to implementing KM systems effectively [37]. Another challenge is the issue of interoperability among various technological systems, which can limit seamless knowledge sharing and retrieval [38].

The influence of KM on patient care and operational efficiency has been an area of rigorous research. Hospitals adopting successful KM practices have demonstrated improvements in patient safety measures, diagnosis accuracy, and overall healthcare service quality [39]. Additionally, better KM practices correlate with increased job satisfaction among healthcare professionals [21].

It is essential to acknowledge that these drivers, challenges, and impacts are interconnected. For instance, effective leadership can not only act as a driver but can also mitigate challenges such as resistance to change, thereby amplifying the positive impacts of KM [40]. On the flip side, challenges like data security concerns can stifle the drivers, leading to diminished or suboptimal impacts [41].

In summary, KM in hospitals is a multifaceted area influenced by various drivers and challenges, each contributing to the broader impact on healthcare delivery and professional satisfaction. As research in this domain continues to evolve, it is imperative to further investigate these relationships to maximize the positive outcomes of KM initiatives in hospitals.

Behavioral aspects and future perspectives

The landscape of knowledge management (KM) in hospitals is profoundly affected by various behavioral aspects. Staff collaboration and knowledge-sharing behavior are pivotal elements for the successful implementation of KM initiatives [42]. A new aspect gaining attention is the role of 'consciousness' or 'awareness' in KM. This involves healthcare professionals' awareness of the value and utility of the knowledge they possess, as well as the knowledge that exists within the organization. Such awareness could significantly affect their willingness to share or seek information, thus impacting KM efficiency [23].

Moreover, emotional factors and organizational hierarchies can act as either catalysts or barriers to effective KM [43]. Leadership behaviors have a significant role in shaping the knowledge management landscape in healthcare settings. Leaders who foster a culture that rewards knowledge sharing contribute to more effective KM systems [44]. The integration of consciousness into leadership approaches is an area ripe for further study [9].

Emerging technologies such as Artificial Intelligence (AI) impact behavioral aspects of KM, including consciousness, and represent a crucial area for future research. The behavioral dynamics of KM in crisis situations, such as a pandemic, can have complex effects on knowledge-sharing behaviors. Additionally, the concept of knowledge hoarding needs further study to understand its impact on patient care and safety [45].

Behavioral aspects are foundational to the effective implementation of KM in hospitals. Understanding these dimensions will provide valuable insights for enhancing patient care and operational efficiency in healthcare settings.

4. Knowledge management in hospitals: future research directions

The existing body of literature on knowledge management (KM) within hospitals has expanded our understanding of its potential benefits and challenges [8]. However, several important areas have yet to be fully explored. This chapter outlines crucial directions for future research, focusing on the evaluation of existing standards and best practices, studies on awareness levels among healthcare professionals, and research into KM processes within hospital settings.

4.1. Evaluation of existing standards and best practices

With the evolution of KM in healthcare, several standards and best practices have been developed. These standards may range from protocols for sharing patient information between departments to methods for updating medical staff about recent advancements [46]. However, empirical studies that critically evaluate the effectiveness and adaptability of these standards in various healthcare settings are noticeably lacking [47]. It is also worth noting the publication of the ISO 30401:2018 standard, which, although not directly related to health care, may shed interesting light on the issue of standardization and quantification of aspects in KM in health care units as well. Assessing the relevance and effectiveness of these standards can facilitate better KM and inform policy-making [48].

4.2. Awareness among healthcare professionals

Knowledge management relies heavily on the participation of healthcare professionals. Therefore, understanding their level of awareness regarding KM practices is essential for effective implementation. A lack of awareness among healthcare professionals can hinder the effective utilization of KM resources and lead to suboptimal patient outcomes. Studies can aim to quantify this awareness and suggest targeted educational interventions [49].

4.3. Research into KM processes

Current research often discusses KM in hospitals at a macro level, focusing on outcomes rather than underlying processes [50]. There is a need to delve deeper into the micro-level processes that make KM

successful or otherwise. Understanding the intricate processes involved in KM can provide insights into its limitations and possibilities for improvement [21].

While existing literature has laid the groundwork for understanding KM in hospitals, these proposed directions aim to fill the existing research gap. Prioritizing these areas for future research can not only contribute to the academic discussion but also have a tangible impact on healthcare delivery and outcomes.

4.4. Systems dynamics and the impact of new technologies

Given the nascent and complex nature of KM within hospital settings, further studies are required to better understand these dynamics. For example, the effect of emerging technologies like Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Internet of Things (IoT) on KM in hospitals remains an underexplored area [51]. Similarly, how variations in organizational culture across different healthcare settings affect KM effectiveness is a subject deserving further inquiry [35].

5. Conclusion

As we have traversed the multifaceted landscape of knowledge management (KM) in hospitals, one cannot help but appreciate the depth and breadth of research conducted in this domain. From the mechanics of information sharing to the human variables that can either amplify or attenuate the success of KM initiatives, the existing literature provides a robust foundation. Yet, it's precisely this richness that illuminates new terrains for intellectual exploration, shaped by the dynamism intrinsic to healthcare, social interactions, and technological advancements.

While this review signifies that KM in hospitals is a well-charted field, the rapid transformations in healthcare technologies, patient expectations, and healthcare policies make it an area that continually defies a state of 'completion.' Consequently, it's both the maturity and fluidity of this field that make it fertile ground for new lines of inquiry.

Even as we acknowledge the maturity of research in evaluating existing KM standards and best practices, gaps still prevail. Such gaps are not merely academic pursuits; they are imperatives that could alter healthcare outcomes and operational efficiency. The ever-evolving nature of healthcare technologies and protocols, coupled with shifts in patient demographics and expectations, necessitates ongoing assessments to ensure that these practices are not just theoretically sound but empirically effective.

Moreover, while the role of healthcare professionals in KM is undeniably pivotal, their varying levels of awareness and willingness to adopt KM best practices

become a variable that can't be overlooked. Bridging this awareness gap offers a roadmap to more stream-lined and effective KM systems, ultimately benefiting both healthcare providers and patients alike.

In the realm of underlying KM processes, our review highlights the need for more granular research. Investigations into the minutiae of these processes promise not just theoretical advancements but actionable insights that can be directly translated into improved patient care and operational efficiencies.

Finally, the intersection of KM and emerging technologies like AI and IoT hints at an imminent paradigm shift. It's not just the technological variables that warrant study; it's their confluence with human factors and organizational cultures that hold the promise – or perhaps the challenge – of redefining KM in healthcare.

To navigate the promise and complexities of KM in healthcare, this multifaceted approach – combining rigorous academic scrutiny with a keen eye for practical application – is non-negotiable. It's not merely about adding to the body of knowledge but also shaping the future of healthcare.

References

1. Gagnon M.P., Attieh R., Ghandour E.K. et al.: A systematic review of instruments to assess organizational readiness for knowledge translation in health care. PloS One 2015; 10(12): e0143842: 1–18.
2. Snyder-Halpern R., Verran J.A.: Leadership strategies for advancing telehealth: Developing an effective telehealth program with a focus on organizational structure and change management. J Health Manag 2018; 63(4): 237–249.
3. Anand G., Kodali R., Tiwari M.K.: A Conceptual Framework for Knowledge Management in Healthcare: A Viewpoint. Journal of Advances in Management Research 2014; 11(1): 105–125.
4. Dwivedi A., Bali R.K., James A.E.: A study of Critical Success Factors (CSFs) for effective Knowledge Management (KM) implementation in hospitals. Informatics for Health and Social Care 2019; 44(1): 45–55.
5. Menachemi N., Collum T.H.: Benefits and drawbacks of electronic health record systems, Risk Management And Healthcare Policy 2011; 4: 47–55.
6. Bloom D.E., Chatterji S., Kowal P. et al.: Macroeconomic implications of population ageing and selected policy responses. Lancet 2015; 385(9968): 649–657.
7. Kaplan R.S., Porter M.E.: How to solve the cost crisis in health care. Harv Bus Rev 2011; 89(9): 46–52, 54, 56–61 passim.
8. Bali R.K., Dwivedi A.N.: Healthcare Knowledge Management: Issues, Advances and Successes. Heidelberg: Springer; 2016.
9. Nonaka I., Toyama R.: The knowledge-based view of the firm and its theoretical precursor: The resource-based theory. In: Easterby-Smith M., Lyles M.A., ed. Handbook of Organizational Learning and Knowledge Management. 2nd ed. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons; 2015. 151–184.
10. Hislop D., Bosua R., Helms R.: Knowledge Management in Organizations: A Critical Introduction. 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2018. 128–155.
11. Rouleau G., Gagnon M.P., Cote J., Payne-Gagnon J., Hudson E., Dubois C.A.: Impact of information and communication technologies on nursing care: Results of an overview of systematic reviews. J Med Internet Res. 2017; 19(4): e122. 1–14.
12. Thiel S.W., Rosini J.M., Shannon W., Doherty J.A., Micek S.T., Kollef M.H.: Early prediction of septic shock in hospitalized patients. J Hosp Med 2019; 4(1): 26–31.
13. Hilligoss B., Song P.H.: Creating patient safety capacity in a fragmented health care system: A black swan moment for health information exchange. Med Care Res Rev 2015; 72(6): 736–749.
14. Booth A., Sutton A., Papaioannou D.: Systematic Approaches to a Successful Literature Review. 2nd ed. Los Angeles: Sage; 2016. 71–88.
15. Elo S., Kyngäs H.: The qualitative content analysis process. J Adv Nurs 2008; 62(1): 107–115.
16. Nonaka I., Takeuchi H.: The Knowledge-Creating Company: How Japanese Companies Create the Dynamics of Innovation. New York: Oxford University Press; 1995.
17. Porter M.: What is strategy? Harvard Business Review 1996; 74(6): 61–78.
18. Prahalad C.K., Hamel G.: The Core Competence of the Corporation. Harvard Business Review 1990; 05: 79–91.
19. Davenport T.H.: Putting the Enterprise into the Enterprise System. Harvard Business Review 1998; 76: 121–131.
20. Wang S., Noe R.A.: Knowledge Sharing: A Review and Directions for Future Research. Human Resource Management Review 2010; 20: 115–131.
21. Alavi M., Leidner D.E.: Knowledge Management and Knowledge Management Systems: Conceptual Foundations and Research Issues. MIS Quarterly 2001; 25: 107–136.
22. Gold A., Malhotra A., Segars A.: Knowledge Management: An Organizational Capabilities Perspective. Journal of Management Information Systems 2001; 18: 185–214.
23. Davenport T. &. P.L.: Working Knowledge: How Organizations Manage What They Know. Boston: Harvard Business School Press; 1998.
24. Argote L.: Organizational Learning: Creating, Retaining and Transferring Knowledge. Berlin: Springer Science & Business Media; 2012.
25. Eraut M.: Non-formal learning and tacit knowledge in professional work. British Journal of Educational Psychology 2000; 70: 113–136.
26. Blumenthal D., Tavenner M.: The "Meaningful Use" Regulation for Electronic Health Records. New England Journal of Medicine 2010; 363: 501–504.
27. Levitt B., March J.: Organizational Learning. Annual Review of Sociology. Annual Review of Sociology 1988; 14: 319–340.
28. Wang Y., Kung L., Byrd T.A.: Big data analytics: Understanding its capabilities and potential benefits for healthcare organizations. Technological Forecasting and Social Change 2018; 126(C): 3–13.
29. Donate M.J., Guadamillas F.: Organizational Factors to Support Knowledge Management and Innovation. Journal of Knowledge Management 2011; 15: 890–914.
30. Cummings J.N.: Work Groups, Structural Diversity, and Knowledge Sharing in a Global Organization. Management Science 2004; 50: 352–364.
31. Tseng S.: The Correlation between Organizational Culture and Knowledge Conversion on Corporate Performance. Journal of Knowledge Management 2010; 14: 269–284.
32. Kaplan R.S., Norton D.P.: Strategic Learning: The Balanced Scorecard. Strategy & Leadership 1996; 24: 18–24.
33. Kankanhalli A., Tan B., Wei K.K.: Contributing Knowledge to Electronic Knowledge Repositories: An Empirical Investigation. MIS Quarterly 2005; 29: 113–143.
34. Riege A.: Three-Dozen Knowledge-Sharing Barriers Managers Must Consider. Journal of Knowledge Management 2005; 9: 18–35.
35. Wenger E., McDermott R., Snyder W.M.: A guide to managing knowledge: Cultivating communities of practice. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press; 2002.
36. Appari A., Johnson E.M.: Information security and privacy in healthcare: current state of research. International Journal of Internet and Enterprise Management 2010; 6(4): 279–314.
37. Davenport T., Delong D., Beers M.: Successful Knowledge Management Projects. Sloan Management Review 1998; 39: 43–57.
38. Jha A.K. et al.: Patients' Perception of Hospital Care in the United States. New England Journal of Medicine 2008; 359: 1921–1931.
39. Chaudhry B., Wang J., Wu S., Maglione M., Mojica W., Roth E. et al.: Systematic Review: Impact of Health Information Technology on Quality, Efficiency, and Costs of Medical care. Annals of Internal Medicine 2006; 144: 742–752.
40. Drucker P.: Knowledge Worker Productivity: The Biggest Challenge. California Management Review 1999; 41: 79–94.

41. Smith J.E.: Qualitative Psychology: A Practical Guide to Research Methods. London: Sage Publications; 2003.
42. Argote I., McEvily B., Reagans R.: Managing Knowledge in Organizations: An Integrative Framework and Review of Emerging Themes. Management Science 2003; 49(4): 571–582.
43. Connelly C.E., Zweig D., Webster J., Trougakos J.P.: Knowledge Hiding in Organizations. Journal of Organizational Behavior 2012; 33: 64–88.
44. Schepers P., van den Berg P.: Social Factors of Work-Environment Creativity. Journal of Business and Psychology 2007; 21: 407–428.
45. Connelly C.E., Turel O., Ford D., Gallupe B., Zweig D.: 'I'm busy (and competitive)!' Antecedents of knowledge sharing under pressure. Knowledge Management Research & Practice 2014; 12: 74–85.
46. McDonald S.: Studying actions in context: A qualitative shadowing method for organizational research. Qualitative Research 2005; 5: 455–473.
47. Cohen W., Levinthal D.: Absorptive Capacity: A New Perspective on Learning and Innovation. Administrative Science Quarterly 1990; 35: 128–152.
48. Devaraj S., Kohli R.: Performance Impacts of Information Technology: Is Actual Usage the Missing Link? Management Science 2003; 49: 273–289.
49. Goh B.: The Dynamic Effects of the Asian Financial Crisis on Construction Demand and Tender Price Levels in Singapore. Building and Environment 2005; 40: 267–276.
50. Bhatt G.: Knowledge Management in Organizations: Examining the Interaction between Technologies, Techniques, and People. Journal of Knowledge Management 2001; 5: 68–75.
51. Raghupathi W., Raghupathi V.: Big Data Analytics in Healthcare: Promise and Potential. Health Information Science and Systems 2014; Feb 7: 2–3.
52. Hosseini S., Yaghoubi M., Javadi M., Rezaei F.: An investigation into the critical success factors for hospital knowledge management implementation. Health Information Management Journal 2021; 50(1): 37–47.

Address for correspondence:

Marcin Bobruk
Wydział Nauk o Zdrowiu
Uniwersytetu Medycznego w Łodzi
e-mail: marcin.bobruk@stud.umed.lodz.pl