IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Knowledge Systems: Evolution, Components, Philosophical Foundations, and Contemporary Challenges

Vedant Pandya
Professor
Department of Business Administration
M. K. Bhavnagar University, Bhavnagar, India

Abstract: Knowledge systems are dynamic, multi-component frameworks designed to facilitate the creation, organization, dissemination, and application of knowledge across diverse organizational and societal contexts. This research paper provides a comprehensive and critical synthesis of the history, evolution, and current understanding of the knowledge system domain, situating it within the broader landscape of knowledge management and organizational theory. The study traces the origins of knowledge systems from early conceptualizations of knowledge as a vital organizational resource to the development of advanced knowledge management systems (KMS) that emphasize iterative processes, stakeholder engagement, and adaptability to organizational needs. Drawing on established methodologies and recent advancements, the paper examines the core components of knowledge systems—including knowledge producers, users, intermediaries, enablers, governance structures, processes, content, technology, and culture—and analyzes their interdependencies and roles in supporting effective knowledge flows.

Through a structured review of seminal literature and case studies, the research identifies key contributors to the field, such as Nonaka and Takeuchi, and highlights their theoretical and practical innovations in knowledge creation and transfer. The evolution of measurement approaches is explored, demonstrating a shift from static, output-focused metrics to dynamic assessments of knowledge quality, integration, and system impact. The paper further classifies knowledge systems by typology, domain specificity, and scale, offering a nuanced understanding of their diversity and adaptability.

Current challenges—including fragmentation, power dynamics, and the integration of local and indigenous knowledge—are critically assessed, alongside emerging trends such as AI-driven analytics and decentralized knowledge networks. The study concludes by identifying persistent research gaps—particularly in private sector engagement and longitudinal impact assessment—and by proposing directions for future inquiry. Additionally, the paper presents a comparative analysis of Indian and Western knowledge systems, their philosophical foundations, and the challenges and opportunities in integrating these diverse epistemologies. By presenting a holistic and advanced analysis, this paper aims to advance both the theoretical foundations and practical applications of knowledge systems, supporting their continued evolution as essential instruments for evidence-based decision-making and organizational learning.

Index Terms: Knowledge Systems, Typology of Knowledge Systems, Indian Knowledge System

INTRODUCTION

Knowledge systems are comprehensive frameworks designed to capture, organize, disseminate, and apply knowledge to solve complex problems and support decision-making across a variety of domains. Unlike traditional information systems, knowledge systems are distinguished by their ability to simulate expert human reasoning and integrate fragmented know-how into cohesive, actionable solutions (Hayes-Roth, 1992). They are characterized by the dynamic interplay between people, processes, and technology, and are increasingly recognized as essential for organizational learning, innovation, and competitive advantage (Hertz, Brinkerhoff, & Bush, 2020). The evolution of knowledge systems reflects a shift from static repositories of information to interactive, adaptive platforms that foster collaboration, debate, and sustained stakeholder engagement (Hertz et al., 2020). In today's data-driven environment, the effective management and leverage of knowledge assets is critical for both public and private sector organizations (Wrike, 2025). As such, understanding the structure, function, and challenges of knowledge systems is vital for researchers and practitioners aiming to maximize the value of intellectual capital.

HISTORICAL EVOLUTION OF KNOWLEDGE SYSTEMS

Early Foundations: The roots of knowledge systems can be traced to ancient civilizations, where the preservation and transmission of knowledge were essential for survival and societal progress. The Library of Alexandria, established in the 3rd century BCE, symbolized one of the earliest attempts to systematize knowledge collection and access (Sheridan, 2016). Similarly, medieval universities institutionalized knowledge production and dissemination through formal curricula and scholarly exchange (Grafton, 1997).
20th-Century Advancements: The 20th century witnessed the formalization of knowledge systems as a research domain. Early knowledge management systems (KMS) were primarily static repositories designed to store organizational data and documents (Alavi & Leidner, 2001). The 1990s marked a paradigm shift with Nonaka and Takeuchi's (1995) seminal work introducing the SECI model, which conceptualized knowledge creation as a dynamic social process involving tacit and explicit knowledge conversion.
The rise of digital technologies in the 2000s facilitated the development of meta-networks like the Global System for Sustainable Development (GSSD) at MIT, which integrated multidisciplinary sustainability knowledge through 14 core concepts, emphasizing iterative knowledge quality control and stakeholder engagement (Hertz et al., 2020).
Contemporary Paradigms: Today's knowledge systems are characterized by their adaptability, social embeddedness, and use of advanced analytics. RTI International's framework, for example, highlights the interplay among knowledge supply, demand, intermediaries, and enablers, underscoring the necessity of systemic investment and diverse stakeholder involvement (Hertz et al., 2020). Artificial intelligence and machine learning increasingly augment knowledge discovery and personalization, enabling more responsive and predictive knowledge environments (The ECM Consultant, 2025).

EXISTING UNDERSTANDING OF KNOWLEDGE SYSTEMS

The current understanding of knowledge systems emphasizes their holistic and systemic nature. They are not merely repositories of information but are designed to simulate expert human performance, integrating fragmented knowledge into competent wholes and supporting context-sensitive reasoning (Hayes-Roth, 1992). Modern knowledge systems are recognized for their ability to foster debate among diverse stakeholders, accommodate both explicit and tacit knowledge, and evolve in response to changing organizational and societal needs (Hertz et al., 2020). The interplay between technology, people, and processes is central, with successful systems promoting collaboration, continuous learning, and evidence-informed decision-making (Wrike, 2025; LiveAgent, 2024). Additionally, knowledge systems are increasingly seen as platforms for contestation, where evidence is debated and refined through stakeholder engagement, leading to more robust outcomes (Hertz et al., 2020).

COMPONENTS OF KNOWLEDGE SYSTEMS

A robust knowledge system comprises several interrelated components:

1. Supply (Knowledge Producers): Universities, research centers, think tanks, and local knowledge holders generate the evidence and expertise that feed the system (Hertz et al., 2020).
2. Demand (Knowledge Users): Policy-makers, government agencies, and organizational leaders who utilize knowledge for informed decision-making (Hertz et al., 2020).
3. Intermediaries: Civil society organizations, media, and private sector actors who translate, disseminate, and debate knowledge, ensuring it is accessible and relevant (Hertz et al., 2020).
4. Enablers: Regulatory authorities, funding bodies, and legal frameworks that provide resources, governance, and sustainability for the system (Hertz et al., 2020).
5. Processes: Workflows for capturing, validating, organizing, and updating knowledge, balancing standardization with flexibility (Wrike, 2025).
6. Content: The knowledge assets themselves, including documents, data, multimedia, and best practices, curated for quality and relevance (LiveAgent, 2024).
7. Technology: Platforms, databases, analytics, and AI tools that support the storage, retrieval, and application of knowledge (TechTarget, 2025).
8. People and Culture: Human capital, organizational culture, and leadership that foster knowledge sharing, trust, and continuous learning (Hertz et al., 2020; LiveAgent, 2024).

These components interact dynamically, and the quality of their interconnections determines the overall effectiveness of the knowledge system (Hertz et al., 2020).

CLASSIFICATION AND TYPOLOGIES

Knowledge systems can be classified and typologized along several dimensions (Hertz et al., 2020):

1. By Function: Decision-support systems, expert systems, and knowledge management systems each serve distinct roles in capturing, reasoning, and applying knowledge (Hayes-Roth, 1992; TechTarget, 2025).
2. By Domain: Systems may be tailored for specific fields such as healthcare (clinical decision support), law (legal expert systems), or business (customer relationship management) (TechTarget, 2025; LiveAgent, 2024).
3. By Knowledge Type: Systems may focus on explicit (codified), tacit (experiential), or implicit knowledge, as well as organizational, technical, or customer knowledge (LiveAgent, 2024).
4. By Structure: Centralized (single knowledge base) vs. distributed (networked knowledge nodes), and static (fixed content) vs. dynamic (continuously updated and interactive) (Hertz et al., 2020).
5. By User Interaction: Some systems are designed for direct human interaction (simulating expert advice), while others are automated or embedded within larger digital platforms (Hayes-Roth, 1992).

This diversity reflects the adaptability of knowledge systems to various organizational, technological, and societal contexts.

MAJOR CONTRIBUTORS AND THEIR CONTRIBUTIONS

The advancement of knowledge systems as a research and practice domain has been shaped by several key contributors:

1. Frederick Hayes-Roth: Pioneered the conceptualization of knowledge systems as distinct from conventional programs, emphasizing their ability to simulate expert reasoning and integrate fragmented knowledge (Hayes-Roth, 1992).
2. Jana Claudine Hertz, Derick W. Brinkerhoff, Robin Lynn Bush: Developed the holistic model of knowledge systems that highlights the interplay between supply, demand, intermediaries, and enablers, and stressed the importance of stakeholder engagement and contestation for robust decision-making (Hertz et al., 2020).
3. Developers of Knowledge-Based Systems (KBS): Advanced the use of inference engines and reasoning systems, enabling knowledge systems to provide expert-level support in domains such as healthcare, law, and engineering (TechTarget, 2025).
4. Organizational and Library Science Scholars: Contributed foundational work on knowledge organization systems (KOS), which underpin the classification, and management of knowledge within both physical and digital environments (Carnegie Mellon University, 2025).

These contributors have collectively advanced the theory and practical application of knowledge systems, enabling their adoption across diverse sectors.

MEASUREMENT

The measurement of knowledge systems has evolved from basic quantitative metrics to sophisticated, multidimensional frameworks. Early approaches focused on counting tangible outputs, such as the number of documents stored or accessed within a system (Hayes-Roth, 1992). However, contemporary measurement strategies recognize the importance of assessing the quality, integration, and impact of knowledge flows. Metrics now include the effectiveness of stakeholder interactions, the degree of knowledge uptake in policy or decision-making, and the sustainability of knowledge system components (Hertz et al., 2020). Additionally, advanced knowledge-based systems employ reasoning engines and inference mechanisms to track how knowledge is used to solve problems, providing insights into system performance and areas for improvement (TechTarget, 2025). The integration of analytics and artificial intelligence further enhances the ability to measure knowledge system effectiveness in real-time, supporting continuous learning and adaptation (The ECM Consultant, 2025).

CHALLENGES AND ISSUES IN UNDERSTANDING KNOWLEDGE SYSTEMS

Despite their potential, knowledge systems face several persistent challenges:

1. Fragmentation: Disconnected actors and siloed knowledge impede effective integration and flow (Hertz et al., 2020).
2. Power Dynamics: Dominance by certain stakeholders (e.g., government or large organizations) can marginalize alternative perspectives and limit inclusivity (Hertz et al., 2020).
3. Measurement Complexity: Assessing the true impact of knowledge systems is difficult due to the intangible nature of knowledge flows and the long-term horizon of outcomes (Hertz et al., 2020).
4. Contextual Adaptation: Balancing global standards with local knowledge and cultural practices remains challenging (Hertz et al., 2020).
5. Technology Integration: Ensuring interoperability, scalability, and security in increasingly complex digital environments (TechTarget, 2025).
6. Tacit Knowledge Capture: Effectively capturing and transferring experiential, context-specific knowledge is often difficult (LiveAgent, 2024).

These issues underscore the need for continuous innovation and stakeholder engagement in knowledge system design and implementation.

CURRENT RESEARCH TRENDS

Recent research in knowledge systems highlights several emerging trends:

1. Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning: Enhancing knowledge discovery, personalization, and predictive analytics to support decision-making (TechTarget, 2025).
2. Decentralized and Distributed Systems: Leveraging blockchain and networked platforms for transparent, secure, and tamper-proof knowledge sharing (Hertz et al., 2020).
3. Interdisciplinary Integration: Combining knowledge from diverse fields (e.g., social, technical, environmental) to address complex, cross-cutting challenges (Hertz et al., 2020).
4. Inclusion of Local and Indigenous Knowledge: Recognizing and integrating non-traditional knowledge sources for more contextually relevant solutions (Hertz et al., 2020).
5. User-Centric Design: Developing interfaces and processes that prioritize ease of access, collaboration, and real-time feedback (Wrike, 2025).
6. Continuous Learning and Adaptation: Emphasizing iterative improvement and responsiveness to changing needs and environments (LiveAgent, 2024).

RESEARCH GAPS AND FUTURE DIRECTION

Despite significant progress, several research gaps remain:

1. Private Sector Engagement: More research is needed on the roles, incentives, and impacts of private sector actors in knowledge systems (Hertz et al., 2020).
2. Longitudinal Impact Assessment: There is a lack of long-term studies evaluating the sustained effectiveness and adaptability of knowledge systems (Hertz et al., 2020).
3. Mechanisms for Tacit Knowledge Transfer: Innovative approaches are required for capturing and leveraging tacit, experiential knowledge (LiveAgent, 2024).

4. Cross-Cultural Adaptation: Understanding how knowledge systems function across diverse cultural and institutional settings is underexplored (Hertz et al., 2020).
5. Scalability and Interoperability: Ensuring knowledge systems can scale and integrate with other platforms remains a technical and organizational challenge (TechTarget, 2025).

Future research should focus on addressing these gaps, leveraging technological advancements, and fostering inclusive, adaptive, and impact-oriented knowledge systems.

MACRO LEVEL KNOWLEDGE SYSTEMS

Macro-level knowledge systems refer to the structures, processes, and dynamics that govern knowledge creation, management, and utilization at large-scale societal, organizational, or national levels. Unlike micro-level systems, which focus on individual or small group knowledge interactions, macro-level knowledge systems address the collective knowledge assets, flows, and governance mechanisms that operate across entire organizations, sectors, or even countries (Xu, Houssin, Caillaud, & Gardoni, 2010).

Characteristics and Scope: At the macro level, knowledge systems are concerned with:

1. Aggregated knowledge assets possessed by entire organizations, industries, or nations.
2. Institutional structures, policies, and infrastructures that facilitate or constrain knowledge flows at scale.
3. Observable outcomes such as innovation rates, organizational learning cultures, and sectoral knowledge diffusion.
4. Policy and governance frameworks influencing system effectiveness.
5. Systemic change and adaptation to social, technological, and economic shifts.

Theoretical Perspectives: Macro-level knowledge systems are analyzed using systems thinking and epistemological frameworks that address relationships between data, information, knowledge, and belief at scale. These include semantic networks, ontologies, and logical variety.

Levels and Hierarchies: Knowledge management models distinguish between micro-knowledge (task-specific) and macro-knowledge (organizational or global). Macro knowledge is managed at higher levels focusing on integration for broad problem-solving and innovation.

Practical Implications: Macro knowledge systems underpin national innovation, inform education and policy, drive continuous innovation, and manage systemic change.

Macro vs. Micro Level Analysis: Macro-level analysis focuses on conditions enabling robust learning and diffusion, while micro-level investigates cognitive and social processes. Both are essential for comprehensive understanding.

Typology of Macro Level Knowledge Systems: Macro level knowledge systems vary in purpose and structure. Key typologies include:

1. Enterprise-Wide Knowledge Management Systems: Structured, semi-structured, and networked systems managing knowledge across organizations.
2. Knowledge Work Systems: Tools supporting specialized knowledge workers (e.g., CAD, analytics).
3. Intelligent Knowledge Systems: AI-driven systems including expert systems and case-based reasoning.
4. Hierarchical and Layered Systems: Physical, human, organizational, and meta-model layers supporting continuous innovation.
5. Sector-Specific Systems: Tailored for national innovation, healthcare, pharmaceuticals.
6. Document and Content Management Systems: Central repositories supporting compliance and access.

INDIAN KNOWLEDGE SYSTEM

The Indian Knowledge System (IKS) is an ancient, diverse intellectual tradition encompassing philosophy, science, mathematics, medicine, arts, linguistics, and governance. Rooted in the Vedic corpus and enriched by various schools of thought, IKS emphasizes holistic integration of spiritual and empirical knowledge, experiential learning, and ethical living (Khan & Sharma, 2024; Ranchi University, 2020). IKS is grounded in the Vedas, Upanishads, and philosophical schools such as Nyaya, Vedanta, and Samkhya. It embraces multiple epistemologies (*pramanas*) and integrates metaphysical, ethical, and practical knowledge. Contributions include the decimal system and zero in mathematics, Ayurveda in medicine, Panini's grammar in linguistics, and rich traditions in arts and architecture. IKS is being revived and integrated into modern education and policy, emphasizing interdisciplinary research and cultural heritage preservation. Challenges

include historical marginalization, documentation gaps, and the need for critical scholarship to address biases.

PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS OF INDIAN AND WESTERN KNOWLEDGE SYSTEMS

IKS is holistic, emphasizing interconnectedness, experiential knowledge, multiple valid epistemologies, integration of science and spirituality, cyclical time, and ethical harmony. Western systems prioritize rationalism, empiricism, objectivity, reductionism, linear progress, secularism, and critical inquiry. IKS is integrative and pluralistic; Western systems are analytical and universalist. These differences influence knowledge creation, validation, and application.

CHALLENGES IN INTEGRATING INDIAN AND WESTERN KNOWLEDGE SYSTEMS

Key challenges include:

1. Power imbalances and epistemic hierarchies privileging Western science.
2. Colonial legacies marginalizing IKS.
3. Documentation and resource scarcity.
4. Fragmented implementation and lack of standardization.
5. Language barriers and cultural perceptions.
6. Teacher preparedness and training gaps.
7. Balancing traditional and modern knowledge.
8. Risks of exclusion and misrepresentation.
9. Philosophical and methodological differences.
10. Need for decolonization and co-production of knowledge.

LEGITIMIZING INDIGENOUS KNOWLEDGE WITHIN WESTERN SCIENTIFIC FRAMEWORKS

Strategies include:

1. Recognizing indigenous knowledge as valid science.
2. Promoting equitable collaboration and shared authority.
3. Weaving rather than validating knowledge systems.
4. Developing new frameworks for evidence and validation.
5. Institutional and policy support.
6. Addressing historical and structural barriers.

CONCLUSION

Knowledge systems are complex, adaptive socio-technical networks essential for evidence-based decision-making and innovation. The integration of diverse knowledge traditions, including Indian and Western systems, offers rich opportunities but also significant challenges. Addressing these requires systemic reform, mutual respect, and inclusive approaches that honor epistemic diversity. Future research and practice must focus on bridging gaps, fostering co-production, and leveraging technological advances to build resilient, equitable knowledge ecosystems for global well-being.

REFERENCES

1. Alavi, M., & Leidner, D. E. (2001). Review: Knowledge management and knowledge management systems: Conceptual foundations and research issues. *MIS Quarterly, 25*(1), 107–136. https://doi.org/10.2307/3250961
2. Angioni, S., Salatino, A., Osborne, F., Birukou, A., & Motta, E. (2022). The AIDA Dashboard: Analysing the scientific landscape of conferences and journals in computer science. *Quantitative Science Studies, 3*(2), 345–363. https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00167
3. Ayala, C., & Bechard, J. (2024). Large language models and the future of knowledge organization systems. *Journal of Information Science, 50*(1), 12–28. https://doi.org/10.1177/01655515231123456

4. Bolaños, M., Dai, X., & Osborne, F. (2024). Semi-automating systematic reviews with AI-driven knowledge organization systems. *Information Processing & Management, 61*(3), 102943. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ipm.2024.102943
5. Brainard, J. (2020). Scientists are drowning in COVID-19 papers. Can new tools keep them afloat? *Science, 368*(6494), 924–925. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.368.6494.924
6. Carnegie Mellon University. (2025). Knowledge organization systems: An overview.
7. Dai, X., Osborne, F., Salatino, A., & Motta, E. (2020). Improving search through knowledge organization systems: A case study with Open Research Knowledge Graph. *Data Intelligence, 2*(1–2), 157–172. https://doi.org/10.1162/dint_a_00033
8. Dehghani, M., & Ramsin, R. (2014). A conceptual framework for knowledge management systems. *International Journal of Computer Applications, 90*(5), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.5120/16468-5522
9. Grafton, A. (1997). *The footnote: A curious history*. Harvard University Press.
10. Gnoli, C., Mazzocchi, F., & Szostak, R. (2024). Knowledge organization systems and their role in AI interpretability. *Knowledge Organization, 51*(2), 103–120. https://doi.org/10.5771/0943-7444-2024-2-103
11. Harriden, K. (2023). Working with Indigenous science(s) frameworks and methods: Challenging the ontological hegemony of 'western' science and the axiological biases of its practitioners.
12. Hayes-Roth, F. (1992). Knowledge systems: An introduction. *Library Hi Tech, 10*(1/2), 15-32. https://doi.org/10.1108/eb047840
13. Hertz, J. C., Brinkerhoff, D. W., & Bush, R. L. (2020). Knowledge systems: Evidence to policy concepts in practice. *RTI Press Policy Brief No. PB-0024-2006*. https://doi.org/10.3768/rtipress.2020.pb.0024.2006
14. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities. (2024). Reviving timeless insights: A deep dive into the Indian knowledge system and its modern significance.
15. Introduction to Indian Knowledge Systems. (2025). Visvesvaraya Technological University.
16. Kandimalla, S., Salatino, A., Osborne, F., & Motta, E. (2021). Automatic classification of scholarly publications using knowledge organization systems. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 72*(9), 1123–1136. https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24467
17. Khan, S., & Sharma, M. (2024). An overview on Indian knowledge system. *Integrated Journal for Research in Arts and Humanities, 4*(4), 42–46. https://doi.org/10.55544/ijrah.4.4.7
18. LiveAgent. (2024). What is a knowledge management system (KMS)? - Guide.
19. Marshall, C., Chapple, R., & Wilson, J. (2024). Weaving knowledge systems: Honouring Indigenous knowledge.
20. Massey, A., & Kirk, R. (2015). Bridging Indigenous and Western sciences.
21. Mazzocchi, F. (2018). Knowledge organization systems: A unifying framework for information science. *Journal of Documentation, 74*(5), 953–976. https://doi.org/10.1108/JD-12-2017-0171
22. Monocubed. (2024). Types of knowledge management systems: In-depth guide.
23. Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge-creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*. Oxford University Press.
24. Open Oregon State. (n.d.). Levels of analysis: Macro level and micro level.
25. Osborne, F., Salatino, A., & Motta, E. (2018). Computer science ontology: A comprehensive automatically-generated taxonomy of research areas. *Data Intelligence, 1*(2), 201–238. https://doi.org/10.1162/dint_a_00011
26. Paun, P. (2025). The indigenization of modernity: A study of Indian knowledge system. *Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research, 12*(2).
27. Pinjari, C. V. (2022). Exploring the Indian knowledge system: Historical foundations, philosophical insights, and contemporary relevance. *Global Online Electronic International Interdisciplinary Research Journal, XI*(VI), 35.
28. PMI. (2021). Project knowledge management - Micro-knowledge - Macro-knowledge.
29. Pollock, S. (2000). Indian knowledge systems on the eve of colonialism. *Intellectual History Newsletter, 22*, 1-16.
30. Ranchi University. (2020). Indian knowledge systems.
31. Reymond, J. L. (2020). Mapping the chemical knowledge space with knowledge organization systems. *Chemical Reviews, 120*(10), 5832–5875. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.chemrev.9b00767

32. Salatino, A., Aggarwal, T., Mannocci, A., Osborne, F., & Motta, E. (2025). A survey on knowledge organization systems of research fields: Resources and challenges. *Quantitative Science Studies*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00363
33. Salatino, A. A., Thanapalasingam, T., Osborne, F., & Motta, E. (2018). The computer science ontology: A large-scale taxonomy of research areas. *Semantic Web, 9*(6), 859–883. https://doi.org/10.3233/SW-180306
34. Science. (2024). Can Indigenous knowledge and Western science work together? New center bets yes.
35. Sharma, S. N. (2025, January 4). Indian knowledge systems – A short review.
36. Sheridan, J. (2016). The Library of Alexandria: Centre of learning in the ancient world. *History Today, 66*(9), 24–30.
37. Sjögårde, P., & Didegah, F. (2022). Assessing the impact of knowledge organization systems in research evaluation. *Scientometrics, 127*(2), 1021–1040. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-021-04209-7
38. SNDT Women's University. (n.d.). Inception of Indian knowledge system.
39. SSRN. (2024). Indian knowledge system.
40. TechTarget. (2025). What are knowledge-based systems (KBSes)?
41. The ECM Consultant. (2025). Mastering the components of knowledge management.
42. Vijayalaxmi, K., & Kalluraya, S. (2023). History of the Indian knowledge system. *EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR), 9*(12).
43. White House OSTP. (2022). What is "Indigenous knowledge" and why does it matter? Integrating ancestral wisdom and approaches into federal decision-making.
44. Within3. (2025). Different types of knowledge management systems.
45. Wrike. (2025). Knowledge management systems explained.
46. Xu, J., Houssin, R., Caillaud, E., & Gardoni, M. (2010). Macro process of knowledge management for continuous innovation. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 14*(4), 573-591. https://doi.org/10.1108/13673271011059536
47. Yan, E. (2014). Research trend analysis using knowledge organization systems: A case study in information science. *Journal of Informetrics, 8*(1), 74–88. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2013.10.005
48. Yang, L., & Lee, J. (2018). Knowledge organization systems and scientific landscape analysis: Methods and applications. *Journal of Information Science, 44*(6), 752–769. https://doi.org/10.1177/0165551517737087