ISSN: 1609-1620 (Print); ISSN: 2674-5224 (Online)
PAHTEI
REFERRED & REVIEWED JOURNAL
09 - 20
VOLUME 27 ISSUE 05 2025

KNOWLEDGE-BASED DECISION MAKING: INTEGRATING KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT FOR ENHANCED ORGANIZATIONAL DECISIONS

Adil Abbasov[1], Kamala Aliyeva[2]
[1,2] Azerbaijan State Oil and Industry University,
[1] SABAH Groups,[2] Instrument engineering department
[1] Master, abbasov.adil.n@gmail.com
[2] Professor, kamalann64@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

In today's complex, data-intensive business environment, organizations are increasingly relying on knowledge-based decision-making (KBDM) to achieve a competitive advantage. This article investigates how integrating systematic knowledge management processes into the decision-making framework enhances organizational performance. Using a mixed-methods approach, including comprehensive surveys, in-depth interviews, and document analysis, the study identifies key enablers of KBDM. These include a collaborative organizational culture, supportive and visionary leadership, and the deployment of advanced technological systems such as decision support systems and artificial intelligence. The findings reveal that organizations that effectively capture both explicit and tacit knowledge can make more informed, evidence-based decisions that improve innovation, operational efficiency, and strategic adaptability. Moreover, the research underscores the importance of aligning technology with human processes to prevent information overload and ensure that knowledge is shared and applied effectively. The practical implications of these findings suggest that firms must invest in building robust knowledge infrastructures and fostering a culture that rewards learning and continuous improvement. The study also outlines future research directions for developing quantitative metrics to evaluate decision quality and further exploring cross-cultural differences in knowledge management practices.
Keywords: Knowledge-based decision making; Knowledge management; Organizational culture; Leadership; Decision support systems; Knowledge sharing

Introduction

Modern organizations operate in a dynamic environment characterized by rapid change, big data, and complex problems. In this context**, knowledge-based decision-making refers to decision** processes that are explicitly informed by relevant organizational knowledge, data, information, and expertise, rather than relying on intuition or isolated information. The premise is that when decisions are grounded in systematically managed knowledge, they become more consistent, transparent, and effective. Many firms have recognized knowledge as a strategic asset for competitive advantage in decision-making. For example, companies that fully leverage internal knowledge and data often devise better strategies and respond faster to market changes than those that do not. As industries globalize and information flows increase, harnessing collective know-how is increasingly seen as indispensable for high-quality decisions.

Despite its promise, systematically embedding knowledge into decision processes presents several challenges. Organizational knowledge is often fragmented: some knowledge is documented in databases and reports (explicit knowledge), while much resides in employees' experiences and

ISSN: 1609-1620 (Print); ISSN: 2674-5224 (Online)
PAHTEI
REFERRED & REVIEWED JOURNAL

intuition (tacit knowledge). Tacit knowledge is by nature difficult to formalize or transfer, so critical insights may remain locked in individuals' heads. Organizations often struggle to capture these insights and make them available for future decisions. Moreover, there can be cultural and motivational barriers to knowledge sharing, employees might fear that sharing what they know could diminish their value or expose past mistakes. Technological hurdles also exist; in some cases, companies lack the integrated systems needed to pool data and lessons learned from across the organization. In other cases, decision-makers face **information overload** from too much data without context, leading to "analysis paralysis." These challenges underscore a gap between the ideal of knowledge-informed decisions and the reality in many organizations. Managers may recognize the value of knowledge-based approaches but be uncertain how to implement them in practice.

This study aims to address that gap by examining how knowledge management practices can be effectively integrated into organizational decision-making. By drawing on established theories and new empirical evidence, the research seeks to identify what factors enable or hinder knowledge-based decision-making (KBDM) and how KBDM, in turn, influences decision quality. The goal is to develop a clearer understanding of the mechanisms by which knowledge, both tacit and explicit, can be systematically gathered, shared, and applied at key decision points. In doing so, the study contributes to both theory and practice: it bridges concepts from knowledge management and decision science, and it offers insights to help organizations move from ad-hoc or intuition-driven decisions to more **knowledge-driven, evidence-backed** decision processes.

Objective

Knowledge Management and Organizational Knowledge: Effective decision-making relies on the quality of knowledge available. Classic works on knowledge management distinguish between tacit and explicit knowledge. Tacit knowledge, as described by Polanyi, is personal know-how and insight that is hard to articulate but crucial for problem-solving. Explicit knowledge is codified information that can be easily documented and accessed. Modern organizations strive to convert tacit knowledge into explicit forms that can be widely shared. The **SECI model** of Nonaka and Takeuchi describes how knowledge is dynamically converted through Socialization, Externalization, Combination, and Internalization processes (turning personal experience into shared knowledge and vice versa). By facilitating this knowledge conversion spiral, organizations create a rich knowledge base that can inform decisions. Another perspective, the knowledge-based view of the firm, posits that knowledge is a fundamental resource for competitive advantage. According to this view, companies that better create, store, and use knowledge will outperform those that do not. In summary, prior research in knowledge management emphasizes developing processes (like knowledge repositories, lessons-learned databases, and communities of practice) that ensure organizational knowledge is captured and readily available when decisions arise.

Decision-Making Models: Traditional decision-making models, such as Simon's intelligence–design–choice framework, assume that decision-makers gather information (intelligence), develop options (design), and then choose the best option (choice). In classical theory, this process is ideally rational, given all available information. In practice, however, bounded rationality limits how much information individuals can process, and decisions are often influenced by cognitive biases or incomplete data. Knowledge-based decision-making can be seen as an evolution of these models, one that explicitly integrates knowledge management into each phase of decision-making.

ISSN: 1609-1620 (Print); ISSN: 2674-5224 (Online)
PAHTEI
REFERRED & REVIEWED JOURNAL

During the intelligence phase, organizations with robust knowledge practices scan their internal and external environments more thoroughly, using knowledge repositories, data analytics, and expert networks to understand problems and opportunities. In the design phase, having access to past project data, research reports, and expert insights can lead to more creative and well-informed alternatives. By the choice phase, knowledge-based approaches provide decision-makers with evidence (from data analysis or prior cases) that clarifies the trade-offs, thereby increasing confidence in the final decision. In essence, KBDM extends traditional models by ensuring that **the right knowledge is available at the right time** to support each step of the decision process.

Enablers of Knowledge-Based Decisions: The literature identifies several organizational factors that influence the success of KBDM. One critical factor is **organizational culture**. A culture that values learning, sharing, and evidence-based practice will encourage employees to contribute information and consult knowledge resources when making decisions. Conversely, in a culture where knowledge is hoarded or mistakes are stigmatized, people may hide information, resulting in decisions made with incomplete insight. Leadership is closely tied to culture; leaders who model knowledge-seeking behavior (for instance, by asking for data or lessons learned before deciding) set a tone that knowledge matters. Another enabler is **technology**. Knowledge management systems (KMS) and decision support systems (DSS) have become powerful tools for KBDM. A well-implemented KMS acts as a central library of organizational knowledge: reports, best practices, client information, and more, all searchable and accessible to employees. DSS, particularly those enhanced with artificial intelligence or analytics, help synthesize large amounts of data to guide decision-makers with forecasts, recommendations, or risk analyses. Research shows that companies using data-driven DSS can achieve measurable performance gains, reinforcing the idea that technology-driven knowledge analysis leads to better decisions.

However, technology alone is not a panacea; how it is integrated into workflows and whether employees trust and know how to use it are equally important. Finally, organizational structure and processes play a role. Firms that embed knowledge activities into their processes (for example, requiring post-project reviews and knowledge-sharing meetings) create a built-in mechanism for continuous learning, which in turn supports more informed decision-making. Taken together, these insights from prior work suggest that KBDM is interdisciplinary, sitting at the intersection of knowledge management (culture, processes, systems) and decision science (models and behavior). This study builds on these foundations, using them to inform the research design and to interpret the findings in context.

Methods

To investigate knowledge-based decision-making in depth, the research employed a mixed-methods design combining quantitative and qualitative approaches. This design was chosen to capture both broad patterns and detailed insights. Quantitative data were collected through a structured survey, while qualitative data came from interviews and document analysis. By triangulating these methods, the study aimed to develop a well-rounded understanding of KBDM, cross-validating findings across different sources of evidence.

Survey: A survey questionnaire was developed to gather quantitative indicators of knowledge-based decision practices across a range of organizations. The survey targeted managers and knowledge workers involved in decision-making. It included a Likert scale and multiple-choice items measuring key constructs: the presence of a knowledge-sharing culture, usage of knowledge management systems, leadership support for knowledge use, and perceived decision-making

ISSN: 1609-1620 (Print); ISSN: 2674-5224 (Online)
PAHTEI
REFERRED & REVIEWED JOURNAL

VOLUME 27 ISSUE 05 2025

effectiveness. For example, respondents rated statements like "Our organization routinely reuses knowledge from past projects when making decisions" and "It is easy to find the information I need for decision-making in my job." The survey was distributed to participants in multiple industries to increase generalizability. In total, responses from a few hundred participants provided a dataset for statistical analysis. These data were analyzed to identify correlations and trends, such as the relationship between knowledge management maturity and decision quality.

Interviews: To complement the survey, semi-structured interviews were conducted with a purposive sample of professionals (e.g., team leaders, project managers, analysts) who had direct experience with implementing or using knowledge-based decision approaches. The interviews probed deeper into how knowledge is applied in daily decision processes and why certain practices succeed or fail. Participants were asked open-ended questions like "Can you describe a time when using organizational knowledge significantly influenced a decision?" and "What challenges does your organization face in encouraging people to use knowledge repositories or data when making decisions?" Interviews typically lasted about one hour and allowed interviewees to share anecdotes and reflections in their own words. All interviews were recorded with consent and transcribed for analysis. The qualitative data from these transcripts were coded to identify common themes (for instance, recurring mentions of trust, incentives, or technology issues) that shed light on the human and organizational factors behind KBDM.

Document Analysis: In addition to surveys and interviews, existing documents and archives related to decision processes were examined. These included internal policy documents on knowledge management, training materials, case reports of past decisions, and evaluation reports. This method provided an unobtrusive means to verify claims and offer concrete examples, such as a "lessons learned" report demonstrating whether knowledge was applied effectively. Reviewing these documents helped confirm if formal practices (e.g., checklists or knowledge bases) were in place and aligned with employee reports. If a survey respondent noted a lack of knowledge-sharing procedures, the absence of related documents served as corroboration; conversely, if an interviewee mentioned a knowledge repository, document analysis could reveal usage statistics or governance policies.

By integrating surveys, interviews, and document analysis, the study ensured both breadth and depth in understanding knowledge-based decision making. Quantitative data revealed measurable patterns, while qualitative insights provided context and motivations behind those patterns, and documents added factual detail. Data from these sources were compared and combined during analysis, quantitative results were statistically analyzed, and qualitative data thematically coded. Ultimately, integrating these insights provided a robust foundation for concluding how knowledge management practices influence decision-making in organizations.

Key Findings

Despite variations among participating organizations, several clear themes emerged from the data. The findings reveal what factors distinguish effective knowledge-based decision-making and what challenges are commonly encountered. Table 1 summarizes the critical organizational readiness factors identified as influencing KBDM success based on the convergent evidence from surveys, interviews, and documents.

Table 1. Organizational Factors Affecting Knowledge-Based Decision Making.

ISSN: 1609-1620 (Print); ISSN: 2674-5224 (Online)
PAHTEI
REFERRED & REVIEWED JOURNAL

Factor	Role in Enabling Knowledge-Based Decision Making
Organizational Culture	A collaborative, trust-oriented culture encourages knowledge sharing and reuse. If employees feel safe to admit mistakes and ask for input, lessons learned are more likely to inform decisions. In contrast, a siloed or blame-oriented culture discourages open knowledge exchange, leading to decisions made in isolation.
People (Skills & Motivation)	Employees' competencies in knowledge management and their willingness to participate are vital. Training staff in knowledge-sharing practices, assigning "knowledge champions," and rewarding contributions (e.g., recognizing innovative ideas) all boost individual engagement in KBDM. When people are empowered and motivated to use knowledge, systems and processes are utilized to their full potential.
Information Technology (IT)	A robust IT infrastructure underpins KBDM by making knowledge accessible. This includes user-friendly knowledge repositories, intranets, collaboration platforms, and decision support tools. When such systems are well-integrated (and kept updated), decision-makers can quickly retrieve relevant data or expertise. Poor or fragmented systems, on the other hand, create knowledge silos and hinder timely access to information.
Knowledge Processes	Formal processes for knowledge creation, sharing, and retention ensure that knowledge is systematically captured and fed into decisions. Practices like regular after-action reviews, communities of practice, or mandatory documentation of project learnings create a "knowledge supply chain" so that past experiences continuously inform new decisions. Without defined processes, valuable knowledge might be overlooked or lost.
Leadership Commitment	Active support from top and middle management legitimizes and drives KBDM. Leaders who champion knowledge use (by demanding evidence for decisions, participating in knowledge-sharing sessions, and allocating resources to KM initiatives) embed the importance of knowledge in the organization's ethos. If leadership is indifferent or solely top-down in decision-making, employees receive the message that their knowledge is not valued.
Strategic Alignment	A clear strategy that treats knowledge as a strategic asset aligns KBDM efforts with organizational goals. When knowledge-based decision-making is explicitly part of the strategy (for example, an objective to improve decision speed or innovation via better knowledge use), it ensures sustained focus, resources, and coherence across culture, people, and technology initiatives. Organizations without this alignment may approach KBDM in an ad hoc way, leading to inconsistent practices.

These factors were often interdependent. For instance, a company with a strong learning culture and leadership support typically had higher IT adoption and more active knowledge processes; this high "knowledge maturity" corresponded with more confidence in decisions and fewer repeated mistakes (as reported by survey respondents). On the other hand, organizations weak in several factors (e.g., siloed culture, low management support, and outdated IT) struggled to make knowledge-based decisions despite recognizing their importance.

Beyond these readiness factors, the study uncovered additional insights:

- **Culture and Leadership Influence:** The qualitative evidence underscored that culture and leadership together form the foundation for KBDM. In organizations where knowledge sharing was "how we do things here," participants described decisions as collective efforts, where people freely consulted colleagues or past project archives before taking action. One interviewee from a high-performing firm noted, "If I have a critical decision, I'm expected to seek input from others or check our knowledge base; it's just part of the process." In such an environment, using knowledge isn't seen as a sign of weakness but as the default mode of operation. By contrast, in a company with a more

ISSN: 1609-1620 (Print); ISSN: 2674-5224 (Online)
PAHTEI
REFERRED & REVIEWED JOURNAL

VOLUME 27 ISSUE 05 2025

politicized culture, an interviewee admitted that **"people keep expertise to themselves because that's how you get ahead here."** This led to situations where decisions were made in a vacuum, sometimes repeating mistakes that could have been avoided. Leadership behavior was a decisive factor in setting these tones. The survey data showed a strong positive correlation between respondents' rating of their leaders' support for knowledge use and the overall effectiveness of decision-making in their organization. Leaders who were described as **inclusive and learning-oriented** had teams that more frequently engaged in knowledge-based practices. For example, some managers held "knowledge roundtables" before major decisions to gather insights, signaling that input was welcome. In contrast, where leadership was autocratic or dismissive of others' input, employees reported being reluctant to voice information, undermining KBDM. In summary, a **supportive culture with engaged leadership** was consistently associated with better utilization of knowledge in decisions.

- **Technology Integration and Decision Support:** Nearly all organizations in the study had some form of information system for knowledge, but their effectiveness varied widely. The findings highlighted that simply having technology is not enough, it's how it is used that counts. In organizations identified as exemplars of KBDM, knowledge platforms (such as an internal wiki, SharePoint site, or custom knowledge portal) were actively used by staff at all levels. Employees could easily search for keywords to find relevant documents or experts, and it was common practice to consult these systems early in the decision process. One manager shared a telling example: her company uses a decision support system that flags if a new project proposal is similar to past projects (and shows how those fared). "The system doesn't decide for us," she explained, "but it alerts us to pitfalls we've seen before so we can learn from them." This kind of **knowledge-based DSS** effectively injects institutional memory into new decisions. However, other participants reported that their organizations had sophisticated tools that were underutilized. Reasons for low use included lack of training ("People don't know how to use the analytics dashboard"), lack of trust in the system ("The data might be outdated or wrong, so managers ignore it"), or poor integration into workflows ("It's there, but it's not part of our routine"). In one case, an interviewee lamented that despite having a costly knowledge database, many in the company still relied on personal spreadsheets and gut feeling. These cases underline that technology must be **user-centered and kept current** to truly enable KBDM. When well-integrated, technology was a force multiplier: it reduced the time to find information, helped teams analyze options with data, and preserved organizational lessons so they were not forgotten. When poorly integrated, technology became just another repository that executives bypassed, leading to knowledge "waste."
- **Improved Decision Outcomes:** Importantly, organizations that achieved a higher degree of knowledge-based decision-making reported tangible benefits. While the study did not track long-term financial performance, respondents' perceptions and examples pointed to improved outcomes. Commonly cited benefits included: faster problem resolution (because answers often already existed in the knowledge base), higher confidence in decisions (knowing that recommendations were backed by data or prior experience), avoidance of past mistakes (teams consulted the record of past failures and adjusted their plans), and more innovative solutions (diverse knowledge inputs sparked creative

ISSN: 1609-1620 (Print); ISSN: 2674-5224 (Online)
PAHTEI
REFERRED & REVIEWED JOURNAL

approaches). For instance, one interviewee described how a product design decision was significantly improved after the team reviewed a knowledge repository of customer feedback and past design choices; they avoided a design flaw that had caused issues two years prior. In the survey, individuals from organizations characterized as having "mature" knowledge practices tended to agree with statements that their organization's decisions are more **evidence-based and successful**. These self-reported advantages align with the theoretical expectation that when decisions are informed by the full breadth of relevant knowledge, they are more likely to be effective. The findings thus illustrate the value proposition of investing in KBDM: better decisions with implications for improved organizational performance and adaptability in the long run.

Discussion

The results of this study reinforce and enrich the existing understanding of the interplay between knowledge management and decision-making. First, the findings strongly support the idea that leveraging organizational knowledge resources leads to better decision quality. This aligns with the knowledge-based view of the firm, which argues that knowledge is a critical source of competitive advantage. In practice, companies that treat knowledge as a key asset by facilitating its capture and use are essentially empowering their decision-makers to be more informed and strategic. The survey correlations showing higher decision effectiveness in firms with advanced knowledge practices echo earlier management research that found links between knowledge utilization and performance outcomes. In other words, this study adds empirical weight to the notion that **"better knowledge leads to better decisions."** It also highlights that this is not automatic; certain conditions (culture, leadership, etc.) must be met for knowledge to truly permeate decision processes.

Comparing these findings to prior theoretical frameworks, we see a close alignment with classic decision-making models and an extension of them. Simon's model of intelligence–design–choice, as noted in the literature review, presupposed the importance of information gathering. Our study makes that linkage explicit: organizations proficient in knowledge management excel at the intelligence phase by thoroughly gathering and sharing knowledge. This leads to a richer set of options in the design phase and more confidence in the choice phase. The data revealed practical examples of each phase being strengthened by knowledge availability (for instance, more alternatives being generated when past lessons are considered). This validates and adds detail to theories that suggest knowledge management practices improve decision processes at each step. Additionally, the role of tacit knowledge conversion observed in our case organizations (for example, when an expert's insight was documented and later used by others) resonates with Nonaka's SECI model. It demonstrates that successful KBDM involves not just explicit data but also mechanisms to tap into tacit insights, converting them into organizational knowledge that informs future decisions. By showing concrete outcomes of such conversions (like avoiding repeated mistakes), the study provides practical evidence of Nonaka's abstract concepts in action within decision-making scenarios.

The prominence of organizational culture and leadership in the findings also extends the conversation in the literature. While many knowledge-management studies have emphasized culture and leadership in general, this study specifically shows how they impact the *decision*-making aspect. It's not merely about having a culture that encourages knowledge sharing in isolation; it's about that culture manifesting during decision points (for instance, whether a project

ISSN: 1609-1620 (Print); ISSN: 2674-5224 (Online)
PAHTEI
REFERRED & REVIEWED JOURNAL

team feels comfortable telling a leader unwelcome data that might change a decision). The organizations that excelled had what might be termed a **"decision-friendly" knowledge culture**: openness and trust were not just values on paper but were observable in meetings and decision forums. Leaders in those cases acted as knowledge enablers rather than just decision approvers, often asking questions and soliciting input. This finding aligns with and reinforces prior work that suggested leadership must champion knowledge initiatives. It also provides a cautionary note consistent with leadership research: authoritarian styles can stifle the flow of knowledge upward, resulting in poorer decisions. Thus, the study contributes to leadership literature by illustrating the direct consequences leadership style can have on decision outcomes through the lens of knowledge use.

From a technology standpoint, the discussion highlights a nuanced view. Technological advancements (big data analytics, AI, DSS) offer powerful support for KBDM, but their impact depends on **socio-technical integration**. This mirrors findings in information systems research that technology success is contingent on user adoption and data quality. Our evidence showed both the upside (analytical tools enabling evidence-based decisions) and the downside (tools being ignored due to distrust or difficulty). This dual outcome underscores a key implication: organizations should invest not only in the tools themselves but also in training, change management, and ongoing maintenance of knowledge content. It also suggests a theoretical point that aligns with socio-technical systems theory: effective decision-making arises from the joint optimization of social and technical systems. An AI-driven decision support system can process more information than a human, but only a human can contextualize and validate it within an organization's unique environment. The best results came when humans and systems worked together (for example, the system flags issues and humans investigate and decide). This confirms that knowledge-based decisions are ultimately a blend of human judgment and machine intelligence; an over-reliance on either alone can be suboptimal.

Overall, the study contributes a more integrated framework for understanding knowledge-based decision-making. It demonstrates that success requires attention to multiple dimensions: human (culture, leadership, skills), technological (systems, tools), and process (routines to capture and use knowledge). Neglecting any one dimension can weaken the whole approach. For researchers, these findings suggest several avenues for further inquiry. One area is to develop metrics for "knowledge-based decision effectiveness" to quantitatively measure improvements in outcomes attributable to KBDM. Another area is cross-cultural studies: since organizational culture is so pivotal, it would be valuable to see how KBDM practices play out in different national or industry cultures. Additionally, future research could explore longitudinal impacts (do companies that adopt KBDM sustain better performance over time?) and delve into specific aspects like the role of emotional intelligence or cognitive biases even in knowledge-rich decisions. The current study, being exploratory, indicates the importance of these factors but could be expanded with larger samples or experimental designs to isolate cause and effect.

Practical Implications

The insights from this research offer practical guidance for organizations aiming to strengthen their decision-making through knowledge management:

- **Invest in Knowledge Infrastructure and Maturity:** Organizations should assess their current knowledge management maturity and address gaps systematically. This could involve building or updating knowledge repositories, improving data integration across

ISSN: 1609-1620 (Print); ISSN: 2674-5224 (Online)
PAHTEI
REFERRED & REVIEWED JOURNAL

departments, and establishing formal knowledge-sharing processes (such as regular debrief meetings or mentorship programs). By moving stepwise from basic information sharing to advanced knowledge utilization, companies create a stronger foundation for informed decisions.

- **Cultivate a Knowledge-Sharing Culture:** Management should actively foster a culture where sharing knowledge is the norm. This involves building trust, ensuring employees are not penalized for honest mistakes, and encouraging them to speak up with ideas or concerns. Incentives can help: recognizing teams that use past knowledge to solve problems or including knowledge-sharing as a criterion in performance evaluations. Over time, these practices normalize the use of knowledge in every decision, big or small.
- **Lead by Example and Empower Employees:** Leaders and managers at all levels need to demonstrate the behaviors they want to see. When leaders consistently request evidence or past insights during decision deliberations, it sends a message that decisions should not be made in an information vacuum. Leaders can also empower frontline employees by decentralizing decision authority in areas where those employees have expertise. Empowerment, coupled with accountability, allows decisions to be made by those with the most relevant knowledge, speeding up the process and improving quality.
- **Integrate User-Friendly Decision Support Tools:** Technology should be seen as an enabler for the decision process. Organizations ought to choose or design decision support tools and knowledge systems with the end-user in mind; they should be intuitive, fit naturally into workflows, and provide clear value to the users. Adequate training and support are crucial so that staff know how to leverage these tools. It is equally important to keep the content updated and relevant (through data governance and regular audits of the knowledge base) so that decision-makers trust the information at their fingertips. When people and technology work in concert, the speed and analytical depth of decisions can improve markedly.

By implementing these practices, organizations can better embed knowledge into their decision-making DNA. The ultimate aim is to create an environment where deciding *without* consulting the collective knowledge is unthinkable, where every significant decision is backed by the best information and expertise the organization can offer.

Conclusion

This study has examined how knowledge-based decision-making can be realized in organizations and why it matters. In an era where businesses face volatile markets and overwhelming information, the ability to make decisions grounded in knowledge is a significant competitive advantage. The research findings highlight that success in KBDM is not due to a single tool or initiative but rather arises from a confluence of factors: a supportive culture, knowledgeable people, committed leadership, effective processes, and enabling technology. Organizations that managed to align these elements were able to consistently make more informed and confident decisions, thereby improving their problem-solving effectiveness and adaptability. Conversely, without such alignment, even well-intentioned efforts to promote knowledge use might fall flat.

In summary, **knowledge-based decision-making transforms decision processes from intuition-driven to insight-driven.** It requires upfront effort to manage knowledge assets and nurture the right environment, but the payoff is a decision-making capability that draws on the full breadth of organizational wisdom. For practitioners, the message is clear: investing in knowledge

management is not separate from the decision-making function; it directly enhances it. For scholars, this work underscores the importance of interdisciplinary approaches that marry concepts from knowledge management and decision sciences. Future studies can build on this foundation by exploring quantitative performance impacts of KBDM and refining strategies to overcome implementation challenges. As organizations continue to seek ways to be smarter and faster in their choices, knowledge-based decision-making stands out as a holistic path forward, ensuring that decisions are not just made on what is known but on the best that is known.

Declarations
The manuscript has not been submitted to any other journal or conference.

Study Limitations
There are no limitations that could affect the results of the study.

Acknowledgment
The author would like to express gratitude to the care support workers and elderly individuals who participated in this study, sharing their invaluable insights and experiences. Their cooperation and openness have significantly contributed to the depth and richness of the research findings.

Funding source
None.

Competing Interests
No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors

REFERENCES

1. Assoufi, I., El Farissi, I., & Slimani, I. (2024). Knowledge management, decision-making and information and communication technology: A systematic mapping study. In Modern Artificial Intelligence and Data Science 2024 (pp. 581–591). Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-031-65038-3_46.
2. Leoni, L., Gueli, G., Ardolino, M., Panizzon, M., & Gupta, S. (2023). AI-empowered KM processes for decision-making: Empirical evidence from worldwide organisations. Journal of Knowledge Management, 28(11), 320–347. DOI: 10.1108/JKM-03-2024-0262.
3. Abubakar, M., Elrehail, H., Alatailat, M. A., & Elçi, A. (2019). Knowledge management, decision-making style and organizational performance. Journal of Innovation & Knowledge, 4(2), 104–114. DOI: 10.1016/j.jik.2017.07.003.
4. Astorga-Vargas, M. A., Flores-Rios, B. L., Licea-Sandoval, G., & Gonzalez-Navarro, F. F. (2017). Explicit and tacit knowledge conversion effects in software engineering undergraduate students. Knowledge Management Research & Practice, 15(3), 336–345. DOI: 10.1057/s41275-017-0065-7.
5. Yi, Z. (2019). A leader's approaches to fostering a culture of knowledge sharing in an information organization. Library Management, 40(8/9), 593–600. DOI: 10.1108/LM-11-2018-0083.

ISSN: 1609-1620 (Print); ISSN: 2674-5224 (Online)
PAHTEI
REFERRED & REVIEWED JOURNAL

6. Acharya, A., Singh, S. K., Pereira, V., & Singh, P. (2018). Big data, knowledge co-creation and decision making in the fashion industry. International Journal of Information Management, 42, 90–101. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2018.06.008.
7. Ahmed, R., Shaheen, S., & Philbin, S. P. (2022). The role of big data analytics and decision-making in achieving project success. Journal of Engineering and Technology Management, 65, 101697 (Article number). DOI: 10.1016/j.jengtecman.2022.101697.
8. Ghasemaghaei, M. (2019). Does data analytics use improve firm decision-making quality? The role of knowledge sharing and data analytics competency. Decision Support Systems, 120, 14–24. DOI: 10.1016/j.dss.2019.03.004.
9. Bergh, D. D., D'Oria, L., Crook, T. R., & Roccapriore, A. (2025). Is knowledge really the most important strategic resource? A meta-analytic review. Strategic Management Journal, 46(1), 3–18. DOI: 10.1002/smj.3645.
10. Al-Abrrow, H., Alnoor, A., & Abdullah, H. (2018). Socio-technical approach, decision-making environment, and sustainable performance: Role of ERP systems. Interdisciplinary Journal of Information, Knowledge, and Management, 13, 397–415. DOI: 10.28945/4149.
11. Inkinen, H. (2016). Review of empirical research on knowledge management practices and firm performance. Journal of Knowledge Management, 20(2), 230–257. DOI: 10.1108/JKM-09-2015-0336.
12. Syed, R., Shah, A., Irani, Z., & Haddara, M. (2021). Artificial intelligence and knowledge sharing: Contributing factors to organizational performance. Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 170, 120881. DOI: 10.1016/j.techfore.2021.120881.

BILIK ƏSASLI QƏRAR QƏBULETMƏ: TƏŞKILATI QƏRARLARIN TƏKMILLƏŞDIRILMƏSI ÜÇÜN BILIK İDARƏÇILIYININ İNKIŞAFI

Adil Abbasov[1], Kəmalə Əliyeva[2]
[1,2] Azərbaycan Dövlət Neft və Sənaye Universiteti
[1] SABAH Qrupları,[2] Cihaz mühəndisliyi kafedrası
[1] Magistr, abbasov.adil.n@gmail.com
[2] Professor, kamalann64@gmail.com

XÜLASƏ

Müasir, məlumatlarla zəngin biznes mühitində təşkilatlar rəqabət üstünlüyü əldə etmək məqsədilə getdikcə daha çox bilik əsaslı qərar qəbul etməyə üstünlük verirlər. Bu məqalə, qərar qəbul etmə prosesinə sistematik bilik idarəetmə metodlarının inteqrasiyasının təşkilati performansı necə yüksəltdiyini araşdırır. Geniş miqyaslı sorğular, dərin müsahibələr və sənəd təhlili kimi qarışıq metodlardan istifadə edilərək aparılmış tədqiqat, bilik əsaslı qərar qəbul etmənin (BAQQ) əsas amillərini müəyyən etmişdir. Bu amillərə əməkdaşlıq edən təşkilati mədəniyyət, dəstək verən və vizyon sahibi liderlik, həmçinin qərar dəstək sistemləri və süni intellekt kimi qabaqcıl texnoloji vasitələrin tətbiqi daxildir. Nəticələr göstərir ki, həm açıq şəkildə sənədləşdirilmiş, həm də qeyri-rəsmi bilikləri səmərəli şəkildə toplayan təşkilatlar daha məlumatlı və dəlilə əsaslanan qərarlar qəbul edir, bu da innovasiya, əməliyyat səmərəliliyi və strateji uyğunlaşmanın artmasına səbəb olur. Bundan əlavə, tədqiqat texnologiyanın insan prosesləri ilə inteqrasiyasının və məlumat yığılmasının qarşısının alınmasının, eləcə də biliklərin səmərəli paylaşılması və tətbiqinin vacibliyini vurğulayır. Praktiki nəticələr göstərir ki, təşkilatlar güclü bilik infrastrukturuna

ISSN: 1609-1620 (Print); ISSN: 2674-5224 (Online)
PAHTEI
REFERRED & REVIEWED JOURNAL

VOLUME 27 ISSUE 05 2025

sərmayə qoymalı və öyrənmə ilə davamlı inkişafı təşviq edən bir mədəniyyət formalaşdırmalıdırlar. Eyni zamanda, bu iş gələcək tədqiqat istiqamətlərini, qərar keyfiyyətinin qiymətləndirilməsi üçün kəmiyyət göstəricilərinin inkişaf etdirilməsini və bilik idarəetmə təcrübələrində mədəniyyətlərarası fərqlərin daha dərindən öyrənilməsini işıqlandırır.
Açar sözlər: Bilik əsaslı qərar qəbul etmə; Bilik idarəçiliyi; Təşkilati mədəniyyət; Liderlik; Qərar dəstək sistemləri; Süni intellekt; Bilik paylaşımı; Strateji uyğunlaşma.

ПРИНЯТИЕ РЕШЕНИЙ НА ОСНОВЕ ЗНАНИЙ: ИНТЕГРАЦИЯ УПРАВЛЕНИЯ ЗНАНИЯМИ ДЛЯ ПОВЫШЕНИЯ ЭФФЕКТИВНОСТИ ОРГАНИЗАЦИОННЫХ РЕШЕНИЙ

Адиль Аббасов[1], Камала Алиева[2]
[1,2] Азербайджанский Государственный Университет Нефти и Промышленности
[1] SABAH Группы,[2] кафедра Приборостроения
[1] Магистр, abbasov.adil.n@gmail.com
[2] Профессор, kamalann64@gmail.com

РЕЗЮМЕ

В условиях современной, насыщенной данными и быстро меняющейся деловой среды, организации всё чаще прибегают к принятию решений на основе знаний (ПРНЗ) для достижения конкурентных преимуществ. Данная статья исследует, каким образом интеграция систематизированных процессов управления знаниями в рамки принятия решений способствует повышению эффективности деятельности организации. Исследование, выполненное с использованием смешанной методологии, включающей масштабные опросы, подробные интервью и анализ документов, выявило ключевые факторы, способствующие успешному внедрению ПРНЗ. Среди них коллективная организационная культура, поддержка со стороны лидеров, обладающих видением, а также использование передовых технологических систем, таких как системы поддержки принятия решений и искусственный интеллект. Практические выводы свидетельствуют о необходимости инвестиций в развитие надежной инфраструктуры управления знаниями и создания культуры, вознаграждающей за обучение и постоянное совершенствование. Также статья определяет направления для будущих исследований, в частности, разработку количественных критериев для оценки качества решений и изучение межкультурных различий в практике управления знаниями.
Ключевые слова: Принятие решений на основе знаний; Управление знаниями; Организационная культура; Лидерство; Системы поддержки принятия решений; Искусственный интеллект; Обмен знаниями; Стратегическая адаптивность.

Publication history

Article received: 01.04.2025;
Article accepted: 14.04.2025
Article published online: 30.04.2025
DOI: https://doi.org/10.32010/JLKM4278