Shodh Sari-An International Multidisciplinary Journal

2026, Vol. 05, Issue 03, 114-133
ISSN: 2959-1376
DOI: https://doi.org/10.59231/SARI7948

Ethical Implications of the Knowledge Management Paradigm for Organizations in the Digital Age

Ogundipe, Rukayat Oladayo[1], Omilani, Mofoluke Abidemi[2], Olajide, Fatahat Oyeteju[3] and Ogunwande, Esther Adunni [4]

[1,2,3,4] Department of Adult Education, Faculty of Education, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria

Abstract

In the current digital age, knowledge management (KM) has transformed from a best practice to a fundamental organizational approach that focuses on the development, sharing and use of knowledge to improve performance and innovation. The use of digital technology and data-intensive processes has led to a number of ethical concerns, including privacy and monitoring, information rights, intellectual rights, digital divide and knowledge hoarding. The above-mentioned concerns indicate the conflict between efficiency-oriented approach and the protection of individual rights and fairness. This paper discusses the ethical implications of the KM paradigm, particularly in relation to digital technology such as surveillance systems, AI and cloud computing. Adopting a conceptual and theoretical approach this study, integrates utilitarianism, deontology, stakeholder theory, literature, policy documents and professional standards such as Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) and International Organization for Standardization (ISO) 30401:2018 to argue for a shift from efficiency-driven KM to a more inclusive and human-centered model that safeguards individual rights and promotes equitable knowledge access. Through conceptual synthesis, it highlights five critical ethical challenges in KM: privacy and surveillance, data ownership, intellectual property, digital exclusion and knowledge hoarding. Based on this synthesis, the paper proposes a multidimensional framework for ethical knowledge governance anchored in transparency, accountability, data deletion, equity and respect for human agency. The study underscores the importance of balancing technological advancement with ethical responsibility, ensuring that KM systems foster trust and safeguard human dignity while advocating for sound ethical framework, transparency, inclusive access, clear data ownership

@2026 International Council for Education Research and Training 2026, Vol. 05, Issue 03, 115-133
ISSN: 2959-1376 DOI: https://doi.org/10.59231/SARI7948

policies, knowledge sharing culture and ethical checks to ensure responsible knowledge management practices. Ultimately, it contributes to the discourse on responsible KM by highlighting the need for ethical reflection and institutional reform in both policy and practice.

Keywords: Knowledge management, Ethics, Technology, Transparency, Equity, Organizations

Introduction: The knowledge management (KM) paradigm represents a shift in organizational thinking that positions knowledge as a core strategic asset to be created, organized, shared and applied systematically. It is based on the assumption that knowledge both tacit and explicit can be harnessed to improve decision-making, foster innovation and sustain competitive advantage (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995; Davenport & Prusak, 1998). As a concept, the KM emphasizes processes such as knowledge creation, codification, sharing and application, while acknowledging the centrality of people, processes and technology in these efforts (Alavi & Leidner, 2001). Knowledge Management (KM) is the systematic integration of people, processes and technologies to create, capture, share and apply knowledge for improved organizational performance and sustained competitiveness (Dalkir, 2013; Sokoh & Okolie, 2021). As a strategic approach, KM enhances innovation, reduces costs and operational inefficiencies, shortens design cycles, preserves intellectual capital and strengthens decision-making capacity (Ibrahim & Reig, 2009; Desouza & Paquette, 2011). It generates value at individual, community and organizational levels by fostering professional growth, collaboration, shared standards and retention of organizational memory, thereby enabling adaptation in dynamic and knowledge-driven environments. The rise of digital technologies has fundamentally transformed how knowledge is managed across sectors. Digital tools such as cloud computing, data analytics, machine learning and collaborative platforms have enabled organizations to process large volumes of information and convert them into usable knowledge at unprecedented speed and scale (Bawden & Robinson, 2009). The shift toward data-driven decision-making has allowed institutions to make strategic choices

@2026 International Council for Education Research and Training
ISSN: 2959-1376
2026, Vol. 05, Issue 03, 116-133
DOI: https://doi.org/10.59231/SARI7948

informed by patterns and trends extracted from structured and unstructured data (Chen, Chiang, & Storey, 2012). However, this digital acceleration also raises significant ethical concerns, especially regarding issues of privacy, surveillance, data ownership, algorithmic bias and digital inclusion (Zuboff, 2019; Floridi & Taddeo, 2016).

The integration of surveillance systems, artificial intelligence (AI) and cloud-based platforms into knowledge management (KM) introduces significant ethical concerns that organizations must navigate carefully. AI enabled surveillance technologies raise serious concerns over privacy, autonomy and the erosion of individual rights when used to monitor behavior and collect data without informed consent, potentially undermining trust and voluntariness in knowledge-sharing environments (Vardhan et al., 2024). When applied to KM, AI may blur intellectual property (IP) boundaries and complicate the ownership of generated knowledge, especially as sensitive and proprietary data are processed and stored on external infrastructures like cloud platforms, contributing to ambiguity in data control and regulatory compliance (Dhirani et al., 2023). Furthermore, the obscureness of many AI algorithms often poses challenges for transparency and accountability, making it difficult to trace how decisions are formulated and to hold developers or adopters responsible for errors, bias, or discrimination. Cloud computing similarly enhances accessibility and collaboration in KM but introduces ethical risks related to data privacy, cross-border data jurisdictions and loss of exclusive control over organizational information (Iqbal et al., 2025). Collectively, these technologies challenge the traditional KM paradigm by requiring a careful balance between knowledge accessibility, organizational efficiency and individual rights. Ethically responsible KM thus necessitates transparent policies, robust governance frameworks and clear protocols to protect privacy, ensure accountability and safeguard intellectual property while enabling innovation and effective knowledge utilization (Idowu, 2025). Despite the growing popularity of KM systems and digital knowledge platforms, ethical considerations are often overlooked in mainstream KM discourse. While the focus has traditionally been on efficiency, productivity and competitive advantage, there is now an urgent need to examine the

@2026 International Council for Education Research and Training
ISSN: 2959-1376
2026, Vol. 05, Issue 03, 117-133
DOI: https://doi.org/10.59231/SARI7948

ethical dimensions of KM practices in the digital context. These include concerns about how knowledge is acquired, who has access to it, how it is used and whether these processes respect human rights, cultural values and individual autonomy (Martin, 2019) and also who owns the knowledge. This paper therefore seeks to explore the ethical implications of the knowledge management paradigm in the digital age, arguing for a more responsible and human-centered approach to managing knowledge in an era defined by technological innovation and increasing interconnectivity. While digital knowledge management systems are becoming widespread, research has prioritized organizational efficiency and competitive advantage, largely neglecting the ethical governance of digital knowledge practices. Within the discourse of Knowledge Management, there is insufficient focus on the ethical ramifications of digital technology, notably concerning data control, privacy rights (right to be forgotten), responsibility for algorithmic decision-making and the ethical ownership of AI-generated content. Current research frequently analyzes workplace privacy and surveillance as isolated technical issues, failing to incorporate broader ethical frameworks that protect the rights of employees and stakeholders within digital work environments. This highlights a critical research gap concerning the ways organizations can harmonize technological progress with ethical obligations in knowledge management.

Therefore, this research aims to analyze the ethical implications of knowledge management in the digital era; analyze how emerging digital technologies such as artificial intelligence, cloud computing and surveillance systems are reshaping ethical concerns surrounding knowledge ownership, privacy and access; explore how ethical frameworks and professional guidelines ensure responsible knowledge management (KM) and propose a human-centered framework for ethical knowledge governance anchored in transparency, accountability, equity and respect.

Literature Review

Key Ethical Issues in Knowledge Management

As knowledge management (KM) practices become increasingly digital and embedded within organizational processes, a range of ethical concerns has emerged. These

@2026 International Council for Education Research and Training
ISSN: 2959-1376
2026, Vol. 05, Issue 03, 118-133
DOI: https://doi.org/10.59231/SARI7948

concerns relate not only to how knowledge is generated and shared but also to how it is monitored, owned, protected and accessed. This section explores five key ethical issues in contemporary KM: privacy and surveillance, data ownership, intellectual property, the digital divide and knowledge hoarding.

Privacy and Surveillance: One of the most pressing ethical issues in KM is the tension between knowledge capture and employee privacy. With the rise of digital platforms and data analytics, organizations increasingly monitor employees' activities to gather insights into work processes and knowledge flows (Zuboff, 2019). These practices often involve metadata tracking, communication analysis and real-time performance monitoring, raising concerns about informed consent and autonomy. According to Ball (2010), such surveillance can create a climate of distrust and stress among employees, undermining collaboration and morale. Ethical KM requires transparency in data collection and ensuring that individuals are aware of and agree to how their knowledge contributions are used.

Data Ownership: In collaborative environments, the question of who owns the knowledge becomes ethically complex. Knowledge is often co-created through teamwork, digital forums and joint research efforts, yet ownership rights are rarely clearly defined (Davenport & Prusak, 1998). In many cases, organizations claim proprietary rights over all employee-generated knowledge, while individual contributors may feel morally entitled to recognition or control over their intellectual outputs. The conflict over knowledge ownership where organizations claim rights over knowledge rooted in individuals creates ethical tension around attribution, consent and fair compensation, particularly in knowledge-based economies (Rechberg & Syed, 2013).

Intellectual Property: Another ethical challenge lies in the balance between sharing knowledge for innovation and protecting intellectual property (IP). KM systems are designed to facilitate the open flow of knowledge, yet unrestricted sharing can lead to the unauthorized use of proprietary ideas or innovations (Alavi & Leidner, 2001). Ethical KM must navigate this tension by fostering a culture of openness while also respecting legal and moral boundaries around IP rights. This is particularly important in academia and research institutions where the

@2026 International Council for Education Research and Training
ISSN: 2959-1376
2026, Vol. 05, Issue 03, 119-133
DOI: https://doi.org/10.59231/SARI7948

line between public and private knowledge is often blurred (Bramwell & Wolfe, 2008).

Digital Divide and Access: The digital divide the unequal access to digital tools and platforms poses another major ethical issue in KM. In both organizational and societal contexts, individuals or groups with limited digital literacy or internet access may be excluded from contributing to or benefiting from knowledge systems (Van Dijk, 2019). This exclusion reinforces existing inequalities, as access to knowledge is increasingly tied to professional development, education and civic participation. Ethical KM must therefore include efforts to bridge technological gaps and create inclusive knowledge environments that serve all stakeholders (Unwin, 2009).

Knowledge Hoarding and Inequity: Finally, knowledge hoarding when individuals or groups intentionally withhold knowledge it can result in power imbalances and inefficiencies. Knowledge is a source of influence and status in many organizations and those in positions of power may deliberately retain information to maintain control (Hislop, 2013; Hislop et al., 2018). This practice undermines collective learning and widens gaps between knowledge-rich and knowledge-poor individuals or departments. Ethical KM involves creating incentives and cultural norms that promote knowledge sharing, mutual respect and equitable access to information (Carter & Scarbrough, 2001).

Digital Technology & Ethical Risks

AI and Algorithmic Bias: Artificial intelligence (AI) systems rely on datasets and algorithms to make predictions or decisions. When this datasets contains biases, AI systems may reproduce or even amplify these biases, leading to discriminatory outcomes. For example, AI-based recruitment tools have been found to disadvantage female applicants because the systems learned patterns from historically male-dominated datasets. Similarly, predictive policing algorithms have been criticized for disproportionately labeling minority groups as high-risk based on biased historical data. These issues demonstrate that algorithmic systems are not inherently neutral but can embed existing inequalities unless fairness auditing and bias-mitigation techniques are implemented (Tolan, 2019; Pingili, 2025).

Cloud Data Storage and Jurisdiction Risks: Cloud computing enables

@2026 International Council for Education Research and Training
ISSN: 2959-1376
2026, Vol. 05, Issue 03, 120-133
DOI: https://doi.org/10.59231/SARI7948

organizations to store and process data on remote servers located in different geographical regions. While this increases efficiency and accessibility, it raises ethical and legal concerns related to data sovereignty and jurisdiction. This ties into data sovereignty the concept that data is subject to the rules of the country where it is stored, rather than where it originated. As companies expand across international borders, the ethical management of knowledge assets necessitates strict adherence to local regulations and individual digital rights, making data sovereignty a top priority in today's compliant knowledge management systems.

Data stored in cloud infrastructures may be subject to the laws of the country where the servers are located, which can differ significantly from the regulations of the country of the person that owns or stored the data. This creates challenges regarding privacy protection, regulatory compliance and government surveillance. Cross-border data storage may also lead to conflicts of law and difficulties in enforcing data protection standards, particularly when multiple jurisdictions claim authority over the same dataset (Mahida, 2022; Dubey & Sharma, 2023).

Workplace Monitoring Systems: Digital monitoring technologies such as productivity-tracking software, biometric devices and AI-enabled surveillance tools are increasingly used by organizations to track employee performance and behavior. Although these systems can enhance efficiency and security, they raise significant ethical concerns regarding employee privacy, autonomy and trust. Extreme or non-transparent supervision can generate a sense of uneasy, diminish workers morale and corrode workplace trust if employees are not enlightened on how their data is gathered, utilized and stored. Ethical implementation therefore requires transparency, informed consent and clear policies regarding data usage and retention (Stegman et al., 2022; Shrivastav, 2025).

Lack of Transparency in Automated Decisions: the internal decision-making processes of many AI-driven systems are difficult for users and sometimes regulators to understand. This lack of clarity brings about ethical challenges because individuals may be unable to establish why a decision such as loan approval, hiring selection, or

@2026 International Council for Education Research and Training
ISSN: 2959-1376
2026, Vol. 05, Issue 03, 121-133
DOI: https://doi.org/10.59231/SARI7948

medical prioritization was made. Without clarification, it becomes difficult to identify discrimination, contest such decisions and demand justification from the organizations. Experts therefore emphasize the need for the AI process that results in output be understandable and trustworthy also transparency frameworks and governance mechanisms that allow users to know and appraise automated decisions affecting them be put in place (Tabbassum & Chintale, 2024; Rauhala et al., 2026).

Right to be Forgotten and Ethical Data Retention: The 'right to be forgotten' is a key ethical concern in modern data management, empowering individuals to request the deletion of their personal information when it is no longer needed. Scholars argue that the permanence of digital records poses a significant threat to personal privacy, individual autonomy and dignity by enabling ceaseless surveillance and creating long-term reputational risks. The inability to easily delete or forget online information creates a "digital footprint" that can be used to track, profile, or discriminate against individuals, eroding the capacity for personal growth and free expression (Mayer-Schönberger, 2009; Rosen, 2012). The principle therefore supports greater individual control over digital identities and responsible data governance (Ausloos, 2012). Legal frameworks like the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) empower individuals with the "right to be forgotten," allowing them to request the deletion of their personal information when certain criteria are met (Mantelero, 2013). Thus, Ethical knowledge management necessitates that organizations carefully manage the tension between organizational productivity and the protection of personal information. Good governance ensures that data is stored and used responsibly, aligning efficiency goals with legal requirements and the digital rights of employees and stakeholders.

Ethical Foundations and Theoretical Frameworks in Knowledge Management

Knowledge Management involves more than just handling information it raises ethical questions about ownership, access and fairness. Drawing on ethical theories helps guide responsible decision-making and supports the development of value driven KM practices. The application of ethics to knowledge management (KM) is increasingly important in the digital age, as

@2026 International Council for Education Research and Training
ISSN: 2959-1376
2026, Vol. 05, Issue 03, 122-133
DOI: https://doi.org/10.59231/SARI7948

organizations must navigate complex moral questions about how knowledge is sourced, controlled and shared. Ethical evaluation of KM practices requires engagement with foundational ethical theories such as utilitarianism, deontology and stakeholder theory, each offering distinct insights into what constitutes responsible and fair knowledge management.

Utilitarianism in Knowledge Management

Utilitarianism, as proposed by philosophers like Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill 1863, emphasizes the maximization of overall good or utility that results in overall satisfaction for the majority. Utility is a term used by classical ethical theorists and philosophers to describe happiness and well-being. Utilitarianism in knowledge management (KM) is an approach that evaluates KM strategies, tools and processes based on their ability to produce the "greatest good" or maximize overall utility that brings about happiness, efficiency, organizational well-being. It focuses on outcomes rather than intentions, often prioritizing knowledge sharing and application that generate maximum tangible benefits (such as productivity, innovation, or profitability) for the largest number of people in the firm. Within KM, this perspective would advocate for knowledge practices that bring the greatest benefit to the most people, such as open access to research or widespread sharing of organizational best practices (Floridi & Taddeo, 2016). However, while utilitarian approaches may justify mass data collection or surveillance to improve organizational efficiency, they risk overriding individual rights, particularly in employee monitoring or data profiling (Zuboff, 2019). This tension illustrates the need to balance collective benefit with personal dignity.

Deontology in Knowledge Management

In contrast, deontological ethics, rooted in the work of Immanuel Kant propounded in 1785, stresses the importance of duties, rules and respect for individual autonomy, regardless of outcomes. Applied to KM, a deontological framework would prioritize informed consent in knowledge sharing, transparency in data use and protection of intellectual property especially in digital environments where knowledge is easily replicated or exploited (Martin, 2019). Deontology provides a strong argument for upholding individual rights even when it may conflict

@2026 International Council for Education Research and Training
ISSN: 2959-1376
2026, Vol. 05, Issue 03, 123-133
DOI: https://doi.org/10.59231/SARI7948

with organizational gain, such as respecting an employee's wish not to have their work experience used in AI training datasets without permission.

Stakeholder Theory and Knowledge Management Governance

Stakeholder theory propounded by Edward Freeman in 1984 bridges these positions by asserting that organizations have ethical obligations to all parties affected by their actions not just shareholders or management, but also employees, clients, partners and society at large (Freeman, 1984). In the context of KM, this implies considering how knowledge practices impact diverse stakeholders: for instance, whether frontline workers benefit from knowledge-sharing initiatives or whether marginalized groups are excluded from access to critical information. It also means involving various stakeholders in designing KM systems to ensure inclusivity and trust (Guerci et al., 2020).

Policy Documents and Professional Standards on Ethics and Knowledge Management

Policy documents and professional standards provide formal guidelines that translate ethical principles into practical rules for responsible knowledge practices. For example, COPE (Committee on Publication Ethics) offers internationally recognized standards that promote integrity, transparency, accountability and ethical conduct in research and publication, ensuring that knowledge creation is honest and credible. Similarly, ISO 30401:2018 provides a structured international framework for designing and governing Knowledge Management systems, emphasizing transparency, accountability, value alignment and continual improvement. Together, they demonstrate that ethical Knowledge Management is not merely theoretical but supported by established global governance standards that guide both knowledge creation and knowledge management.

Ethical Theories and Their Relevance to Knowledge Management

As knowledge management (KM) becomes more digitized and data-intensive, organizations face increasing ethical dilemmas around how knowledge is collected, shared and used. These challenges include issues such as employee privacy, intellectual property, informed consent and inclusion. To assess these dilemmas in a

@2026 International Council for Education Research and Training
ISSN: 2959-1376
2026, Vol. 05, Issue 03, 124-133
DOI: https://doi.org/10.59231/SARI7948

structured way, this study draws on three major ethical theories: utilitarianism, deontology and stakeholder theory. Each provides a unique perspective on what makes a KM practice ethically acceptable and collectively forms a balanced ethical framework for analyzing the KM paradigm in the digital age.

Utilitarianism is concerned with outcomes. It proposes that the ethically right decision is the one that produces the greatest good for the greatest number (Mill, 1863). In the context of KM, this theory supports practices that maximize organizational efficiency, innovation and knowledge accessibility. For example, sharing employee-generated knowledge widely through digital platforms may improve collective learning and performance across an organization. However, this benefit must be weighed against potential harm, such as the violation of privacy or the risk of unauthorized knowledge exploitation (Floridi & Taddeo, 2016). Utilitarianism thus helps evaluate whether KM strategies bring more societal or organizational benefit than harm. In contrast, deontological ethics focuses on duties, rights and the moral principles behind actions, regardless of outcomes. Based on the philosophy of Kant, deontology insists that individuals must be treated as ends in themselves, not merely as means to an end (Kant, 1993). When applied to KM, deontology emphasizes respect for individual autonomy, informed consent and fairness in knowledge use. For instance, while collecting employee performance data might improve decision-making, doing so without consent or transparency would violate ethical duties, even if the organizational outcome is positive (Martin, 2019). Deontological reasoning highlights that ethical KM must respect individual rights and dignity, not just aim for efficiency.

Stakeholder theory complements these perspectives by broadening the ethical focus to include all parties affected by knowledge practices not only organizational leaders or shareholders but also employees, customers and the wider community (Freeman, 1984). KM decisions often have ripple effects across various groups. For example, if a new digital knowledge platform is introduced, but older or less tech-savvy workers are excluded due to lack of digital skills, this creates ethical concerns about fairness and inclusion (Guerci et al., 2020). Stakeholder theory thus reminds us that ethical KM must consider the

@2026 International Council for Education Research and Training
ISSN: 2959-1376
2026, Vol. 05, Issue 03, 125-133
DOI: https://doi.org/10.59231/SARI7948

interests, vulnerabilities and values of all affected stakeholders.

These three theories are necessary for this study because they allow for a deeper and more holistic analysis of ethical issues in KM. Utilitarianism provides a lens to assess the consequences of knowledge practices; deontology focuses on rights and moral duties; and stakeholder theory ensures that no group is marginalized in the process. Applying this combined ethical framework enables a more responsible and people-centered approach to knowledge management in the digital age.

Ethical Codes and Standards in Knowledge Practice

Beyond theory, professional codes of ethics and corporate governance frameworks provide practical guidance for ethical knowledge management. For example, academic research institutions emphasize integrity, transparency and accountability in knowledge creation and dissemination, as seen in codes from bodies like the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE, 2011). In the corporate sector, International Organization for Standardization (ISO) on Knowledge management systems [ISO 30401:2018] provides a formal standard for knowledge management systems, emphasizing transparency, risk awareness and value alignment (ISO, 2018) .According to the ISO, 2018 each organization must develop a KM strategy tailored to its unique business context, operational environment and specific goals. These frameworks help ensure that knowledge practices align with broader ethical norms, promote fairness and protect against misuse of information. Together, these ethical theories and standards form a foundation for critically evaluating KM practices in the digital era. They help organizations move beyond efficiency-focused models toward responsible knowledge governance that respects both human values and institutional goals.

A Framework for Ethical Knowledge Governance

In today's information-filled workplaces, it's important to have clear ethical rules for how knowledge is handled. Four critical pillars transparency, accountability, equity and respect for human agency form a robust framework to guide responsible knowledge governance in any industry or sector.

Transparency: ensures that the processes and rules governing knowledge handling are clear and accessible to all stakeholders. It

@2026 International Council for Education Research and Training
ISSN: 2959-1376
2026, Vol. 05, Issue 03, 126-133
DOI: https://doi.org/10.59231/SARI7948

supports trust and enables informed participation. Research on the scholarly knowledge ecosystem emphasizes transparency as foundational, interconnected with values like equity, inclusion and accountability. Without transparent information practices, the system risks exclusion, elitism and information hoarding (Altman & Cohen 2022; Altman et al., 2018).

Accountability: Accountability complements transparency by ensuring that individuals or institutions are held responsible for their actions regarding knowledge management. Studies on governance of global public–private partnerships underscore that transparency and accountability are central to ethical and effective governance: transparency provides the foundation, while accountability ensures follow-through and justification of actions (Fox, 2007; Reich, 2017).

Equity: Focuses on fair access to, contribution toward and benefits from knowledge systems. In information science, systemic inequities such as barriers in participation, access and representation are highlighted as major ethical challenges. Addressing these requires embedding equitable design and inclusive practices in governance frameworks (Altman et al., 2018).

Respect for Human Agency: means recognizing individuals as active contributors and decision-makers, not objects or passive recipients of knowledge systems. Critiques of AI-driven KM emphasize the ethical dangers of delegating moral reasoning to machines eroding autonomy, critical thinking and ethical engagement. Ethical governance must preserve human capacity, requiring transparency and validation of AI-supported decisions (Kahl, 2023).

This framework built on transparency, accountability, equity and human agency establishes a principled foundation for ethical knowledge governance. Together, these pillars ensure that KM systems are not only efficient but also fair, inclusive and respectful of human dignity.

Methodology: This study adopts a conceptual and theoretical approach, relying on a synthesis of scholarly literature, policy documents and professional standards on knowledge management and ethics. Sources were identified through academic databases and selected for their relevance to ethical theories utilitarianism, deontology and stakeholder theory as well as contemporary

@2026 International Council for Education Research and Training
ISSN: 2959-1376
2026, Vol. 05, Issue 03, 127-133
DOI: https://doi.org/10.59231/SARI7948

KM practices. A conceptual synthesis was employed to integrate recurring issues such as privacy, surveillance, data ownership, intellectual property, digital exclusion and knowledge hoarding with ethical principles and governance standards, including COPE and ISO 30401:2018. This methodology provides a foundation for developing the proposed framework for ethical knowledge governance, emphasizing transparency, accountability, equity and respect for human agency.

Policy Pillars for Ethical Knowledge Management Governance

To implement an ethical Knowledge Management (KM) paradigm in the digital age, organizations must put in place the following policy pillars within their Human Resource (HR) and Information Technology (IT) governance systems.

Policy Pillar 1: Ethical Audit and Compliance Frameworks: Organizations must integrate systematic, periodic ethical audits into their data governance frameworks to evaluate how knowledge is collected, processed, stored and shared. HR and IT departments should align to ensure ethical, transparent and secure use of employee data and technology. They must be empowered to suggest corrective actions whenever these systems demonstrate discriminatory results or violate ethical guidelines. Independent ethics boards or compliance teams should be in place and should have the authority to audit AI-powered knowledge management systems and suggest corrective actions whenever these systems demonstrate discriminatory results or violate ethical guidelines.

Policy Pillar 2: Data Stewardship and Data Sovereignty Policies: Organizations should create detailed data management guidelines covering ownership, access, accountability and retention. HR and IT must collaborate to implement security measures, conduct audits and ensure data protection regulations are met. Policies must cover secure data storage, responsible cross-border data transfer and support the right to be forgotten where applicable.

Policy Pillar 3: Inclusive and Ethical System Design: Integrate ethical principles directly into the design phase of Knowledge Management (KM) systems. IT departments should put in place fairness testing, bias detection and accessibility standards in digital platforms and HR departments should advance inclusive participation by

@2026 International Council for Education Research and Training
ISSN: 2959-1376
2026, Vol. 05, Issue 03, 128-133
DOI: https://doi.org/10.59231/SARI7948

accommodating various levels of digital literacy and access to technology. Hence, system development that incorporates diverse perspectives reduces exclusion and strengthens ethical responsibility.

Policy Pillar 4: Participatory Governance and Transparency: To enhance KM governance, organizations ought to adopt a collaborative approach that includes staff and stakeholders in both the formulation of policies and the assessment of system performance. HR and IT departments should give transparent explanations regarding automated decisions, employee monitoring practices and the use of AI-supported tools. Institutionalizing mechanisms for feedback, appeals and ethical concerns is essential to fostering accountability, trust and transparency within any organization. These systems ensure that complaints are handled fairly, ethical breaches are addressed and stakeholders feel their voices are heard and valued.

Policy Pillar 5: Knowledge Sharing and Anti-Hoarding Culture: Organizations should foster a collaborative, open-knowledge culture by building incentive structures that recognize teamwork and discourage knowledge hoarding. HR departments should integrate knowledge-sharing behaviors into performance evaluation and professional development systems, while IT departments should create transparent and easy to use knowledge-sharing platforms that guarantee equal access to organizational knowledge resources.

Conclusion: As digital knowledge systems become more embedded in organizational life, ethical questions around how knowledge is acquired, governed and shared must be brought to the forefront. This paper has shown that ethical KM is not just a technical issue but a moral imperative. Theories such as utilitarianism, deontology and stakeholder theory, combined with governance principles of transparency, accountability, equity and agency, offer a robust foundation for more responsible knowledge practices. Moving forward, ethical reflection must be institutionalized within KM systems to ensure that technological advancements do not compromise human dignity or deepen social inequalities. With the proliferation of digital knowledge, organizations need to make ethical governance covering data sovereignty, digital rights and participatory accountability a core part of HR and IT strategies. By aligning KM with ethical

@2026 International Council for Education Research and Training
ISSN: 2959-1376
2026, Vol. 05, Issue 03, 129-133
DOI: https://doi.org/10.59231/SARI7948

imperatives and social justice, we pave the way for knowledge systems that not only enhance organizational efficiency but also uphold dignity, fairness and shared 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. Altman, M., & Cohen, P. N. (2022). The scholarly knowledge ecosystem: Challenges and opportunities for the field of information. *Frontiers in Research Metrics and Analytics*, *6*, Article 751553. https://doi.org/10.3389/frma.2021.751553
3. Altman, M., Wood, A., O'Brien, D. R., & Gasser, U. (2018). Practical approaches to big data privacy over time. *International Data Privacy Law*, *8*(1), 29–51. https://doi.org/10.1093/idpl/ipx027
4. Ausloos, J. (2012). The 'right to be forgotten' – Worth remembering? *Computer Law & Security Review*, *28*(2), 143–152. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clsr.2012.01.006
5. Ball, K. (2010). Workplace surveillance: An overview. *Labor History*, *51*(1), 87–106. https://doi.org/10.1080/00236561003654776
6. Bawden, D., & Robinson, L. (2009). The dark side of information: Overload, anxiety and other paradoxes and pathologies. *Journal of Information Science*, *35*(2), 180–191. https://doi.org/10.1177/0165551508095781
7. Bramwell, A., & Wolfe, D. A. (2008). Universities and regional economic development: The entrepreneurial University of Waterloo. *Research Policy*, *37*(8), 1175–1187. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2008.04.016
8. Carter, C., & Scarbrough, H. (2001). Towards a second generation of KM? The people management challenge. *Education + Training*, *43*(4/5), 215–224. https://doi.org/10.1108/EUM0000000005483

@2026 International Council for Education Research and Training
ISSN: 2959-1376
2026, Vol. 05, Issue 03, 130-133
DOI: https://doi.org/10.59231/SARI7948

9. Chen, H., Chiang, R. H. L., & Storey, V. C. (2012). Business intelligence and analytics: From big data to big impact. *MIS Quarterly*, *36*(4), 1165–1188. https://doi.org/10.2307/41703503
10. COPE. (2011). *Code of conduct and best practice guidelines for journal editors*. Committee on Publication Ethics. https://academic.oup.com/DocumentLibrary/journals/Code_of_conduct_for_journal_editors_1.pdf
11. Dalkir, K. (2013). *Knowledge management in theory and practice*. Routledge.
12. Davenport, T. H., & Prusak, L. (1998). *Working knowledge: How organizations manage what they know*. Harvard Business School Press. https://doi.org/10.1145/348772.348775
13. Desouza, K., & Paquette, S. (2011). *Knowledge management: An introduction*. Neal-Schuman Publishers.
14. Dhirani, L. L., Mukhtiar, N., Chowdhry, B. S., & Newe, T. (2023). Ethical dilemmas and privacy issues in emerging technologies: A review. *Sensors*, *23*(3), Article 1151. https://doi.org/10.3390/s23031151
15. Dubey, P., & Sharma, R. (2023). Cloud computing and data sovereignty: Navigating legal and regulatory challenges. *International Journal for Legal Research and Analysis*. https://www.ijlra.com/details/cloud-computing-and-data-sovereignty-navigating-legal-and-regulatory-challenges-by-prashant-dubey-dr-razit-sharma
16. Floridi, L., & Taddeo, M. (2016). What is data ethics? *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, *374*(2083), Article 20160360. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2016.0360
17. Fox, J. (2007). The uncertain relationship between transparency and accountability. *Development in Practice*, *17*(4-5), 663–671. https://doi.org/10.1080/09614520701469955
18. Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Pitman.
19. Guerci, M., Radaelli, G., Siletti, E., Cirella, S., & Shani, A. B. R. (2015). The impact of human resource management

@2026 International Council for Education Research and Training
ISSN: 2959-1376
2026, Vol. 05, Issue 03, 131-133
DOI: https://doi.org/10.59231/SARI7948

practices and corporate sustainability on organizational ethical climates: An employee perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *126*(2), 325–342. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1946-1

20. Hislop, D. (2013). *Knowledge management in organizations: A critical introduction* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.
21. Hislop, D., Bosua, R., & Helms, R. (2018). *Knowledge management in organizations: A critical introduction* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.
22. Ibrahim, F., & Reig, H. (2009). What is the value of knowledge practices? *Electronic Journal on Knowledge Management*, *1*(2), 103–112.
23. International Organization for Standardization. (2018). *Knowledge management systems — Requirements* (ISO Standard No. 30401:2018). https://www.iso.org/standard/68631.html
24. Idowu, E. (2025). *Ethics of cloud-based AI in predictive policing and surveillance in authoritarian regimes* (Version 1). MDPI Preprints. https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202507.1358.v1
25. Iqbal, A. M., Otaibi, M. A., & Aljaghthami, K. (2025). AI in cloud platforms: Ethical considerations. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, *10*(11). https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25nov133
26. Kahl, P. (2023). *Generation of knowledge: A moral perspective*. Medium. https://medium.com/
27. Kant, I. (1993). *Grounding for the metaphysics of morals* (J. W. Ellington, Trans.). Hackett. (Original work published 1785)
28. Mahida, A. (2022). A comprehensive review on ethical considerations in cloud computing-privacy data sovereignty and compliance. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence & Cloud Computing*, *1*(1), 2–4. https://doi.org/10.47363/JAICC/2022(1)231
29. Mantelero, A. (2013). The EU proposal for a General Data Protection Regulation and the roots of the 'right to be forgotten'. *Computer Law & Security Review*, *29*(3), 229–235.

@2026 International Council for Education Research and Training
ISSN: 2959-1376
2026, Vol. 05, Issue 03, 132-133
DOI: https://doi.org/10.59231/SARI7948

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clsr.2013.03.010

30. Martin, K. (2019). Designing ethical algorithms. *MIS Quarterly Executive*, *18*(2), 81–91. https://doi.org/10.17705/2msqe.00012
31. Mayer-Schönberger, V. (2009). *Delete: The virtue of forgetting in the digital age*. Princeton University Press.
32. Mill, J. S. (1863). *Utilitarianism*. Parker, Son and Bourn.
33. Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge-creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-6301(96)81509-3
34. Pingili, R. (2025). Ethical implications and challenges of AI in workflow automation and optimization. *International Journal of Business and Management*, *20*(6).
35. Rauhala, M., Drake, M., & Saaranen, P. (2026). Ethical AI in the workplace: Ensuring fairness and transparency. *AI and Ethics*, *6*(1), Article 12. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-025-00903-5
36. Rechberg, I., & Syed, J. (2013). Ethical issues in knowledge management: Conflict of knowledge ownership. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, *17*(6), 828–847. https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-06-2013-0232
37. Reich, M. R. (2017). *The core roles of transparency and accountability in the governance of global health PPPs*. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK513009/
38. Rosen, J. (2012). The right to be forgotten. *Stanford Law Review Online*, *64*, 88–92. https://www.stanfordlawreview.org/online/privacy-paradox-the-right-to-be-forgotten/
39. Sokoh, G. C., & Okolie, U. C. (2021). Knowledge management and its importance in modern organizations. *Journal of Public Administration, Finance and Law*, *20*(1), 283–300. https://doi.org/10.47743/jopafl-2021-20-18
40. Shrivastav, P., Tiwari, D., & Lakshmi, G. (2025). Study of employee privacy rights

@2026 International Council for Education Research and Training
ISSN: 2959-1376
2026, Vol. 05, Issue 03, 133-133
DOI: https://doi.org/10.59231/SARI7948

in the digital age. *Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management*, *10*(45s). https://doi.org/10.52783/jisem.v10i45s.9036

41. Stegman, J., Trottier, P. J., Hillier, C., Khan, H., & Mannan, M. (2023). My privacy for their security: Employees' privacy perspectives and expectations when using enterprise security software. In *Proceedings of the 32nd USENIX Security Symposium* (pp. 3583–3600). USENIX Association. https://www.usenix.org/system/files/usenixsecurity23-stegman.pdf
42. Tabbassum, A., & Chintale, P. (2024). Ethical considerations in AI developments. *International Journal of Global Innovations and Solutions*. https://doi.org/10.21428/e90189c8.1d49fc86
43. Tolan, S. (2019). *Fair and unbiased algorithmic decision making: Current state and future challenges* (arXiv Preprint arXiv:1901.04730). https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1901.04730
44. Unwin, T. (2009). *ICT4D: Information and communication technology for development*. Cambridge University Press.
45. Van Dijk, J. A. G. M. (2019). *The digital divide*. Polity Press.
46. Vardhan, H., Prakarsh, P., & Mansi. (2024). Balancing innovation and privacy: Assessing the legal implications of artificial intelligence in the context of privacy rights and data protection. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, *6*(5). https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2024.v06i05.26746
47. Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs.

Received: Mar 05, 2026
Accepted: May 02, 2026
Published: Jul 01, 2026