



Paper 3: - Towards a Knowledge Sharing Maturity Model for medical imaging departments

By
Maryam Almashmoum

Supervised by
Prof. John Ainsworth
Dr. James Cunningham

ፊ

Faculty of Biology, Medicine, and Health
Division of Health sciences

Maryam Almashmoum^{1,2}, BA, MSc; James Cunningham¹, MSc, PhD; John Ainsworth¹, MSc, PhD

¹Division of Informatics Imaging and Data Sciences, School of Health Sciences Faculty of Biology, Medicine, and Health The University of Manchester, Manchester Academic Health Science Centre, Manchester, United Kingdom

²Nuclear Medicine Department, Faisal Sultan Bin Eissa, Kuwait Cancer Control Center, Kuwait

Corresponding Author:

Maryam Almashmoum, BA, MSc

Division of Informatics Imaging and Data Sciences, School of Health Sciences, Faculty of Biology, Medicine, and Health,

Manchester Academic Health Science Centre

Centre for Health Informatics

The University of Manchester

Vaughan House

Portsmouth St

Manchester, M13 9GB

United Kingdom

Phone: 44 07949062010

Email: maryam.almashmoum@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk

ORCID ID :0000-0003-2756-3842

Abstract

Background: Knowledge sharing in medical imaging departments is being driven by the need to improve healthcare services, develop healthcare professionals' skills, and reduce repetitive mistakes. It is considered an important step in the implementation of knowledge management solutions. By following a maturity model of knowledge sharing, knowledge sharing practices can be improved. The aim of this study was to develop a maturity model knowledge sharing in medical imaging department for helping managers to assess the level of maturity for knowledge sharing practices.

Objectives: In the modern healthcare institutions, improvements in healthcare professionals' skills and healthcare services are often driven through practicing knowledge sharing behaviours. To understand the level of maturity of knowledge sharing, managers can follow the indicators of maturity model knowledge sharing and its measurements in order to identify the current level and move to the next level.

Methods: This study was conducted in three stages: An 'overview stage' which highlighted the factors that affect knowledge sharing practices in medical imaging departments; an 'Analysis factor stage' which was designed to assess the factors that affect knowledge sharing by using a concurrent mixed method approach's (questionnaires, and semi-structured interviews) in two medical imaging departments; and 'Structuring maturity model knowledge sharing stage', where a maturity model of knowledge sharing was developed based on the findings of the other stages.

Results: The model presented in this study includes 17 indicators divided into 11 components. Those components derived from the findings of the questionnaires and semi-structured interviews that were applied in the medical imaging departments. It consists of five maturity levels: initial, aware, define, managed, and optimised. In each level were included measurements in order to help managers to assess the current level by answering to the measurement's questions.

Conclusion: This maturity model of knowledge sharing in medical imaging departments allows managers and policy makers to measure the maturity level of knowledge sharing in those departments. Although the model has been applied to the medical imaging departments, it might easily be modified to apply it to other institutions.

Keywords

Knowledge management; knowledge sharing; medical imaging departments; cancer centres; the Christie, KCCC, maturity model; factors; indicators; measurement.

Introduction

Knowledge is an essential asset in achieving successful institutions practices, and sharing knowledge gives a sustainable competitive advantage to modern institutions [1] [2]. Accessing knowledge is the main step in problem solving and decision making [3]. Knowledge is a mixture of experiences, thoughts, ideas, values, and information. In the context of institutions, knowledge can be shared and transformed among employees within institutions to create new experiences and information that did not exist before [4]. Healthcare institutions, for example, hospitals, and specialised centres have to apply knowledge management (KM) system in order to build a proper and effective network among all healthcare providers [4]. The reason for implementing knowledge management system is mainly because of its complexity, and the huge number of knowledge-based resources that need to be managed [5]. Implementing knowledge management depends on understanding its processes (knowledge creation, knowledge capture, knowledge sharing, and knowledge applications). Moreover, identifying a clear framework to follow is vital to target any weaknesses in each step, and creating a good environment for healthcare professionals. As a result, health care services, and patient outcomes can be improved [5].

Knowledge sharing is considered an important factor to improve health care services, and an essential step for successful knowledge management within institutions as it can lead to improve healthcare settings performance, save them time, reduce costs, and increase health education levels [6]. It plays an important role in providing great accountability and establishing good practices in health planning and policymaking. Abzari et al. [7] stated that knowledge sharing is considered an essential factor in successful institutional performance. It refers to the act of sharing both tacit and explicit knowledge, such as thoughts, ideas, and experiences from one person, group, or institution to another in order to formulate new knowledge [8]. Knowledge sharing is one of the challenges for healthcare institutions due to the variety of resources and knowledge. Healthcare institutions are complex environments given the variety of specialities in each department and who operates institutional resources in each department [9].

Medical imaging departments are essential in any healthcare institution due to the importance of performing important procedures for the pre-treatment plan and interpreting results. Based on the observation at the cancer centre, there are several problems facing knowledge sharing

practices in the medical imaging department such as a lack of awareness of the importance of knowledge sharing, difficulty sharing knowledge among healthcare professionals, and a lack of implementation of information and communication technology (ICT) [10]. Creating a communication environment is important to control the amount of knowledge shared among healthcare professionals in their institutions [11]. Additionally, dealing with healthcare institutional issues is directly related to human capital [12]. Sharing knowledge among healthcare professionals is critical to apply that knowledge in their daily work and allow them to create new knowledge that is needed for developing the institutional process. Both tacit and explicit knowledge are important to enhance the knowledge sharing process among healthcare professionals because they are directly related to their experience, and skills [13]. Therefore, identifying a clear maturity model for knowledge sharing in medical imaging is important to help policymaker, and leaders follow it to enhance knowledge sharing practices among healthcare professionals.

Literature review

Maturity in this context refers to the degree to which technology, institutional process or frameworks evolve over time [14, 15]. In institutions, a maturity model (MM) can be methodically used to define operations and identify stages which can lead to policy plans [16]. The concept of the maturity model was developed in the early 1970s [17]. It is increasingly applied in the field of information systems [18] and is established in many fields such as knowledge management, information management, software performance and management [19-22]. The purpose of maturity models is to provide a clear model based on an institution's capabilities in a certain managerial area by using a set of criteria and related evaluation methodologies [23]. It can be a powerful tool that helps identify strengths and weaknesses in a specific area [24]. Bititci et al., [25] indicated that maturity models have a positive impact on improving institutional performance and respond to many challenges by describing each step and stage properly.

Healthcare institutions face challenges in achieving best practices in knowledge management implementation [26]. Maturity in knowledge management is defined as the degree to which knowledge assets are effectively managed and controlled within institutions [27]. There have been several maturity models for evaluating and describing these areas of management that have been proposed [14-16, 28-30]. Some other applications of maturity models have been applied to healthcare intuition information systems [31].

There is a continuing need to structure and develop a new Knowledge Sharing Maturity Model (KSMM) for enhancing knowledge sharing practices among employees in the medical imaging departments [32]. KSMM helps decision-makers to achieve institutional tasks and improve the quality of patient outcomes [33]. There are several models of knowledge sharing [34-37]. Despite the variety of these models, few of them focus on knowledge sharing in healthcare in general and in the medical imaging department in particular [38]. There are several factors that affect knowledge sharing among healthcare professionals, including the maturity model of multidisciplinary team meetings, community of practice information and communication technology, social media networks, PACS, tele- medicine, and digital library [39-45]. Creating a maturity model for knowledge sharing that consists of all factors that affect their behaviours is vital to implementing a knowledge sharing environment among healthcare professionals.

To date, there is no maturity model to assess knowledge sharing practices among healthcare professionals in general hospitals as a whole, or in medical imaging departments specifically. Developing a maturity model to evaluate the level of maturity of knowledge sharing behaviours is a challenge due to the interactions of healthcare professionals' behaviours with each other on one hand and with ICT on the other , and is dependent on human beings, cultural environments and technological facilitators [46].

Aim and Research questions

The aim of this paper is to structure and present the steps of the development of a KSMM for understanding how healthcare professionals share knowledge, and to define the proper stages of achieving the best knowledge practices among healthcare professionals in medical imaging departments. Therefore, the key research questions are: (1) What are the main components that structured the KSMM? (2) What are the stages of MM that help managers in medical imaging departments need to follow in order to evaluate and enhance knowledge sharing practices among healthcare professionals? (3) **What are** the indicators that control the KSMM, and how can managers measure them.

Research objectives

This paper has various objectives. Firstly, to identify the main stages and components that relate to KSMM. Secondly, the main characteristics of each stage involved in the MM explained in depth. Finally, to create a proposal for a MM that includes the knowledge sharing influencing indicators that affect knowledge sharing practices among healthcare

professionals in medical imaging departments. Additionally, the measurements for each indicator that form the components of the KSMM will be presented.

Research methodology

This paper illustrates the development of a maturity model for knowledge sharing in medical imaging departments. There were three stages conducted in this study, as shown in [Figure 1](#). First an “overview stage”, consisting of a review of previous literature that identified factors that affect knowledge sharing practices in healthcare institutions in general and medical imaging departments specifically. Second the “analysis factors” stage, which consists of applying several methodologies to examine those factors. Third the “structuring” stage. Here, the initial maturity model for knowledge sharing in the medical imaging department was be developed.




Figure 1: The three stages conducted in this study

An overview stage:

An overview stage illustrated the factors that affect knowledge sharing in medical imaging departments at the general hospital and cancer centres specifically. There were several studies that identified knowledge sharing factors were divided into three categories: individual factors, administrative factors, and technological factors [38, 47-59]. Any factor that has a positive impact on enhancing knowledge sharing is called a facilitator. On the other hand, any factors that hinder knowledge sharing practices is called a barrier. Based on previous literature, the factors that affect knowledge sharing in medical imaging departments are the same whether in a general hospital or a cancer centre. However, they are different in terms of terminology because the nature of the cancer centre is mainly concerned with treating cancer cases, which need more than one specialty to end up with an appropriate protocol to treat specific cases [60]. Therefore, documenting the factors that affect knowledge sharing in medical imaging departments from the previous literature is important in order to test those factors in the next stage [60]. Those factors are shown in [Table 1](#).

Analysis factors stage:

In this stage, to examine and analyse those factors, mixed methods are used in this study. The mix method consists of questionnaires, and semi-structured interviews [61]. A triangulation - validate mixed methods design was used in this study. The questionnaire was structured based on the previous studies, and the semi-structured interview questions were formed based on the factors in the previous stage in order to

Table 1: Factors that affect knowledge sharing in the medical imaging departments in general hospitals Vs cancer centres [60].

Types of factors	Facilitators terminologies in medical imaging departments in general hospitals	Facilitators terminologies in medical imaging departments in cancer centres
Individual factors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Trust -Positive attitudes -Awareness -Experience -Intrinsic Motivation -Personality -Self-esteem -Self-efficacy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Trust -Positive attitudes -Awareness -Experience -Intrinsic Motivation -Personality -Self-esteem -Self-efficacy
Departmental factors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Communities of Practice (CoP), inter-professional collaboration -leadership -Culture -Teamwork -Extrinsic motivation -Learning and training -Doctor rounds -Departmental arrangements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Multi disciplinary team (MDT), Community of oncologists -leadership -Culture -Teamwork -Extrinsic motivation -Learning and training -Doctor rounds -Departmental arrangements
Technological factors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -ICT (PACS, social media, intranet, extranet, tele-medicine, tele-radiology) -Network -Digital library 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -ICT (PACS, social media, intranet, extranet, tele-medicine, teleradiology) -Network -Digital library

examining those factors through distributing questionnaires and conducting semi-structured interview among healthcare professionals who are working in the medical imaging

department at two cancer centres [62-64]. The questionnaire was divided into three parts: the demographic section, knowledge sharing practices, and factors that affect knowledge sharing practices in the medical imaging departments. The questionnaires were distributed electronically using the Qualtrics survey tool. The semi-structured interviews were conducted via Microsoft Teams. Those methods were applied among healthcare professionals in the medical imaging department of two cancer centres: the Christie hospital and Kuwait cancer Control Centre.

Structuring MM stage:

In this stage a maturity model for knowledge sharing was developed. Based on the identifying factors that affect knowledge sharing practices in medical imaging departments, a clear vision was developed in order to build a KSMM in a proper way, helping the managers and policymakers to follow those steps and understand how those factors are related to each other in different stages. Furthermore, it helps them either to implement knowledge sharing environment, or to identify the weak points of knowledge sharing practices.

Results of mixed methods

In this paper, we used a triangulation concurrent mixed method approach. An electronic survey was distributed among healthcare professional in two cancer centres from February 2023 until July 2023. It consists of 65 questions divided into three sections. To assess the factors that affect knowledge sharing practices, the Likert scale with seven points was used to evaluate those factors, [Multimedia Appendix 1](#) shown the survey questions. A total of 85 responses were received. Qualtrics XM software was used to analyse the quantitative data. Those factors were divided into three categories based on the systematic review: individual factors, departmental factors, and technological factors [60].

The semi-structured interviews were conducted online using Microsoft Teams among 13 healthcare professionals who are working in the medical imaging departments at two cancer centres. Thematic analysis was used to analyse the qualitative data. Codes were organised by using NVivo software. This was done in order to validate the quantitative methods, understand their views, and understand how knowledge sharing practices are going in those centres. Additionally, to assess if there are a clear policy to adopt knowledge sharing practices. [Multimedia appendix 2](#) shows the interview questions and consent form. All those methods were applied under the ethical improvement programme at both centres.

The results revealed that there are 10 components derived from 5 categories, as shown in [Table 1](#). Those categories start with awareness, which is considered the as main step to

adopting knowledge sharing practices in the department. Awareness of the importance of knowledge sharing in developing healthcare professionals' skills and improving healthcare services is important to increase their willingness to share their knowledge. The results of the quantitative method showed that healthcare professionals in both cancer centres have a high level of awareness of the importance of knowledge sharing. The second category is related to the types of knowledge sharing. It is divided into two categories: tacit and explicit knowledge. Tacit knowledge is the most dominant type of knowledge in the medical imaging department because of several meetings, and specialised meetings (multidisciplinary team meetings, Community of practices, and community of oncologists) are occurred in those departments. In contrast, explicit knowledge exists in the endorsed documents, protocols, policies, and procedures manuals. Therefore, understanding both types of knowledge and organising them is important to increase knowledge sharing practices.

The third, fourth, and fifth categories are related to the factors that affect knowledge sharing practices: individual, departmental, and technological factors. The mean scores of the factors fall between Somewhat Agree to Strongly Agree, which reveals that healthcare professionals are believed in the importance of those factors in enhancing knowledge sharing behaviours. The individual factors consist of two components: communication among health professionals, and personality & positive attitudes. Building trust relationships among healthcare professionals is important to allow them to share their experiences. Additionally, most of the respondents agreed that intrinsic motivation has a positive impact on sharing knowledge by increasing their self-efficacy, and self-esteem through giving them opportunities to practice their abilities and experiences. There is a strong relationship between (personality and positive attitudes), and increased knowledge sharing practices. The respondents indicated that knowledge sharing behaviours occur among individuals. Each of them has a specific personality and attitude towards knowledge sharing practices. Some of them like to share their knowledge in large groups, while other feel relief when they share it in small groups.

The departmental factors have a big responsibility to enhance knowledge sharing based on respondents' thoughts. It consists of five components: leadership and culture, achieving departmental task, continues education, decision making, and infrastructure and workforce. The participants agreed that a leader has a responsibility to create a culture of communication that allows healthcare professionals to practice knowledge sharing behaviours. Developing healthcare professionals' skills required setting a clear plan for practicing continuing education activities such as attending conferences, lectures, training sessions, and workshops.

Offering them space and time is vital to allowing them to practice knowledge sharing activities through organising tasks among them and giving them empty spaces. To achieve departmental tasks, working within a team is crucial to increase the number of tasks achieved. Making a decision regarding patient treatment is one of the important tasks in the department. That task was created in highly specialised meetings such as: Multidisciplinary teams (MDTs), and communities of practices (CoP).

Technological factors consist of several technological modalities such as PACS, social media, intranet, extranet, tele-medicine, tele radiology that require a high-speed networking. These factors consist of two components: stored and shared electronic data electronically, and access to the electronic databases. The respondents illustrated that using the technology requires skills for using it efficiently. Moreover, accessing the databases is vital to expanding healthcare professionals' knowledge about up-to date treatment plans used to treat cancer patients.

Maturity Model development

The development of the maturity model was derived from the systematic review that identified the factors that affect knowledge sharing behaviours in the medical imaging department, and concurrent mixed methods that evaluated those factors in two cancer centres. The non- probability sampling technique was used for mixed methods. Self-selection sampling technique for the quantitative methods, and snowball sampling technique for the qualitative method. The results indicated that KSMM consists of 17 indicators divided into 11 components. Those components represented the five main categories: awareness, knowledge sharing repository, individual factors, departmental factors, and technological factors. [Table 2](#) shows the details of the maturity model for knowledge sharing. Knowledge sharing is a dynamic process among healthcare professionals to manage the institutional process and interaction with information and communication technology infrastructures. As a consequence, those components were incorporated into the five maturity levels. Those level were adopted from the work of the Lee & Kankanhalli [16] that indicated that there are five levels of maturity in knowledge management (initial, aware, defined, managed, and optimized) based on people, process, and technology. The maturity model of knowledge sharing for the medical imaging department presented in [Table 2](#). For each indicator, there are measurement questions that help managers and policymakers to assess each indicator.

Table2: The maturity model of knowledge sharing for the medical imaging departments		
Categories	Components	Indicators
Awareness	-Awareness and willingness	1. Awareness and willingness towards KS
Types of knowledge sharing -Tacit knowledge -Explicit knowledge	-Understanding and organizing knowledge sharing repository	2. Structured, and collected both types of knowledge
Individual Factors -Trust -Positive attitudes -Experience -Intrinsic Motivation -Personality -Self-esteem -Self-efficacy	- Communication among healthcare professionals. -Personality and positive attitudes	3. Building trust among healthcare professionals and share their experience 4. Increased intrinsic motivation (self-efficacy, and self-esteem) 5. Personality and communication among healthcare professionals
Departmental factors -Multi disciplinary team (MDT), Community of oncologists -leadership -Culture -Teamwork -Extrinsic motivation -Learning and training -Doctor rounds -Departmental arrangements	-Leadership and culture -Achieving departmental tasks -Continuous education and develop HCP skills -Decision making -Infrastructure and workforce	6. Structured leadership and creating culture 7. Handover policy 8. Creating teamwork 9. Organising (learning lectures, workshops, training sessions, doctor rounds, and participation in conferences 10. Regular meeting 11. MDT and Cop making decision 12. Meeting room and office layout 13. Enhanced extrinsic motivation 14. Organised work process

Awareness: It is the first phase of introducing knowledge sharing practices among healthcare professionals. It measures by how fast knowledge reach healthcare professionals within department and how fast the tasks were performed in an efficient way.

Awareness	1. Awareness and willingness towards KS	Indicator 1/17: The healthcare professionals in the medical imaging department are aware of importance of knowledge sharing behaviours, and facilitators and the factors that affect knowledge sharing practices.				
		-The term knowledge sharing term is not new. Healthcare professionals are not aware of or understand the importance of knowledge sharing.	-Health care professionals are aware of the importance of knowledge sharing in enhancing their skills and increasing patient outcomes, but others have miss understood.	-Healthcare professionals are aware of the importance of knowledge sharing, and the facilitators and barriers that affect knowledge sharing practices.	-Circular discussions, and meetings are organised to introduce the concept of knowledge sharing.	-Healthcare professionals are fully aware of the importance of knowledge sharing, and the factors that affect it. They are willing to share their knowledge with others.
	The measurement	-Do HCPs know about knowledge sharing in general? -Did they willing to understand the concept of knowledge sharing?	-Has L1 achieved? -Are healthcare professionals aware of the importance of knowledge sharing?	-Has L1, and L2 achieved? -Do you know the definition of knowledge sharing? -Do HCPs knew about facilitators and barriers that affect knowledge sharing practices?	-Has L1, L2, and L3 achieved? - Are there any plans to introduce and discuss the importance of knowledge sharing?	-Has L1, L2, L3, and L4 achieved? -Is there a clear policy that shows the importance of understanding knowledge sharing practices at the workplace?
<p>Types of knowledge sharing: It consists of any data, or information that indicates to a certain amount of knowledge either tacit or explicit knowledge, needing to share it in order to create new knowledge.</p>						
Structure	2. Structured, and collected both types of knowledge	Indicator 2/17: Healthcare professionals aware of both types of knowledge and how its structured, and collected to enhance knowledge sharing practices				

		-Healthcare professionals and their managers are not aware of two types of knowledge (tacit and explicit). Additionally, they do not know what kind of knowledge they have.	-Health care professionals are aware of the tacit knowledge that they have such as thoughts, skills and ideas based on their working experience. Additionally, they are aware of the explicit knowledge that it exists in the medical imaging department such as policies, manuals, procedures, patient reports, quality control documents, and incident report. However, it is not organised.	-Healthcare professionals are aware of both types, and how to share, and discriminate between them to create new knowledge.	-Senior managers and heads of departments are provided a place and offered the time to share their thoughts and ideas. For example, circular discussion in a, morning/daily/weekly/monthly meeting. -Explicit knowledge is organised based on its purpose. For example: -Policies: department guidelines, ethical process, incident reports, handover policies, quality control. - Patients data: patients' data, scans, history, results.	-Healthcare professionals now fully understand both types of knowledge, what are the purpose of them, and how to use and access them to enhance knowledge sharing practices.
	The measurement	- Do HCPs and their managers know about types of knowledge?	-Has L1 achieved? -Are HCPs aware of the types of knowledge either tacit or explicit that exist in the department?	-Has L1, and L2 achieved? -Are HCPS aware of both types of knowledge and able to discriminate between them?	-Has L1, L2, and L3 achieved? -Is there time and regular meetings to share (tacit and explicit) knowledge? -Are there clear classifications for the various types of explicit knowledge that exists the department?	-Has L1, L2, L3, and L4 achieved? -Is there a clear policy for circulating both types of knowledge to support knowledge sharing behaviours among healthcare professionals?
<p>Individual factors: it consists of several individual characteristics that play important role in sharing their knowledge.</p> <p>It is the key for successful knowledge sharing practices because it relays on the people.</p>						
among healthcare	3. Building trust among healthcare professionals,	Indicator 3/17: Budding trust among healthcare professionals and their managers helping to circulate knowledge sharing among them, therefore increasing number of tasks.				

<p>and share their experience</p>	<p>-There is no trust among healthcare professionals or their managers, and they are not aware of the importance of trust in sharing knowledge. There are several problems and conflicts among each other in daily work.</p>	<p>-Health care professionals are aware of the importance of trust in knowledge sharing in enhancing their experiences and minimize their conflicts. However, there is lack of trust in their abilities, and experience to share their knowledge, and they doubt their abilities.</p>	<p>-Healthcare professionals trust their knowledge, experience, and skills as well as those of others.</p>	<p>-Skills, and experiences are shared by healthcare professionals because they trust each other in order to increase patient outcomes and reduce errors.</p>	<p>-Managers and healthcare professionals fully understanding the importance of trust, in terms of other experiences that they have shared with others. Additionally, managers trust their healthcare professionals to perform procedures efficiently.</p>
<p>The measurements</p>	<p>-Is there trust among HCPs or between their managers? -Are there conflicts among HCPs in the department?</p>	<p>-Has L1 achieved? -Are HCPs aware of the importance of trust in enhancing the sharing of their experiences?</p>	<p>-Has L1, and L2 achieved? -Are HCPs fully trusting their peer's knowledge and shared experiences?</p>	<p>-Has L1, L2, and L3 achieved? -Are HCPs sharing their knowledge and experiences in their daily work to improve health services?</p>	<p>-Has L1, L2, L3, and L4 achieved? -Are managers trusting HCPs skills and experiences? -Is the department free from any conflicts?</p>
<p>4. Increased intrinsic motivation (self-efficacy,</p>	<p>Indicator 4/17: Intrinsic motivation is one of the important individual facilitators that allow knowledge sharing behaviours circulating among healthcare professionals</p>				

	and self-esteem)	-There is no inner feeling, self-efficacy, and self-esteem that help healthcare professionals to seek out optimal challenges and share their knowledge based on their abilities and interests.	-There is intrinsic motivation, self-efficacy, and self-esteem, and managers aware of the importance of those in enhancing knowledge sharing, but there is lack of opportunities that help them to employ their skills.	-Healthcare professionals have an internal factor (joy and satisfaction) that cause knowledge sharing behaviours. Each health care professionals have high self-esteem and self-efficacy that allow to believe in their self to be capable to achieve institutional tasks, and procedures.	- Clear policy is created to help them to increase their motivation, self-efficacy, and self-esteem for example: giving them opportunities to employ their skills by allowing them to set new procedures and protocols that contribute to increasing health services.	-Managers and healthcare professionals are fully understand of importance of intrinsic motivation, self-efficacy, and self-esteem to accelerate knowledge sharing practices among them. Additionally, healthcare professionals who have high self-efficacy and self-esteem are more willing to share their knowledge compared to others.
	The measurement	-Are HCPs have inner feeling, self-efficacy, and self-esteem to seek out optimal challenges?	-Has L1 achieved? -Are managers aware of importance of intrinsic motivation, self-efficacy, and self-esteem in enhancing knowledge sharing? -Are there lack of opportunities that allow them to employ their skills?	-Has L1, and L2 achieved? -Are HCPs capable to achieve departmental tasks and procedures?	-Has L1, L2, and L3 achieved? -Are their clear policies to enhance their abilities?	-Has L1, L2, L3 and L4 achieved? -Are managers fully understand of importance intrinsic motivation, self-efficacy, and self-esteem to accelerate knowledge sharing practices among them?
Perse	5. Personality and communicatio	Indicator 5/17: The personality and positive attitudes of healthcare professionals are directedly related to the good communication among them, therefore enhance knowledge sharing				

	n among healthcare professionals	-The managers are not aware of the importance of personality in enhancing knowledge sharing. Additionally, there are no positive attitudes among healthcare professionals and their managers.	-The managers are aware of the types of personality that are divided into five types: extraversion, neoticism, openness to experience, and moods and emotions. But they are not aware of the relationship between personality and positive attitudes towards enhancing knowledge sharing practices.	-Each healthcare professional has a specific personality that cannot be changed in the workplace because it was formulated where the person was raised. Additionally, the managers are aware of the importance of personality and positive attitudes in enhancing knowledge sharing.	-Healthcare professionals at the workplace respect each other no matter what kind of personality the person has and treat each other with a positive attitude. Additionally, managers give them the chance to develop their personalities in terms of communicating with each other to enhance knowledge sharing practices and solve their problems.	-Managers and healthcare workers fully understand the importance of positive attitudes in enhancing knowledge sharing by allowing them to share their experience, thoughts, and ideas with total respect to their personalities because the main target in the workplace is to increase patient outcomes and reduce errors.
	The measurement	-Are HCPs have positive attitudes among their peers?	-Has L1 achieved? -Are managers aware of types of personality?	-Has L1, and L2 achieved? - Are managers aware of the importance of positive attitudes in sharing knowledge? - Applying Com/b model to change the behaviours to positive attitudes	-Has L1, L2, and L3 achieved? -Are managers giving HCPs chances to develop their personalities? -Are HCPs respectful each other in the workplace?	-Has L1, L2, L3, and L4 Achieved? -Is there any conflict among workers and managers? -Are there any activities that allow them to develop their personalities?
Departmental factors: it is the ability of the departments to achieve institutional tasks, increased patient's outcome by enhancing knowledge sharing practices among healthcare professionals.						
Leadershi	6. Structured leadership and creating culture.	Indicator 6/17: Head of departments, and senior managers are the leader in their department. They have responsibility to build a cultural knowledge sharing environments to enhance knowledge sharing practices.				

		-There is no manager or head of head of department in the medical imaging departments.	-There is a manager and a head of department, but they are not aware of the role of leadership in increasing knowledge sharing practices.	-All healthcare works aware of the role of leadership in facilitating individual and collective efforts to understand and influence the people to realise what is to be done and how to realise shared objectives.	- Leaders create a culture that consists of the values and beliefs that directly affect the institutional tasks and procedures. Additionally, they set several policies that organise the workflow flow, solving their problems in order to optimise knowledge sharing practices within the departments.	-Leaders fully understand their role in creating a culture of knowledge sharing by providing them with a space to share their knowledge.
	The measurement	-Is there a leader in the department?	-Has L1 achieved? -Are leaders aware of their role in enhancing knowledge sharing practices?	-Has L1, and L2 achieved? -Are healthcare professionals aware of their leadership role in facilitating resources to help HCPs reach their objectives?	-Has L1, L2, and L3 achieved? -Are the leader having clear policies to organise knowledge sharing practices?	_Has L1, l2, L3, and L4 achieved? - Are the tasks done based on the workflow plan? -Is the leader fair in giving the worker equal opportunities? -Do the leaders share updated policies with their workers?
	7.Handover policy	Indicator 7/17: Handover policy: it is the policy that helps to keep the knowledge either tacit or explicit circulating among healthcare professionals, and it has positive impact on increasing knowledge sharing practices.				
		-There is no handover policy in the department.	-The leaders are aware of the importance of the handover policy, but they are not aware of its importance in enhancing knowledge sharing.	-Healthcare professionals are aware of the importance of handover policy, and the managers have a clear plan to introduce it to the workers.	-Leaders introduced the handover policy and endorsed it among healthcare workers. Anyone who wants to leave departments has a role in handing over responsibility and their knowledge to others to keep the knowledge circulating in the departments.	-Healthcare professionals are fully understanding handover policy, and they are willing to share any knowledge they have to cover their duties when they are absent.

	The measurement	Is there a handover policy?	-Has L1 achieved? -Are the leaders aware of the handover policy for enhancing knowledge sharing practices?	-Has L1, and L2 achieved? -Do the leaders have a clear policy for the handover?	-Has L1, L2, and L3 achieved? -Are HCPs aware of handover policy?	-Has L1, L2, L3, and L4 achieved? -Are HCPs willing to share their knowledge once they decide to leave?
Achieving departmental tasks	8. Creating teamwork	Indicator 8/17: Creating teamwork within workplace is important to achieve, tasks, and procedures in an efficient way by enhancing knowledge sharing among healthcare professionals.				
		-There is no teamwork in the medical imaging department.	-Leaders, and healthcare professionals are aware of the importance of teamwork in enhancing knowledge sharing, resulting in an increased number of tasks, however, there is no actual teamwork within the department.	-In the medical imaging department teamwork, is the group of professionals who are working together, and sharing their skills, and experiences to perform institutional tasks.	-The departmental tasks were performed by working in teams. Additionally, leaders divided healthcare professionals into several teams, each of them has a responsibility to perform a specific task based on their experience, and skills.	-Leaders and healthcare professionals fully understand the importance of working within team in order to increase their ability to share their knowledge and increase the number of tasks within the department because each of them is responsible for achieving specific tasks within the group based on their experience and skills.
	The measurement	-Are HCPs workings as a group or team?	-Has L1 achieved? -Are leaders and HCPS aware of the importance of teamwork within the department?	-Has L1, and L2 achieved? -Are there groups of HCPs working together to perform specific tasks?	-Has L1, L2, and L3 achieved? -Did the leader divide HCPs into several teams to perform specific tasks based on their experience?	-Has L1, L2, L3, and L4 achieved? -How fast the departmental tasks are achieved in the department? -Is there specific teamwork for specific task? -How many teamwork groups are involved in department, and what are they?

Continuous education and develop HCP skills	9. Organising (learning lectures, workshops, training sessions, doctor rounds, and participation in conferences	Indicator 9/17: Organising continues education activities such as: learning lectures, workshops, training sessions, doctor rounds, and participation in conferences helps to developing healthcare professionals' skills, by enhancing knowledge sharing activities among them				
		-There are no continuing education activities.	-Leaders are aware of the importance of continuing education activities, but there do have a plan or policy to offer these activities to healthcare professionals.	-Leaders are aware of the importance of continuing education in enhancing knowledge sharing behaviours by developing their skills in participation in those activities (learning lectures, workshops, training sessions, doctor rounds, and participation in conferences), and after that, they come coming with new knowledge and want to share it with others.	-leaders organised several activities to develop their skills. Additionally, they have set clear plan and policy to give everyone the chance to participate in those activities, and share what they have learned with their colleagues.	-Leaders fully understand the impotence of continuing education. Additionally, there is a clear policy that encourages workers to participate in those activities and allows them after that to share their knowledge with others to maximise the benefits from those activities.
Making decision	The measurement	-Are there continuing education activities in the department?	-Has L1 achieved? -Are leaders aware of the importance of continued education in enhancing knowledge sharing?	-Has L1, and L2 achieved? -Are leaders using continues education to develop HCPs skills?	-Has L1, L2, and L3 achieved? - Is there a clear policy to manage participation in continues education activities?	- Has L1, L2, L3, and L4 achieved? -What are the activities that the department offers to healthcare professionals?
	10. Regular meeting	Indicator 10/17: Regular meetings either between leaders and healthcare professionals, or among healthcare professionals are one of important factor that increased knowledge sharing activities, therefore, increased patients' outcomes.				

		-There are no regular meetings in the department. Most of the healthcare professionals do not know about any updates in the department.	-Leaders are aware of the importance of regular meetings in informing them of any updates in the department, but there is no regular meeting among them.	-Any updates that are introduced in the department, leaders organise meetings to discuss them with workers to share knowledge, ideas, and allow them to participate in anything that is introduced in the department.	-In the department, there are several meetings that happen regularly such as morning/weekly/monthly meetings, and each of meeting has a specific purpose to do it such as making decision, creating, new protocol, solving problems, discussing incident reports.	-Healthcare professionals are fully aware of the purpose of those meetings, and they are regularly involved in them meeting. Additionally, for those who are not attend those meetings, there are follow up meetings for those who do not attend those meetings.
	The measurement	Is there a regular meeting in the department?	-Has L1 achieved? -Are leader aware of importance of the meetings in enhancing knowledge sharing?	-Has L1, and L2 achieved? -Are leaders organised meetings to inform HCPs about any updates in the department?	-Has L1, L2, and L3 achieved? -Is there a regular policy for setting meetings in the department?	-Has L1, L2, L3, and L4 achieved? -Is there a follow up meeting for those who cannot attend?
	11. MDT and Cop making decision	Indicator 11/17: The specialized meetings such as MDT, and CoP have a significant role in enhancing sharing knowledge by setting clear treatment plan based on patient case. There are several professionals from different specialised fields are involved in those meetings.				
		-Not all healthcare professionals know about those professional meetings.	-Leaders aware are of the importance of those meetings in making decisions, but most healthcare professionals are not aware of or know about them, and they are not involved in those meetings.	-In the medical imaging departments, healthcare professionals participate in several specialised meetings such as MDT, CoP, and CoO. Those meetings contain different workers from different disciplines such as: Radiology, radiographers, nurses, oncologists, surgeons, and radiotherapists in order to share their knowledge, and therefore, enhance making decisions based on the specific cases.	-In the department, there are several specialised meetings, each of those meetings is specialised in certain diseases, and all healthcare professionals are involved in those meetings routinely in order to share their knowledge and create new one. -Healthcare professionals participate in those meetings for training purpose.	-All healthcare professionals are fully aware of those meetings, and all of them have a chance to participate in those meetings. Additionally, the representative in each field can attend those meetings in other hospitals.

Infrastructure and workforce	The measurement	-Are there specialised meetings in the department?	-Has L1 achieved? -Are leaders aware of the importance of the specialised meetings in the department?	-Has L1, and L2 achieved? -Are HCPs participating in the specialised meeting to make decisions based on the specific cases?	-Has L1, L2, and L3 achieved? -Is there a clear policy to manage attending specialised meetings?	-Has L1, L2, L3, and L4 achieved? -Are there representative members to attend those meetings in another hospital?
	12. Meeting room and office layout	Indicator 12/17: In the medical imaging department has an empty room for meetings, and there is organized layout that enhances knowledge sharing practices				
		-In the medical imaging department there is no empty room for sharing knowledge, or offices for healthcare professionals.	-Leaders are aware of the importance of empty spaces to share their knowledge, but there are not enough spaces to practice that, or available offices to all healthcare professionals.	-There is empty space in the department that has a significant role in performing more circular discussions, and meetings. Additionally, there are enough offices for all healthcare professionals.	-In the department, there is a specific schedule for the periodical meetings among healthcare professionals with their leaders. Additionally, there are enough offices that for employees to perform their tasks.	-Leaders fully understand the importance of empty spaces, and office layout to enhance knowledge sharing practices among healthcare workers. Additionally, any healthcare professional has the opportunity to use the empty room to meet others.
	The measurement	-Is there empty room for knowledge sharing in the department?	-Has L1 achieved? -Are leaders aware of the importance of empty space in enhancing knowledge sharing?	-Has L1, and L2 achieved? -Is there enough space, and offices for all HCPs to share their knowledge?	-Has L1, L2, and L3 achieved? -Is there a specific schedule for performing meetings in those spaces?	-Has L1, L2, L3, and L4 achieved? -Are the offices fit for all healthcare professionals?
	13.Enhanced extrinsic motivation	Indicator 13/14: Extrinsic motivation is of the important factors that enhances knowledge sharing among healthcare professionals. It could be physically or emotionally.				

		There is no extrinsic motivation in the department.	-Managers are aware of the importance of extrinsic motivation in enhancing knowledge sharing, but there is a lack of policy for extrinsic motivation.	-In the department there are several extrinsic motivation activities that help HCPs practice knowledge sharing to get those incentives.	-In the department, there are several incentives either physical (giving bones) or emotional (self-appreciation, putting their name on the papers that contribute to it, putting their names on the appreciation board, and giving them certificate).	-Managers fully understand the importance of setting clear policies for incentives to maximise the level of sharing knowledge.
	The measurement	Are there incentives in the department?	-Has L1 achieved? -Are managers aware of the importance of extrinsic motivation in enhancing knowledge sharing?	-Has L1, and L2 achieved? -Are there a variety of extrinsic motivation in the department?	-Has L1, L2, and L3 achieved? -Are there physical and emotional motivation in the department?	-Has L1, L2, L3, and L4 achieved? -Is there clear policy for extrinsic motivation in the department?
	14.Organised work process	Indicator 14/17: Organized work process is one of important indicators that enhances knowledge sharing by giving them clear plan to achieves work process, enough time, and fair opportunities to practice knowledge sharing activities				

		-There is no clear plan to organise the workflow process.	-Leaders are aware of the important of an organised work process, but there is no clear plan to organise the workflow process in the department.	-Leaders have a clear plan for how to organise activities among healthcare professionals. Additionally, they are grouping this activity into work unit to increase number of performing tasks.	-The workflow process is divided among healthcare professionals, each of them has a specific job to perform it tasks. Therefore, all healthcare professionals know how to perform tasks in departments. Additionally, time is available to practice knowledge sharing activities among them by attending meetings and continuing education practices (mentioned in indicator 9).	-Leaders fully understand the importance of an organised workflow process, and there is a clear plan to perform the tasks within the department. Additionally, all healthcare professionals are aware of how to perform the tasks within their department, and they can cover for other in their absence. -There is plenty of time due to the organised workflow process to allow them to practice knowledge sharing activities.
	The measurement	-Is there clear plan for the workflow process?	-Has L1 achieved? -Are leaders aware of the importance of organised work in enhancing knowledge sharing?	-Has L1, and L2 achieved? -Are HCPs working based on an organised plan that is set monthly?	-Has L1, L2, and L3 achieved? -Are workflow and departmental tasks divided among HCPs?	Has L1, L2, L3, and L4 achieved? Is there a clear policy on how to organise workflow? -Is there enough time to allow HCPs to participate in knowledge sharing activities?
Technological factors: It consists of using both types of technology infrastructure: hardware and software that allow healthcare professionals to perform their tasks efficiently						
Stored and	15. Strong network	Indicator 15/17: Strong network plays vital role in enhancing knowledge sharing by introducing new technology to store, and share the data, anytime and anywhere.				

		-There is no access to the network in the department.	-Leaders are aware of the importance of networks in the department in sending and receiving data electronically, therefore enhancing knowledge sharing activities.	-There is a strong network in the department, helping in sending and receiving the data among other departments in the local hospital or around the country.	-Based on the strong network infrastructure, there are several technological modalities have been introduced in the department, such as HIS, RIS, and PACS. Additionally, it allows the use of social media platforms to share knowledge among workers electronically, such as, WhatsApp, Zoom .etc.	-There is a strong network that allows leaders to use electronic tools to practice knowledge sharing among workers. Additionally, there is a clear policy to update and maintain the network in the department.
	The measurement	-Is there access to the network in the department?	-Has L1 achieved? -Are leaders aware of the importance of networks in enhancing knowledge sharing?	-Has L1, and L2 achieved? -Is there a strong network in the department to send and receive patient files?	-Has L1, L2, and L3 achieved? -Are there information and communication technology infrastructures available in the department?	-Has L1, L2, L3, and L4 achieved? -Is there a clear policy to obtain a high-speed network and maintain it in the department?
	16. Implementation information, communication technology	Indicator 16/18: Implanting information communication technology infrastructure such as: PACS, social media, intranet, extranet, tele-medicine, teleradiology play very important role in enhancing knowledge sharing behaviours.				

	and maintenance	-There is no implementation of ICT infrastructure.	-Leaders are aware of the importance of ICT. However, not all healthcare professionals know how to use it efficiently.	-ICT infrastructure plays an important role in enhancing knowledge sharing by speeding up that transfer process of the data that is needed to perform specific tasks, such as interpreting results and making decisions.	-In the department, there are a variety of ICT infrastructures. Each of them has a specific purpose for using it. For example: -HIS, RIS, and PACS: uploading and downloading patient data, history, scans, and lab reports to speed up. -Intranet/Extranet: for the departmental circulars, policies, manuals, and protocols. -Social media platforms: WhatsApp, Zoom, Teams, Facebook, and so on, for sharing knowledge within the department, and use them in an emergency case to establish meetings electronically. -Healthcare professionals attended workshops to learn how to deal with this technology.	-The department are fully utilising ICT infrastructure. Additionally, leaders and healthcare professionals need to be aware of how to deal with this technology properly. -There is periodically maintenance, and clear a policy to develop, and update this technology.
	The measurement	-Are there implementations of ICT infrastructures in the department?	-Has L1 achieved? -Are leaders aware of the importance of ICT in enhancing knowledge sharing?	-Has L1, and L2 achieved? -Does ICT have a role in speeding up the process of performing the departmental tasks?	-Has L1, L2, and L3 achieved? -Are HCPs trained well enough to allow them to use these infrastructures properly? -Are there a variety of ICT modalities in the department?	-Has L1, L2, L3, and L4 achieved? -Is there a clear policy for periodical maintenance of ICT infrastructure?
Access to	17: Digital libraries	Indicator 17/17: Digital libraries is one of important technological facilitators that enhance knowledge by developing healthcare professional's knowledge through accessing to the updated articles and journals.				

		-There is no access to the electronic databases.	-Leaders are aware of the importance of digital libraries, but there is no access to the electronic databases.	-Healthcare professionals are able to access electronic databases to read and gain knowledge based on other works that have been publicised through a medical journal. However, there is limited access to those databases such as, for physicians only.	-In the department, there are digital libraries that allow healthcare professionals to access several international journals to read, and therefore discuss them with other peers.	-The department has fully implemented electronic databases. Additionally, there is a digital library in the department, and all works are eligible for access to it.
	The measurement	-Is there digital library in the department?	-Has L1 achieved? -Are leaders aware of the importance of digital libraries?	-Has L1, and L2 achieved? -Are HCPs able to access to the electronic databases? -Are all HCPs granted permission to access those databases?	-Has L1, L2, and L3 achieved? -In the department, are there journal clubs to discuss the recent articles?	-Has L1, L2, L3, and L4 achieved? -Is the department fully implemented in the digital library, and do all HCPs have permission to access it?

Discussion

Despite the considerable attention to knowledge management in healthcare intuitions, and the significance of the maturity model in managing healthcare recourses, knowledge sharing in hospitals has been less focused on developing the maternity model as a tool for assessing knowledge sharing practices or a roadmap to adopting knowledge sharing behaviours. This is the essence of the present work. This study aimed to develop a knowledge sharing maturity model in the medical imaging department by assessing the factors that affect knowledge sharing practices. Several maturity models have been developed in social media, health systems, digital libraries, ICT, PACS, and telemedicine [39, 41, 43-45]. Those models were used to assess each factor that affects knowledge sharing practices in terms of benchmarking efforts and to develop progressive strategies that might improve its activities. Additionally, Yiren et al., [42] shed light on a maturity model for cancer multidisciplinary teams. That

model consists of 17 indicators that are used to measure healthcare professionals' performance and monitor the quality of performance at cancers centre over time.

Figure 1 highlights the five components that affect KSMM in the medical imaging department and classifies each component in terms of its influence on knowledge sharing behaviours. Awareness of the importance of knowledge management is one of the core components that contribute to the adoption knowledge sharing practices among healthcare professionals. Most of the respondents showed a high level of awareness of the importance of knowledge sharing in developing their skills, increasing healthcare services, and reducing medical errors. Therefore, results showed that more than half of respondents in both cancer centres (17 (58.6%, 32 (57.1%)) participated daily in knowledge sharing activities that were available in their department. Additionally, one of the articles showed that without awareness of the importance of knowledge sharing, there are no knowledge sharing practices in the medical imaging department [10]. The next step is structured types of knowledge (tacit and explicit). Understanding the types of knowledge available in the department, and how to capture, documented, and share it is vital to accelerating knowledge sharing practices in the department. Tacit knowledge appears the in medical imaging department as a dominant type among healthcare professionals that is considered as tool for sharing knowledge in lectures, conferencing, and meetings. In contrast, explicit knowledge takes several forms such as documents, policies, procedures, and manuals. That form allows workers to reach it anytime in an easy way [65]. From the third to the fifth step, factors that affected knowledge sharing that divided into three categories: individual factors, followed by departmental factors, and finally technological factors [10, 38, 47-50, 52, 54-57].

Through this study, the key research questions have been answered. The model can be used as a scoring tool to assess knowledge sharing practices indicators with each maturity model scoring 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 respectively. Moreover, this model can help managers and policymakers find the opportunities for improvements and the way to achieve them. Additionally, applying KSMM helps healthcare institutions increase health services and patient outcomes, reduce errors, and solve the problem in a practical way.

The purpose of using the maturity model in the institutions is not to achieve the highest level of maturity, but the maturity model gives the institutions the roadmap to make a decision about what to improve and how. This study has several limitations that need to be addressed. First, this maturity model was based on the medical imaging department's vision. In terms of the factors, knowledge sharing factors might from one department to another, but they are similar in general. Therefore, it could be modified to be adopted by other institutions. Second,

this study lacks reliability. Therefore, would be useful to apply the Delphi method among experts in a knowledge management in order to evaluate the reliability of this model.




Figure2: Schematic description of the five components that affect KSMM in medical imaging departments

Future work

Following the creation of this knowledge sharing maturity model for medical imaging departments, we will validate this model by applying Delphi methods to provide a consensus view of the suitability of these indicators for improving knowledge sharing practices [66-69]. We will conduct a study in which experts in the field of knowledge management and heads of departments within healthcare organisations will participate in a two round Delphi study assessing the maturity model. This study will extend the results of the work we have presented here, and address the reliability of the model as a generalised tool for use within medical imaging departments and the healthcare sector more widely. We expect that this

work will lead to refinements in the model and will provide a practical grounding for the theoretical work presented in this paper.

Conclusion

Knowledge sharing is considered a core step in the implementation of knowledge management. Health care institutions have a responsibility to adopt knowledge sharing practices in order to manage knowledge that is either tacit or explicit. A medical imaging department is crucial in any healthcare institution. Therefore, creating KSMM is important to develop knowledge-sharing practices. The model proposed in this study allows managers to measure the maturity level of knowledge sharing in the medical imaging department. By providing the roadmap, the knowledge sharing maturity model allows imputations and managers in healthcare intuitions to appraise knowledge sharing practices and adopt a culture of knowledge sharing to achieve the departmental tasks, and improvements. Additionally, it could help managers to assess knowledge sharing practices in the medical imaging department and find the weak points that have a negative on impact those behaviours. A range of factors were addressed from in our previous work and then we evaluated those factors in two medical imaging departments in two cancer centres. Those factors are divided into 5 categories. Therefore, the KSMM consists of 17 indicators that are divided into 11 components and presented in 5 categories. The most important of those indicators is awareness of the importance of knowledge sharing. Presumably because it allows healthcare professionals to develop their skills, and perform several tasks. The model presented might also be used to identify statements for improvement. The measurement of each indicators helps the managers to assess what level they are. If the answer to the first level is NO. Therefore, they have to work on this indicator until they achieve it and next to the next level. Moreover, this model that was presented in table 2 will contribute to identify which they are and assess the weakness points, thereby will help the managers and policy makers to develop knowledge sharing practice to the next level. In general, knowledge sharing practices is important in healthcare institutions to avoid repetitive errors, improve healthcare services, improve collaborations and communication among staff, and therefore it will encourage them to come with new ideas together.

Acknowledgements

This study was completed as a part of doctoral studies funded by Ministry of health, Kuwait, and University of Manchester, UK.

Conflicts of interest

No declared

Multimedia Appendix 1

The questionnaires questions, consent form for the interview, and the questions of the interviews.

Multimedia Appendix 1

The consent form for the interview, and the questions of the interviews.

References

1. Kogut B, Zander U. What firms do? Coordination, identity, and learning. *Organization science*. 1996;7(5):502-18.
2. Mc Evoy PJ, Ragab MAF, Arisha A. The effectiveness of knowledge management in the public sector. *Knowledge management research & practice*. 2019;17(1):39-51. doi: 10.1080/14778238.2018.1538670.
3. Haughom J. Innovation in healthcare: why it's needed and where it's going. *Health Catalyst* Retrieved from <https://www.healthcatalyst.com/innovation-inhealthcare-why-needed-where-going>. 2014.
4. Rego I, Pereira L, Dias Á, Gonçalves R, Costa RLd. Knowledge management maturity in healthcare service. *International Journal of Knowledge and Learning*. 2023;16(1):17-55.
5. Sandhu MS, Jain KK, bte Ahmad IUK. Knowledge sharing among public sector employees: evidence from Malaysia. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*. 2011;24(3):206-26.
6. Al-Kurdi OF, El-Haddadeh R, Eldabi T. The role of organisational climate in managing knowledge sharing among academics in higher education. *Int J Inf Manage*. 2020;50:217-27. doi: 10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2019.05.018.
7. Abzari M, Shahin A, Abasaltian A. Studying the impact of personality constructs on employees' knowledge sharing behavior through considering the mediating role of intelligent competencies in project-oriented organizations. *Modern Applied Science*. 2016;10(6):194-204.
8. Vuori V, Okkonen J. Knowledge sharing motivational factors of using an intra-organizational social media platform. *Journal of knowledge management*. 2012;16(4):592-603.

9. Radević I, Dimovski V, Lojpur A, Colnar S. Quality of healthcare services in focus: the role of knowledge transfer, hierarchical organizational structure and trust. *Knowledge Management Research & Practice*. 2021;1-12.
10. Al Mashmoum MJ, Hamade SN. Knowledge Sharing Among Employees of Kuwait Cancer Control Center. *International Journal of Knowledge Management and Practices*. 2019 2019 2021-09-11;7(1):15-25. PMID: 2241046417.
11. Abidi SSR. Knowledge management in healthcare: towards 'knowledge-driven' decision-support services. *International journal of medical informatics*. 2001;63(1-2):5-18.
12. Sharma K, Sharma V. Evaluating knowledge management practices in Indian manufacturing and service industry: an overview. *International Journal of Knowledge Management Studies*. 2018;9(3):222-42.
13. Dorow P, Medeiros C, Camozzato T, Silva C, Vargas F, Huhn A. Knowledge sharing process between radiologist. *Int J Adv Res*. 2018;6(7):431-6.
14. Klimko G, editor. Knowledge management and maturity models: Building common understanding. *Proceedings of the 2nd European conference on knowledge management*; 2001: Bled, Slovenia.
15. Serenko A, Bontis N, Hull E. An application of the knowledge management maturity model: the case of credit unions. *Knowledge Management Research & Practice*. 2016;14(3):338-52.
16. Pee LG, Kankanhalli A. A model of organisational knowledge management maturity based on people, process, and technology. *Journal of information & knowledge management*. 2009;8(02):79-99.
17. Gibson CF. Managing the four stages of EDP growth. *Harvard Business Review*. 1974;52(1):76-88.
18. Paulk MC, Curtis B, Chrissis MB, Weber CV. Capability maturity model, version 1.1. *IEEE software*. 1993;10(4):18-27.
19. Aho M, editor. What is your PMI? A model for assessing the maturity of performance management in organizations. *PMA 2012 Conf*; 2012.
20. Becker MC, Salvatore P, Zirpoli F. The impact of virtual simulation tools on problem-solving and new product development organization. *Research Policy*. 2005;34(9):1305-21. doi: 10.1016/j.respol.2005.03.016.
21. Van Aken EM, Letens G, Coleman GD, Farris J, Van Goubergen D. Assessing maturity and effectiveness of enterprise performance measurement systems. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*. 2005;54(5/6):400-18.
22. Wettstein T, Kueng P. A maturity model for performance measurement systems. *WIT Transactions on Information and Communication Technologies*. 2002;26.
23. Maier AM, Moultrie J, Clarkson PJ. Assessing organizational capabilities: reviewing and guiding the development of maturity grids. *IEEE transactions on engineering management*. 2011;59(1):138-59.
24. Jääskeläinen A, Roitto J-M. Designing a model for profiling organizational performance management. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*. 2015;64(1):5-27.
25. Bititci US, Garengo P, Ates A, Nudurupati SS. Value of maturity models in performance measurement. *International journal of production research*. 2015;53(10):3062-85.

26. Yan Q-y, Xiang F, Shi X-x, Zhu Q. Implementation of knowledge management in Chinese hospitals. *Current medical science*. 2018;38(2):372-8.
27. Šajeva S, Jucevičius R. Model of knowledge management system maturity and its approbation in business companies. *Socialiniai mokslai*. 2010 (3):57-68.
28. Teah HY, Pee LG, KANKANHALLI A. Development and application of a general knowledge management maturity model. *PACIS 2006 Proceedings*. 2006:12.
29. Kulkarni U, St Louis R. Organizational self assessment of knowledge management maturity. 2003.
30. Spanellis A, MacBryde J, Dörfler V. A dynamic model of knowledge management in innovative technology companies: A case from the energy sector. *European Journal of Operational Research*. 2021;292(2):784-97.
31. Carvalho JV, Rocha Á, van de Wetering R, Abreu A. A Maturity model for hospital information systems. *Journal of Business Research*. 2019;94:388-99.
32. Arif M, Al Zubi M, Gupta AD, Egbu C, Walton RO, Islam R. Knowledge sharing maturity model for Jordanian construction sector. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*. 2017;24(1):170-88.
33. Mettler T, Rohner P, editors. Situational maturity models as instrumental artifacts for organizational design. *Proceedings of the 4th international conference on design science research in information systems and technology*; 2009.
34. LODHI SA. National College of Business Administration & Economics Lahore. 2005.
35. Sayed S, Mutasa R, Kaaya E, Mudenda V, Rajiv E, Vuhahula E, et al. Establishing the College of Pathologists of East, Central and Southern Africa – The Regional East Central and Southern Africa College of Pathology. *African Journal of Laboratory Medicine*. 2020 2020 2020-06-18;9(1). PMID: 2414179020. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/ajlm.v9i1.979>.
36. Taylor WA, Wright GH. Organizational readiness for successful knowledge sharing: Challenges for public sector managers. *Information Resources Management Journal (IRMJ)*. 2004;17(2):22-37.
37. Supar N, Ibrahim AA, Mohamed ZA, Yahya M, Abdul M, editors. Factors affecting knowledge sharing and its effects on performance: a study of three selected higher academic institutions. *International Conference on Knowledge Management (ICKM)*; 2005.
38. Lema B. A framework to support knowledge sharing practice among health care professionals at Yekatit 12 hospital medical College: Addis Ababa University; 2017.
39. Fitterer R, Rohner P. Towards assessing the networkability of health care providers: a maturity model approach. *Information Systems and e-Business Management*. 2010;8:309-33.
40. Ekuobase GO, Olutayo VA. Study of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) maturity and value: The relationship. *Egyptian Informatics Journal*. 2016;17(3):239-49.
41. Sheikhshoaei F, Naghshineh N, Alidousti S, Nakhoda M. Design of a digital library maturity model (DLMM). *The Electronic Library*. 2018;36(4):607-19.
42. Liu Y, Evans L, Kwan T, Callister J, Poon S, Byth K, et al. Developing a maturity model for cancer multidisciplinary teams. *International Journal of Medical Informatics*. 2021;156:104610.
43. Van Dyk L, Schutte CS. The telemedicine service maturity model: A framework for the measurement and improvement of telemedicine services. *Telemedicine*. 2013:217-38.
44. van de Wetering R, Batenburg R. A PACS maturity model: a systematic meta-analytic review on maturation and evolvability of PACS in the hospital enterprise. *International journal of medical informatics*. 2009;78(2):127-40.

45. Jami Pour M, Jafari SM. Toward a maturity model for the application of social media in healthcare: The health 2.0 roadmap. *Online Information Review*. 2019;43(3):404-25.
46. Muqadas F, Rehman M, Aslam U, Ur-Rahman U-. Exploring the challenges, trends and issues for knowledge sharing: A study on employees in public sector universities. *VINE Journal of Information and Knowledge Management Systems*. 2017;47(1):2-15.
47. Monazam Tabrizi N. *Models for Describing Knowledge Sharing Practices: The Case Study of UK Hospitals*. 2016.
48. Lee HS, Hong SA. Factors affecting hospital employees' knowledge sharing intention and behavior, and innovation behavior. *Osong public health and research perspectives*. 2014;5(3):148-55.
49. Shahmoradi L, Safdari R, Piri Z, Mahmoodabadi AD, Shahmoradi S, Nejad AF. Knowledge sharing as a powerful base for management: Barriers and solutions. *The health care manager*. 2017;36(2):176-83.
50. Gider Ö, Ocak S, Top M. Perceptions of physicians about knowledge sharing barriers in Turkish health care system. *Journal of medical systems*. 2015;39:1-13.
51. Kim S-J, Park M. Leadership, knowledge sharing, and creativity. *The Journal of Nursing Administration*. 2015;45(12):615-21.
52. Imran MK, Fatima T, Aslam U, Iqbal SMJ. Exploring the Benefits of Social Media Towards Knowledge Sharing Among Doctors. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research*. 2019;34(2).
53. Yip K. *Exploring barriers to knowledge sharing: A case study of a virtual community of practice in a Swedish multinational corporation*. 2011.
54. Ariati N, Sensuse DI, Handayani PW, editors. *Factors affecting knowledge sharing capability of doctors in Palembang*. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*; 2020: IOP Publishing.
55. Lin TC, Lai MC, Yang SW. Factors influencing physicians' knowledge sharing on web medical forums. *Health Informatics Journal*. 2016;22(3):594-607.
56. MamoMulate E, Gojeh LA. *Current Status and Factors Affecting Knowledge Sharing Practices among Health Professionals in Hiwot Fana Specialized University Hospital in Ethiopia*. 2020.
57. Demsash AW, Chakilu B, Mazengia A. *Knowledge Sharing Practice and Its Associated Factors Among Healthcare Providers at University of Gondar Comprehensive Specialized Hospital, North West Ethiopian: Cross-sectional Study*. 2021.
58. Almeida MH, Ramos A, Sousa MJ, Santos CM, Fontes AP, editors. *Organizational Factors Affecting Knowledge Sharing Capabilities: A Study with Portuguese Health Professionals*. *European Conference on Knowledge Management*; 2020: Academic Conferences International Limited.
59. Pun JK, Matthiessen CM, Murray KA, Slade D. Factors affecting communication in emergency departments: doctors and nurses' perceptions of communication in a trilingual ED in Hong Kong. *International journal of emergency medicine*. 2015;8(1):1-12.
60. Almashmoum M, Cunningham J, Alkhaldi O, Anisworth J. Factors That Affect Knowledge-Sharing Behaviors in Medical Imaging Departments in Cancer Centers: Systematic Review. *JMIR human factors*. 2023;10:e44327-e. doi: 10.2196/44327.
61. Creswell JW, Creswell JD. *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*: Sage publications; 2017. ISBN: 1506386717.

62. Alhalhouli ZT, Hassan Z, Abualkishik AM. An updated model to enhance knowledge sharing among stakeholders in Jordanian hospitals using social networks. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*. 2013;18(8):1089-98.
63. Noor NM, Salim J. Factors influencing employee knowledge sharing capabilities in electronic government agencies in Malaysia. *International Journal of Computer Science Issues (IJCSI)*. 2011;8(4):106.
64. Lee H-S. Knowledge management enablers and process in hospital organizations. *Osong public health and research perspectives*. 2017;8(1):26.
65. Adeyelu TS, Kalema BM, Motlanthe BL. An empirical study of knowledge sharing: A case of South African healthcare system. *Knowledge Management & E-Learning: An International Journal*. 2019;11(1):114-28.
66. Kagias P, Sariannidis N, Garefalakis A, Passas I, Kyriakogkonas P. Validating the Whistleblowing Maturity Model Using the Delphi Method. *Administrative Sciences*. 2023;13(5):120.
67. Gallotta B, Garza-Reyes JA, Anosike A, editors. Using the Delphi method to verify a framework to implement sustainability initiatives. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management*; 2018: 92922.
68. Martins AI, Santinha G, Almeida AM, Ribeiro Ó, Silva T, Rocha N, et al. Consensus on the Terms and Procedures for Planning and Reporting a Usability Evaluation of Health-Related Digital Solutions: Delphi Study and a Resulting Checklist. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*. 2023;25:e44326.
69. Habibi A, Sarafrazi A, Izadyar S. Delphi technique theoretical framework in qualitative research. *The International Journal of Engineering and Science*. 2014;3(4):8-13.

1:

An overview
stage

2:

Analysing
factors
stage

3:

Structuring
the RIM
stage