

An Empirical On Knowledge Sharing In Learning Organizations In Kutahya, Turkey

Kemal Demirci¹, Nuray Mercan¹, Yaşar Aksanyar¹, Bayram Alamur², Vasfi Kahya³

1Dumlupınar University Institute of Social Sciences, Kütahya, Turkey,

2Balıkesir University Havran Vocational School Of Higher Education,

3Dumlupınar University Institute of Social Sciences, Kütahya, Turkey

E –mails: *mkdemirci26@hotmail.com, snmmercan@yahoo.com, ayyasari@gmail.com, alamur_bayram@hotmail.com, vasfikahya@hotmail.com*

Abstract

Comunities today and in the future have to process, evaluate and internalize the information more than past. Comunities and enterprises, which don't understand the environment, and are unconscious about changes, and which don't read the world, are obliged to deteriorate, even to die. Fiber speed and continious changes of present world, makes compulsory to learn continiously and to educe information. Enterprises have to be open to continiously learning to carry on their growth and development and they have to gain capability to share knowledge. This paper undertakes to contribute to this search by addressing some fundamental questions about the nature, domain, conceptual foundations, and practical challenges of knowledge management and organizational learning. A positive relationship has been found between continiously learning which are learner dimensions of organization, dialog and research, team learning, sharing systems, empowered workers, connection between the systems, sharing information of supportive leadership and openness of in-house cognitive canals through the correlation and multiple regression analysis done in the result of the research.

Keywords: Knowledge Management, Knowledge Share, learning organization.

1.INTRODUCTION

The term organizational learning may refer to individual learning within the organization, the entire organization learning as a collective body, oranywhere in between these extremes. However, most organizational learning refers to team ororganizational level learning. Of

course, individual learning, or learning in small or large groups or as an entire organization may be needed for the firm to possess the requisite knowledge to take effective action. From a knowledge management perspective, all levels of learning are important and all must be nurtured and made a natural part of culture. To date, most of the knowledge management emphasis has been put on locating, creating and sharing knowledge. For this reason, we consider or organizational learning to refer to the capacity of the organization to acquire the knowledge necessary to survive and compete in its environment. (Bennet and Bennet, 2006: 1-3).

Knowledge sharing in an organization is an important issue. Because knowledge is considered as being the source of organizational competitive and a kind of strategic capital in an information economy, the more the knowledge is expanded in an organization, the more the capacity of competition is (Yaghi Et Al, 2011:20).

Knowledge sharing can be defined as transferring knowledge from one place or one person to another (Sharrat and Usoro, 2003:4-5). It is possible to define knowledge sharing basically as making knowledge useable for the individuals in an organization. In other words, knowledge sharing is a process of bartering knowledge with other individuals so that they can understand, claim and use it (Ipe, 2003:341); knowledge sharing is that employees share their knowledge, thoughts, suggestions and experience in their organization with others (Bartol and Srivastava, 2002:65).

The first section of the paper considers conceptual analysis of knowledge sharing. In the second section, we will try to explain conceptual analysis of learning organization. In the third section, the results and the findings of the study will be evaluated, in the conclusion section, the importance of knowledge sharing in learning organizations will be evaluated by using the findings.

2. Conceptual analysis of knowledge sharing

Knowledge sharing is a social mutual interactive culture and involves knowledge, skill and experience exchange of employees in an organization. For an organization, knowledge sharing is capturing knowledge based on experience, organizing it, making it reusable and transferring it; it depends on making knowledge available for others in an organization or a business. Many studies have shown that knowledge sharing is compulsory because it allows organizations to increase their innovation performance and to decrease unnecessary learning efforts (Lin, 2007:315-316).

Knowledge is about knowledge exchange between two individuals. It can also be expressed as “willingness of individuals in an organization to share their knowledge with others” (Mc Neish and Mann, 2010:19-20). Sharing knowledge also allows administrators and employees keep what they know and to practice it (Yang, 2007:84). The aim of sharing knowledge is either to create new knowledge out of existing knowledge or to improve it (Christensen, 2007:37).

Knowledge sharing is thought as a social behaviour and many physical, technological, psychological, cultural and personal factors have effective roles in not only supporting but also limiting knowledge sharing. Despite many advantages of knowledge sharing, researchers and implementers often argue that in many cases, in fact, individuals abstain from sharing their knowledge with others (Davenport, 2007); moreover, they say that act of sharing knowledge is unnatural and there are many reasons for people to abstain from sharing their knowledge with others. Some of what obstruct sharing knowledge between colleagues are the following factors: the relations between the source of knowledge and the receiver of the knowledge aren't extensive, according to Smith and McKeen (2003) rewards and motivation aren't enough for sharing, according to Ikhsan and Ronald (2004) time is insufficient, and knowledge sharing culture is lacking. Furthermore, inadequacy in understanding what to share with whom, limited appreciation of sharing knowledge and fear of acquiring false knowledge may also hinder knowledge sharing acts (Cited in Majid and Wey, 2009:22).

2.1. Conceptual analysis of learning organizations

Organizational learning can be said to occur when there is a change in the content, conditionality, or degree of belief of the beliefs shared by individuals who jointly act on those beliefs within an organization. Knowledge can be articulated and codified to create organizational knowledge assets. Knowledge can be disseminated (using information technologies) in the form of documents, drawings, best practice models, etc. Learning processes can be designed to remedy knowledge deficiencies through structured, managed, scientific processes (Sanchez, 2005: 3).

Organizational learning requires a sharing of language, meaning, objectives and standards that are significantly different from individual learning. When the organization learns, it generates a social synergy that creates knowledge, adding value to the firm's knowledge workers and to its overall performance. When such a capability becomes embedded within the organization's culture, the organization may have what is called a core competency. These are usually unique to each organization and can rarely be replicated by other firms. The

knowledge behind a core competency is built up over time through experiences and successes and rests more in the relationships and spirit among the knowledge workers that is the sum of each worker's knowledge (Bennet and Bennet, 2006: 1-3).

3. Research Method and Sample

The "Questionnaire of Learning Organizations' Dimensions" which we referred to was developed by Watkins and Marsick (1997). The reliability and the validity of the questionnaire, learning continuum, dialog and research, learning as a team, sharing system, connections between systems, empowered employees, supporting leadership.

The data were collected through a questionnaire based on literature. Surveys of Chow, Deng and Ho (2000) were utilized in evaluating the employees' knowledge sharing. There were 24 questions by Chow, Deng and Ho (2000) in the questionnaire: 5 about the perspectives of the employees about knowledge, 5 about the cases requiring knowledge sharing, 9 about the cases obstructing knowledge sharing and 5 about the elements of knowledge sharing that is the basic variable of intellectual capital.

This research was conducted by questionnaire method to totally 124 people who work in different segments of Altintas District Governorship.

3.1. Demographical Characteristics of the Subjects

Shows demographic features of the subjects: Age Distribution: 20-25 Yaş %14,5; 25-30 age %36,5 ;30-35 age %16,5; 35-40 age %14,5 ; 40-45 age %8,9 ; Over 45 %13,7 Marital Status Distribution Married 92 - % 74,2 ; Single 32 - %25,8 Distribution According To Position Officer 47 - %37,9 , Office Boy 2 - %1,6 ;Teacher 50 - %40,3;Policeman 2 - %1,6; Sağlıkçı 5 - % 4 ;Health Worker 18 - %14,5. Distribution According To Departments Land Registry 5 - %4; Education 67 - %54; Governorship 15 - %14,1 ; Health 1 - %13,7; Forestry 13 - %10,5; Treasury 7 - %5,6. Working Time Distribution 1-5 Years 77 %62,1 ; 5-10 Years 25 %20,2 ; 10-15 Years 10 %8,1 ; 15-20 Years 1 %8 ; Over 20 Years 11 %8,9 Distribution Of Education Level High School 24 - %19,4 ; University 99 - %79,8 ; Masters Degree 1 - %0,8

4. Research Hypothesis

The hypothesis can be said like this;

H1: There is a statistically significant correlation between the participants' (officers') viewpoints about sub-dimension of learning organization; knowledge management, dialog

and research, learning as a team, sharing systems,empowered employees, connections between systems and supporter leadership.

H2:There is a statistically significant correlation between the participants' (officers') viewpoints about openness of the internal channel and learning organizations, dialog and research, learning as a team, sharing systems, empowered employees, connections between systems and supporter leadership.

4.1.Findings and analysis

4.1.1. Reliability of the Questionnaire

In order to testthe reliability of questionnaire after analyzing the findings the Likert type data of the questionnaire, Cronbach's Alpha value was found as 0,95. Some 28 questions which take part in the questionnaire were analysed to test reliability and Cronbach's Alpha value of Likert type questionnaire findings was found as 0,80.

1. Analysis of correlations between sub-dimensions of sharing information and learning organizations

		DIALOG	TEAM	SHARING	EMPOWERING	SYSTEM	SUPPORT
SITUATIONS REQUIRING THE SHARING INFO	Pearson Correlation	,536**	,424**	,387**	,388**	,405**	,360**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
OPENNESS of IN-HOUSE COGNITIVE CANALS	Pearson Correlation	,459**	,442**	,374**	,407**	,428**	,349**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000

**İlişki 0,01 düzeyinde anlamlıdır (çift yönlü) Relationship is significant at the 0,01 level. (two ways)

In the result of correlation analysis, at the 0,01 significance level situations requiring the sharing info and relationship in a positive way have been observed between dialog and research team learning, sharing systems, empowered workers, connection between the systems, sharing information of supportive leadership and openness of in-house cognitive canals which are dimensions of sharing information.

2. Multiple regression analysis between learner dimensions of organization and sharing information

$R^2 = 30,1$ ADJUSTED $R^2 = 25,9$ F=7,150 P VALUE =,000			
INDEPENDENT VARIABLES	β PARAMETER	t VALUE	P VALUE
CONTINUOUSNESS	-,038	-,377	,707
DIALOG	,458	3,523	,001
TEAM	,044	,333	,739
SHARING	-,030	-,244	,808
EMPOWERING	,018	,144	,886
SYSTEM	,087	,589	,557
SUPPORT	,049	,400	,690

Continuously learning which are learner dimensions of organization, dialog and research, team learning, sharing systems, empowered workers, connection between the systems and sharing information of supportive leadership explains 25,9 % part of total variance of sharing info perceptions.

3. Multiple regression analysis between learner dimensions of organization and openness of in-house cognitive canals

$R^2 = 27,1$ ADJUSTED $R^2 = 22,1$ F=6,167 P VALUE =,000			
INDEPENDENT VARIABLES	β PARAMETER	t VALUE	P VALUE
DIALOG	-,127	-1,233	,220
TEAM	,284	2,140	,034
SHARING	,211	1,564	,120
EMPOWERING	-,043	-,342	,733
SYSTEM	,049	,386	,700
SUPPORT	,176	1,165	,246

Dialog and research which are learner dimensions of organization, team learning, sharing systems, empowered workers, connection between the systems and sharing information of supportive leadership explains 22,1 % part of total variance of openness of in-house cognitive canals of perceptions.

5. CONCLUSION

Named as a knowledge era and since 1990 and onwards which are the beginning of the new era it has been observed that many academic studies on knowledge management and knowledge sharing and also it is thought that this interest will become more dense in the following years. At the end of the study, a positive relationship has been found in the correlation analysis and regression analysis between learner organization and sharing information. Knowledge management has been influential both reaching the individual aims and organizational aims and targets by catalyzing. Today, knowledge society has become an economical system with new occupational structures, new production relationships and social structures in which knowledge is produced densely. In the knowledge society, the main motivation factor which leads the individuals and entrepreneurs to produce knowledge is to desire self realization. The race to success, as a success competition, it makes feel not only in local level but also in global level. Knowledge management- in learner organizations- is to provide a common language which will reflect the organization's own identity for reaching the aims of organizations, adopting sharing vision which is desired to be composed, and abolishing the resistance against wanting to apply to administrative approaches. (Karahana and Yilmaz,2010).

REFERENCES

Bennet A. and Bennet D. (2003) The partnership between organizational learning and knowledge management. In Handbook on Knowledge Management (HOSAPPLE CW, Ed), Vol. 1, pp 439–455, Springer, New York.

Ipe M. (2003). 'Knowledge Sharing On Organizations: A Conceptual Framework', Human Resource Development Review. Thousand Oaks: Dec. Vol:2, Iss.4.

Bartol M. K. And Srivastava A. (2002) "Motivation and Barriers to Participation in Virtual Knowledge-Sharing Communities of Practice", Journal of Leadership and Organization Studies, Vol.9, No.1, pp.64-75.

Chow C.W. Deng F. J. Ho J.L. (2000) "The Openness of Knowledge Sharing Within Organizations: A Comparative Study in The United States And The People's Republic Of China", *Journal of Management Accounting Research*; Vol.12, pp.65-95.

Christensen H. P. (2007) "Knowledge Sharing: moving away from the obsession with best practices", *Journal of Management*, Vol.11, No.1. pp.36-47.

Karahan A.and Yılmaz H. (2010) "Learning Organizations and Knowledge Management" *Osmangazi University Institute of Social Sciences Review*, Nisan 2010, 5(1), s.147-174

Lin H.F. (2007) *Knowledge Sharing and Firm Innovation Capability: An Empirical Study*, *International Journal of Manpower*, Vol.28, No:3/4, pp. 315-332.

Majid S. and Wey S. M. (2009) *Perceptions And Knowledge Sharing Practices Of Graduate Students In Singapore*, *International Journal of Knowledge Management*, 5(2),pp. 21-32.

Mc Neish J. and Inder J. S. M. (2010) "Knowledge Sharing and Trust in Organizations", *The 20 IUP Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. VIII, Nos. 1 & 2, pp.18-38.

Sanchez R. (2005) " Knowledge Management and Organizational Learning: Fundamental Concepts for Theory and Practice" *Lund Institute of Economic Research Working Paper Series*

Sharrat M. and Usoro A. (2003), 'Understanding Knowledge-Sharing in Online Communities of Practice', *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol: 1, Issue: 2, Dec., pp. 4-5.

Yaghi B. And Alfawaer S. N. (2011) *Knowledge-sharing degree among the undergraduate students: A case study at applied science private university - Middle East University for graduate studies, Amman (JORDAN)*

Yang J.T. (2007) *The Impact of Knowledge Sharing on Organizational learning and Effectiveness*, *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol.11, No:2, pp.83-90.

Watkins K. And Marsick V. (1997) Dimensions of The Learning Organization
Questionnaire [survey] (Warwick, RI: Partners for the Learning Organization)