

The Need of Knowledge Management in Organizations

Kurumlarda Bilgi Yönetimi Gereksinimi

Mehmet Nesip OGUN*

Abstract

The need for knowledge is as old as human history and the importance of this need is even more increased in the technology age of today. Anyone, regardless of his or her position, is in desire and in need to get the necessary scope-of-interest knowledge in order to keep up with the change and thus to be able to survive. Therefore, in this paper, a general overview of knowledge age and knowledge society is presented and the search points out the importance of knowledge management for organizations and the other related disciplines. After that, the main purpose of this research is laid out, that is, the employee's attitude toward knowledge sharing and the relationship between their positions and knowledge sharing is explained. Finally, results are evaluated and our conclusions are proposed. It can be seen that sharing of knowledge is not sufficiently successful in the institution on which we carried out our survey. In addition, cognitive channels should be kept open, desire and attitudes of organization members for sharing of information should be increased in order to establish an intellectual capital management system in the institution.

Keywords: Knowledge management, Intellectual capital, Knowledge sharing, Intangible assets

Öz

Bilgiye olan ihtiyaç insanlık tarihi kadar eski olup, günümüzün teknoloji çağında bu ihtiyaç daha da artmıştır. Her insan, hangi konumda bulunursa bulunsun kendi ilgi alanına giren konularda bilgi sahibi olmak istemekte ve bu bilgiyi elde etmeye ihtiyaç duymaktadır, aksi takdirde değişime ayak uydurmakta zorluk çekecek, yokılmaktan kurtulamayacaktır. Bu nedenle, bilgi çağı ve bilgi yönetiminin genel değerlendirmesi yapılarak, organizasyonlar için bilgi yönetiminin önemi ve ilgili diğer disiplinler belirtilmektedir. Ardısıra araştırmanın esas amacı olan; çalışanların bilginin paylaşımı ile ilgili tutumları, mesleki statüleriyle bilgi paylaşımı arasındaki ilişki ortaya konulmuştur. Müteakip bölümde ise elde edilen sonuçlar değerlendirilmiş ve gerekli önerilerde bulunulmuştur. Araştırmanın uygulandığı organizasyonda bilgi paylaşımının başarılı bir şekilde uygulanmadığı görülmektedir. Buna ilave olarak bilişsel kanalların açık olması gerektiği, organizasyonda entelektüel sermaye yönetiminin tesis edilebilmesi amacıyla çalışanların bilgi paylaşımına yönelik istek ve tutumlarının artırılması gerekmektedir.

Anahtar sözcükler: Bilgi yönetimi, Entelektüel sermaye, Bilgi paylaşımı, Gayri maddi varlıklar

* Dr., Baskent Üniversitesi, Ankara. (nesip75@yahoo.com, nogun@baskent.edu.tr)

Introduction

Although Knowledge Management is still considered as a new concept, Dalkir (2005, p. 12) argues that Knowledge Management as a phenomenon has existed much longer than its concept. In addition, there is a huge amount of literature about what knowledge means in epistemology, the social sciences, philosophy, and psychology (Polanyi, 1958; Polanyi, 1966). Knowledge Management concept has become a growing interest used in both academic environment and business world starting from 1990's. The most important reason for that it has been understood by quick scientific and technological development that the structures and the organizations designed for the need of industrial revolution have been deficient and the arisen of the influence of information on production (Sağsan, 2004). Knowledge management, which has a meaning of "an elastic combination which forms an environment for the agglomeration and evaluation of the experiences and values in an order, knowledge for the purpose, professional view, new experiences and new knowledge" is an interdisciplinary management model, which is about production, coding, sharing, learning and renewing of knowledge. This model found itself a development area in 1990's by economists' hypothesis, which is "knowledge is production factor" (Barutçugil, 2002). Knowledge Management is a multi-discipline, which originates from other disciplines such as psychology, management science, sociology, strategy, and production engineering (Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1995).

Knowledge as a new production factor is; an important income for the companies beside other production elements (labor, capital, land), an important source as an economical power and an indispensable element for personal development and for the development of companies. Therefore, the world focuses on knowledge-intensive format among labor-intensive, capital-intensive, material-intensive and energy-intensive format (Drucker, 2000, p. 355). The activities about determination, obtaining, evaluation, accessing and sharing of information (databases, documents, politics, procedures, information type) of any enterprise are considered to be in main studying area of knowledge management (Sağsan, 2004) and by this way it is aimed to make knowledge productive. Because, knowledge to be managed can only be determined and evaluated under the light of results of management activities (Barutçugil, 2000, p. 2).

In addition, studies performed in last years have left its place to the approaches, which consider the issue in the aspect of intellectual capital rather than considering it in the aspect of technology. In this approach, it has strikingly been understood that the human brain is the place in which knowledge is produced has a great role (Barca, 2004). Moreover, knowledge is mainly about humans and hence the role of technology can only be of supporting nature (Davenport and Prusak, 1998; McDermott, 1999). The traditional companies in which all the things depend on production and increasing production rate have shift to knowledge economy companies which make most of their investments to develop qualification and specialty (Edvinsson, 1997, p. 366) to increase

knowledge or to supply human capital and therefore trying to make knowledge to be used in product and services. The studies performed in such environments show that the most important capital of an organization is human capital. These developments in managerial and cultural structure make organizations change their management mentalities radically (Barca, 2004). These developments affecting assets and capital structures of organizations also make organizations take knowledge management and intellectual capital management concepts into consideration and make them create new managerial structures.

Knowledge Management, Intellectual Management and Intellectual Capital Management

Knowledge management is the use of capital of an organization in the most effective way. In other words, knowledge management is a new discipline which provides individuals, teams and organizations the opportunity of collective and systematic production, sharing and application of information to achieve the organizational aims (Barutçugil, 2000, p. 5). On the other hand, knowledge management serves as a function of production, sharing and distribution of knowledge in a social environment. However, it reflects a function that has to be activated in all parts of the organization rather than leaving it alone to a specialty of a department as in other functions of an organization (Barca, 2004).

“New” and intangible assets like personnel skills, customer care, models, computers and management systems cannot find place in traditional financial and managerial reports. Another important point is that traditional intangible assets like brands, patents and betterments have not find place in financial and managerial reports unless they meet criterions (Şamiloğlu, 2003, p. 132). Since knowledge has become a power for organizations in today’s competitive environment, today’s organizations try to increase knowledge production in order to compete with other organizations effectively. Therefore, organizations have to pay attention to intangible asset investments (Yörük and Erdem, 2006, p. 60).

Necessity of making investment to intangible assets is closely related to knowledge economy or awaking of requirements of knowledge era. Having an additional value of an organization because of successful activities can be explained by investments made to intangible assets. These transformations pointing out intangible assets are stated by intellectual capital concept (Yörük and Erdem, 2006, p. 60).

Intellectual capital is “total knowledge of employees which makes organization dominance in the market” (Stewart, 1991, p. 44). Intellectual capital can be formed in three main constructs that encompass the phenomenon of intellectual capital including **human capital** (the talent base of the employees), **structural capital** (the non-human storehouses of information) and **relational capital** (the knowledge embedded

in business networks) (Stewart, 1997). Human capital is the total of knowledge, skills and innovative properties of employees in an organization to perform their individual duties. This capital also includes the values, culture and philosophy of the organization (Şamiloğlu, 2002, p. 85). Organizational culture that the employees formed and knowledge that is gained and used by the employees to perform individual duties effectively are the most important elements of intellectual capital components in an organization (Çelik and Perçin, 2000, p. 112).

However, human capital is not an element that the organization can have the ownership. The organizations can not possess the ownership of human capital, they only utilize their knowledge and skills, and in other words they hire the human capital (Edvinsson and Malone, 1997). Therefore, keeping the knowledge gained by human capital depends on whether the employee wants to share his/her knowledge or not. Although human capital is very necessary for organizations, it will be lost when the employee left the organization. Thus, organization should aim to turn operational capital into structural capital, which is one of the elements of intellectual capital. Stewart determines structural capital as "the knowledge not going to home at night" (Stewart, 1997, p. 93). Examples to structural capital are intangible assets like databases, which contains strategically important knowledge, brand and patent rights, copyrights and research and development efforts. As it can be seen these assets are knowledge belong to organization. This knowledge will still be kept within the organization even though the employees left the organization. Therefore, knowledge can only be kept within the organization if and only if knowledge is turned into the property of the organization.

In this sense, intellectual capital management is a continuous and dynamic management process which makes the information (raw material) possessed by the employees become a structural capital and therefore by creating an added value it makes the knowledge turn into venture capital of the organization (Lynn, 2000, pp. 120-121).

The Importance of Knowledge Management for Organizations

Since political, social and economical structure became more complex nowadays, it causes organization require more knowledge. Especially the existence of a rapid change in both technology and management area by the transition period from industrial society to knowledge society makes organizations embrace the policies in which knowledge is a power to achieve success in the market. However, knowledge has no use alone; therefore, a knowledge management is a must to evaluate knowledge effectively and productively.

The reasons why organizations need knowledge management can be listed as: (Barclay and Murray, 1997; Alakuş, 1991, p. 44):

- ◊ Having a more competitive shape in market and competition of organizations on the basis of knowledge,

- ◇ Manufacturing of products and services mostly using an knowledge-intensive way,
- ◇ Lack of time to learn and collect knowledge,
- ◇ Having a loss of knowledge on other areas because of the orientation preferred as a result of some strategies in management of an organization,
- ◇ Necessity of updating the knowledge and information sources in the organization,
- ◇ Arisen of the necessity of controlling of knowledge considering whether it meets the need of organization or not,
- ◇ The necessity of keeping the documents in suitable conditions, supplying easy-access, and transferring of knowledge to user by cheapest way.

The technological developments and globalization process after 1980's created an economical and dynamic structure called as "knowledge economy". While this process has developed a competitive, dynamic, innovative company profile, which uses many financial and managerial techniques together, it has changed the attitudes of administrators and shareholders. Because of new economical structure, that has affected assets and capital structures of companies, intangible assets have become as important as tangible assets. Especially the importance of intellectual capital, which includes knowledge management, information capital, professional intelligence and learning-organization concepts has been increased and depending on this the perspective to value has had a development (Ercan, Öztürk, Küçükkaplan, Başçı and Demirgüneş, 2006, pp. 1-2).

Valuation is the financial expression of the value of assets (Ercan, Öztürk and Demirgüneş, 2003, p. 1) However, since value is a relative concept and it is difficult to determine, company valuation is on of the most complex topics of financial management. The most important point in the determination of value of a company is to determine the real value of that company. Real value is not the value determined by market according to demand and supply, it is the value, which is calculated by considering the elements that creates value (Ercan et al., 2006, p. 2). At this point, the economical developments in globalization era make the organizations find new ways to determine, report, manage, develop and use the secret information as competitive and value added elements. Intellectual capital has become the most important element among those elements. The management of an intellectual capital, which is also called as information that can be turned into value contains the same concept with the knowledge management as the most important competition tool and value adding power (Ertuğrul, 2000, p. 76).

However, it can be seen that intellectual capital has a wider content than knowledge management. Management of intellectual capital covers the determination of relationship between the past and future value of the organization and the assets that can be classified as intellectual capital of that organization and the determination of the activities to develop these assets. Therefore, intellectual capital management has

become a wider concept than knowledge management and knowledge management has become a subsection of intellectual capital management (Saruhan and Sulaoğlu, 2005, p. 5; Öge, 2002, p. 197).

The existence of the efforts to add value in either knowledge management or intellectual capital management is the common point. If the knowledge and skills of an employee in an organization is not been able to turn into structural capital, it creates a loss of value for that organization. When the knowledge that belongs to an individual is shared to create an organizational value it becomes a part of intellectual capital. Therefore, knowledge management and intellectual capital management are interconnected and they integrate each other. While management of knowledge contains the transformation of data and information belongs to the organization into human capital and customer capital, intellectual capital management contains the process of transformation of institutional values resulted from the knowledge management into value in the market (Öge, 2002, p. 197). According to the leading theorists of intellectual capital like Edvinsson, Malone, Sveiby, Stewart, traditional accountancy is insufficient in showing natural dynamics of modern organizations. Nowadays, value can be increased by products and services mostly based on intellectual intelligence. To achieve this, informed human resources is necessary (Şamiloğlu, 2006, p. 79).

Nowadays, success in business depends on the qualification and the skill of organization in using knowledge. A value-based management system exhorts the administrators to maximize the economic value by using values of organization in the most productive way. In recent years knowledge and informed human resources has been determinative in the production of products and services. The continuity of this determinative property of knowledge has made the employees have important positions (Şamiloğlu, 2002, p. 85).

The key for 21st Century organizations in which there is an increasing competition, rapid globalization and technological advances is human and human-focused management mentality to keep their current share, to continue their activities with an acceptable profit and to get the right decisions.

An Application to Determine the Conditions That Prevents Sharing Information

Importance of Research

Knowledge sharing is an activity through which knowledge is exchanged among people in an organization. In this regard, organizations have recognized that knowledge constitutes a valuable intangible asset for creating and sustaining competitive advantages (Miller and Shamsie, 1996). Sharing of knowledge is needed in organizations to conduct knowledge management successfully and thus to transform the institutional values into market value. The knowledge perspective of employees and the situations

that prevent sharing of knowledge affect intellectual capital management directly. Knowledge management has a vital importance in the successful management of an organization. Because, when the need for risk management resulted from uncertainties on decision making process of an organization is taken into account, the importance of knowledge management in intellectual capital management becomes apparent. In our study, the situations that prevent sharing of knowledge which is the first step of our study in the aspect of knowledge management and intellectual capital management, which profession groups avoid sharing of knowledge and the reason for that will be clearly defined and various suggestions will be presented.

The Aim of the Study

In this study, it has been aimed to exhibit the attitudes of employees about sharing of knowledge and the relationship between professional statuses and sharing of knowledge. In this sense, it has been tried to find answers to the questions below:

- ◇ What are the employees' knowledge perspectives?
- ◇ How are the employees' perceptions about sharing of knowledge?
- ◇ How is the openness of institutional cognitive channels in sharing of knowledge?
- ◇ What are the conditions that prevent sharing of knowledge in institutional aspect?

Getting answers to those research questions will help to find out the level of knowledge sharing in the organization. It will also allow us to learn more about knowledge management dynamics in the organization that survey was carried out.

Content and Restrictions of the Study

There is no position preventing sharing of knowledge except exclusive knowledge in the institution in which the study has been performed. However, system operates according to "know what you need" principle. There is no obstacle for employees to access technology. There is adequate number of phone, fax, computer etc. in the institution and there are also computer terminals providing internet connection.

Along with the professional statuses, current positions of individuals have also been asked. It is believed that first-hand data obtained carefully from the study will enlighten the other studies to be performed.

It would be ideal to make comparative study among the different organizations to evaluate the perceptions of employees in terms of knowledge sharing to picture the differences between different sectors. But, in this study one business organization was chosen for the survey.

Hypothesis of the Study

Hypothesis about the Employees' Knowledge Perspective

- ◇ The knowledge that the employees have is a source of power for them.
- ◇ The knowledge that employees have is private and they do not think to share this knowledge.
- ◇ The knowledge that employees have is a value for the institution.
- ◇ The knowledge that the employees gain by means of the institution is the value of the institution.
- ◇ The knowledge that the employees have helped the employees to keep their professional positions.

Hypothesis about the Perceptions of Employees on Sharing Knowledge

- ◇ The employees find techniques that either improve my work or make it easy.
- ◇ The employees share new techniques with their colleagues.
- ◇ The employees share new techniques with their administrators.
- ◇ The employees exchange knowledge with their colleagues.
- ◇ Administrators deal with the ideas, suggestions and innovations of the employees.

Hypothesis about Openness of Institutional Cognitive Channels in Sharing of Knowledge

- ◇ The employees learn lessons from their mistakes.
- ◇ There is no problem for the employees unless they repeat mistakes.
- ◇ The employees share all the knowledge and skills by having teamwork.
- ◇ Administrators are not afraid of disclosing their mistakes.
- ◇ Administrators claim their failures as well as their successes.

Hypothesis about the Situations that Prevent Sharing of Knowledge

- ◇ There is no limitation for the promotion of employees in case they share knowledge.
- ◇ The employees' risk of getting penalized decrease if their mistakes are not known.
- ◇ The employees have concerns if their mistakes are known by others.
- ◇ The employees think that it is embarrassing if somebody knows their mistakes.

- ◇ The employees think that their charisma is affected negatively if they can't hide their mistakes.
- ◇ The employees never share knowledge if they think it is harmful to their pride.
- ◇ There is a habit of hiding mistakes and not learning lessons from the mistakes in the institution.
- ◇ The institution is not normative.
- ◇ The employees know their responsibilities, they do not hide their mistakes and they do not think that this will create a trouble.

Method of the Study

The study was carried out in a business organization that conducts its operation in private sector.

The data of the study have been obtained by questionnaires formed according to the literature. Based on the literature a questionnaire, which is close-ended and it has been developed a five optional Likert scale. In the questionnaire, there is total of 29 questions. Five questions are about the employees' perspectives of knowledge, next 5 are about the employees' perceptions on sharing of knowledge, the other 5 are about openness of institutional cognitive channels in sharing of knowledge and last 9 questions are about the situations that prevent sharing of knowledge.

All of the employees are taken into account. The list showing all the employees have been obtained from the organization. The employees on which Simple Random Sampling method to be applied have been chosen. The questionnaire has been prepared very carefully so that answerers can clearly understand the whole questions. It is aimed to measure perceptions of answerers on sharing knowledge rather than measuring their knowledge levels. Therefore, necessary corrections have been made on questionnaire after making a pilot scale application with 10 people. The questionnaire has been applied to 130 people and all the questionnaires have been taken back.

The data obtained have been analyzed by SPSS 11.0 computer programme. In analyses, descriptive, One-Way Variance Analysis (ANOVA) and Tukey-HSD test methods have been applied.

Variance analyses have been used for the comparison of the data belongs to more than one group. In other words, it has been aimed to compare the data obtained from different conditions and to determine whether there is a difference or not (Hovardaoğlu, 1994, p. 66).

Variance analysis is the analysis of performance by means of variances (Köksal, 1985, p. 321). In this research, we it has been aimed to research among various profession groups one-way variance analysis has been applied in this research to find of differences among professional groups

"Honestly Significantly Different" test developed by Tukey is used to test all pair-wise comparisons among means (Hovardaoğlu, 1994, p. 66). Tukey-HSD test has been applied in this study to find source of differences among professional groups.

In order to determine the reliability of the result of the questionnaire, Cronbach Alpha test has been used. The minimum allowable value for this test is 0.60. At this study Cronbach Alpha has been found as $\alpha=0.7539$.

Findings and Evaluation

Findings of the Application

Evaluation of the Questions about the Employees' Knowledge Perspective

- ◇ As a result of our survey answers given to the question about perception of knowledge level as a source of power are: 3.1% totally disagree, 1,5% disagree, 3,8% undecided, 28,5% agree and 63,1% totally agree. Mean of the answers to this question is 4,669. As a result of the survey, our hypothesis "the knowledge that the employees have is a source of power for them" is confirmed by 91,6%.
- ◇ The answers to the question "the knowledge that the employees have is private" are: 43,8% totally disagree, 45,4% disagree, 5,4% undecided, 3,1% agree and 2,3 % totally agree. Mean of answers to this question is 1,7462. Our hypothesis is not confirmed by 89,2%.
- ◇ The answers to the question "the knowledge I have is an important value for the institution" are: 0,8% totally disagree, 4,6% disagree, 8,5% undecided, 40,8% agree and 45,4% totally agree. Mean of answers to this questions is 4,2538. Our hypothesis is confirmed by 86,2%.
- ◇ The answers to the question "the knowledge that is gained by the institution is the value of the institution" are: 5,4% totally disagree, 11,5% disagree, 18,5% undecided, 30,8% agree and 33,8% totally agree. Mean of the answers to this question is 3,7615. Our hypothesis is confirmed by 64,6%.
- ◇ The answers to the question "the knowledge that the employees have helped the employees to keep their professional positions" is: 3,8% totally disagree, 16,2% disagree, 11,5% undecided, 35,4% agree and 33,1% totally agrees. Mean of answers to this question is 3,7769. Our hypothesis is confirmed by 68,5%.

The Evaluation of Questions about the Employees' Perception of Sharing Knowledge

- ◇ The answers to question "I find techniques that either improve my work or make it easy" are: 0% totally disagree, 3,1% disagree, 3,1% undecided, 44,6% agree and 49,2% totally agree. Mean of the answers to this question is 4,4. Our hypothesis is confirmed by 93,8%.

- ◇ The answers to the question "I share new techniques with my colleagues" are: 0,8% totally disagree, 3,8% disagree, 1,5% undecided, 45,4% agree and 48,5% totally agree. Mean of the answers is 4,3692. Our hypothesis is confirmed by 93,9%.
- ◇ The answers to the question "I share new techniques with my administrators" are: 0% totally disagree, 6,2% disagree, 11,5% undecided, 42,3% agree and 40% totally agree. Mean of the answers is 4,1615. As a result of the survey our hypothesis is confirmed by 82,3%.
- ◇ The answers to the question "I exchange knowledge with my colleagues" are: 0,8% totally disagree, 0% disagree, 2,3% undecided, 36,2% agree and 60,8% totally agree. Mean of the answers is 4,5615. Our hypothesis is confirmed by 97%.
- ◇ The answers to the question "administrators' deal with the ideas, suggestions and innovations of the employees" are: 5,4% totally disagree, 13,1% disagree, 23,1% undecided, 32,3% agree and 26,2% totally agree. Mean of the answers is 3,607. Our hypothesis confirmed by 58,5%.

The Evaluation of Questions about Openness of Institutional Cognitive Channels in Sharing of Knowledge

- ◇ The answers to the question "we take lessons from our mistakes" are: 0,8% totally disagree, 6,9% disagree, 12,3% undecided, 27,7% agree and 52,3% totally agree. Mean of the answers to this question is 4,2385. Our hypothesis is confirmed by 80%.
- ◇ The answers to the question "There is no trouble for us unless we repeat my mistakes" are: 3,1% totally disagree, 3,1% disagree, 6,2% undecided, 53,8% agree and 33,8% totally agree. Mean of the answers 4,1231. Our hypothesis is confirmed 87,6%.
- ◇ The answers to the question "we share all the knowledge and skills by having teamwork" are: 2,3% totally disagree, 11,5% disagree, 9,2% undecided, 36,2% agree and 40,8% totally agree. Mean of the answers is 4,0154. Our hypothesis is confirmed by 77%.
- ◇ The answers to the question "administrators are not afraid of disclosing their mistakes" are: 14,6% totally disagree, 23,8% disagree, 16,9% undecided, 31,5% agree and 13,1% totally agrees. Mean of the answers are 3,0462. Our hypothesis is not confirmed by 44,6%.
- ◇ The answers to the question "administrators claim their failures as well as their successes" are: 13,1% totally disagrees, 27,7% disagree, 27,7% undecided, 23,1% agrees and 8,5% totally agree. Mean of the answers is 2,8615. Our hypothesis is not confirmed by 31,6%.

Evaluation of Questions about the Conditions that Prevents Sharing of Knowledge

- ◇ The answers to the question "I can't get promotion if I share knowledge" are: 26,2% totally disagree, 33,8% disagree, 16,9% undecided, 14,6% agree and 8,5% totally agree. Mean of the answers is 2,4538. As a result of our survey our hypothesis is confirmed by 60%.
- ◇ The answers to the question "My risk of getting penalized decreases if my mistakes are not known" is: 12,3% totally disagree, 32,3% disagree, 19,2% undecided, 22,3% agree and 13,8% totally agree. Mean of the answers is 2,9308. Our hypothesis "The employees' risk of getting penalized decreases if their mistakes are not known" is confirmed by 59% according to the survey results.
- ◇ The answers of the question "I have concerns if my mistakes are known by the others" are: 10,0% totally disagree, 35,4% disagree, 12,3% undecided, 28,5% agree and 13,8% totally agree. Mean of the answers given to this question is 3,0077. Our hypothesis "The employees have concerns if their mistakes are known by others" is confirmed by 60%.
- ◇ The answers to the question "I think that it is embarrassing if somebody knows my mistakes" are: 19,2% totally disagree, 29,2% disagree, 18,5% undecided, 17,7% agree and 15,4% totally agree. Mean of the answers given to this question is 2,8077. Our hypothesis "The employees think that it is embarrassing if somebody knows their mistakes" is confirmed by 56%.
- ◇ The answers to the questions "My charisma is affected negatively if I can't hide my mistakes" are: 22,3% totally disagree, 35,4% disagree, 16,9% undecided, 17,7% agree, 7,7% totally agree. Mean of the answers to this question is 2,5308. Our hypothesis "the employees think that their charisma is affected negatively if they can't hide their mistakes" is confirmed 51%.
- ◇ The answers to the question "I never share knowledge if I think it is harmful to my pride" are: 7,7% totally disagree, 15,4% disagree, 17,7% undecided, 30,0% agree and 29,2% totally agree. Mean of the answers to the question is 3,5769. Our hypothesis "The employees never share information if they think it is harmful to their pride" is confirmed by 59,2%.
- ◇ The answers to the question "Lessons are not learned from the mistakes, and mistakes are hidden in the institution" are: 20,0% totally disagree, 22,3% disagree, 19,2% undecided, 28,5% agree and 10% totally agree. Mean of the answers is 2,8615. Our hypothesis "There is a habit of hiding mistakes and not learning lessons from the mistakes in the institution" is not confirmed by 42,3%.
- ◇ The answers to the question "The institution is normative" are: 13,8% totally disagree, 19,2% disagree, 20,8% undecided, 28,5% agree and 17,7% totally agree. Mean of the answers to the question is 3,1692. Our thesis "The institution is not normative" is not confirmed by 46,2%.

- ◇ The answers to the question "The employees don't want to take responsibilities in the institution, hide their mistakes and don't want trouble" are: 13,1% totally disagree, 17,7% disagree, 19,2% undecided, 32,3% agree and 17,7% totally agree. Mean of the answers given to the question is 3,2385. Our thesis "The employees know their responsibilities, they don't hide their mistakes and they don't think that this will create a trouble" is not confirmed by 30,8%.

The Evaluation of the Application and Suggestions

Transformation of personal knowledge and skills into institutional knowledge is necessary in organizations. Otherwise, personal knowledge does not become a part of intellectual capital. Since sharing of knowledge is the first stage of intellectual capital management, after determining the level of sharing of knowledge it has to be taught all the employees that knowledge must be shared although it is individually private. It can be seen that the administrators have the tendency of hiding knowledge. Supporting mechanisms should be developed determining that although sharing of knowledge by administrators is more important why they share knowledge less. As an example to these mechanisms, coordination meetings and after-shift activities can be given. Functionality of these mechanisms is very important for the determination of the institutional values after intellectual capital management process.

As a result of our survey, it has been found out that the administrators do not sufficiently deal with the employees' ideas, suggestions and innovations. However, management of knowledge, the institutional data and information, transformation of information into human capital and customer capital and thus increasing the market value of an organization by intellectual capital management can only be possible if the employees' ideas, suggestions and innovations are taken into account. Otherwise, knowledge management and intellectual capital management are applied improperly.

77% of the employees have the tendency of sharing knowledge by having teamwork. This percentage can be considered as low. Because, in order to determine the institutional value properly the employees have to register all the information via sharing systems. Supplying a healthy management and an informatics system has a vital importance in 100% sharing.

In the institution in which we carried out the survey, it can be seen that 55,4% of the administrators have concerns if their mistakes are known and 31,6% of them claim their failures. Experiences and rights can be achieved if the failures or mistakes are exposed. If administrative mistakes are declared in a management system, the precautions not to repeat the mistakes can easily be taken. Thus, self-control of the organization for sharing of knowledge is provided.

About the perception that knowledge is a source of power; it has been concluded that the employees without knowledge and not using knowledge in the direction of organizational aims are not considered as successful while the employees who unders-

tood the importance of knowledge and information get more important role in the institution and thus it is needed to give an education to the employees not thinking that knowledge is a source of power to change their wrong perceptions about the issue.

It is concluded about prevention of fear of being penalized and doing mistakes that it has a vital importance for organizations to educate the employees about the management and informatics methods, which provide making right decisions in the most difficult situations and removing the employees' concerns about getting penalized and doing mistakes. In addition, the inferences below have been determined as a result of the survey.

While 44,6% of the employees have concerns about their mistakes to be known, 38,4% of the administrators have not concerns about their mistakes. This shows that the administrators have concerns about their mistakes as well as the employees. This means that the employees and the administrators are not fully trust each other. Some precautions should be taken to prevent institutional culture to be affected negatively thus an educational program must be applied by top-level administrators of the institution to remove these concerns.

31,6% of the employees think that the administrators expose their failures as well as their successes while 40,8% of the administrators think that they don't expose their failures as well as their successes. All the employees should be informed about all phases of a project, unsuccessful projects should be declared as well as successful projects and the administrators should be able to explain the failures not resulted from their personal mistakes. In addition, the administrators should declare the failures resulted from their personal mistakes to the employees in a cause-effect relationship.

While 42,3% to take lessons from faults, 38,5% of the employees thinking that contrary side and these failures hidden from others. This result can be evaluated parallel with above paragraph. Human existing everywhere, failures will being inevitable. Important thing will be direct to workings that aim at doing continuous improvements and access to perfect reach with total quality philosophy. In other words, after from failure, organizations should be learned where came from these failures and then give lessons with headline "made failures and take lessons from these" to employees with certain periods. Thus, organization can be prevented once more these.

While 33% of the employees think that the institution is normative, 46,2% of the administrators do not agree with this idea. In order to achieve a success in organizations, they must have a mission parallel to their existence reasons and according to the mission organizations must have a set of rules and these rules must be accepted and applied by the employees of organizations. However, except the written rules, organizations should be reminded that there are other rules related to social structure of the society and business sector. Another important issue is that the rules above should be

explained to the employees properly. The result of the survey shows that these rules are not understood properly by the employees. In order to prevent this understanding and to show them that these rules have vital importance, current rules must be explained to all of the employees starting from the top to the bottom.

While 30,8% of the employees do not agree with the hypothesis "nobody wants to take responsibilities, hides the mistakes, does not want trouble in the institution", 50% of the employees agree with the hypothesis. All responsibilities of the employees from top to bottom must be clearly determined in the preparation of organization charts. It is not true to mention about success in an organization without responsibilities. Therefore, clear determination of responsibilities as well as the determination of authority, and well-determined work definitions in an organization provides successful results in the direction of aims of that organization.

Conclusion

Sharing of knowledge, knowledge management and intellectual capital management form rings of a chain in a healthy accountancy and human resources management system. Knowledge management and intellectual capital management are interconnected concepts. For the determination of real value of an organization in the market, operation mechanism of these three systems should be coherent to each other. Sharing of knowledge forms the main phase of intellectual capital management. Therefore, a problem occurring in the process of sharing of knowledge in organizations negatively affects a healthy accountancy and management system.

It can be seen that sharing of knowledge is not sufficiently successful in the organization on which we carried out our survey. Related to uncertainties resulted from various sources in organizational decisions, in the management of depending results and vital importance of knowledge management and intellectual capital management in competitive and increasingly globalize environment; the hypothesis about employees' knowledge perspectives, their perceptions about sharing of knowledge, their openness to cognitive institutional channels, the situations that prevent sharing of knowledge have been presented and the effects of these hypothesis on knowledge management and intellectual capital management have been analyzed. As a result of the analysis performed for the examination of sharing of knowledge and the employees' attitudes about sharing of knowledge, it is concluded that cognitive channels should be kept open, desire and attitudes of organization members for sharing of knowledge should be increased in order to establish an intellectual capital management system in the institution.

Even though realization of knowledge sharing is not easy in the most of the organizations, managers should encourage their personnel for sharing knowledge and collaboration. Because, it is obvious that effective knowledge sharing is going to bring positive innovative to the organization.

References

- Alakuş, M. (1991). *Bilgi toplumu*. Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları.
- Barca, M. (2004). Yeni ekonomide bilgi yönetiminin stratejik önemi. *Active Bankacılık ve Finans Dergisi*. Retrieved January 20, 2005 from http://www.bilgiyonetimi.org/cm/pages/mkl_gos.php?nt=145
- Barclay, R. O. and Philip C. M. (1997). *What is knowledge?* Retrieved May 2, 2004 from <http://www.media-access.com/whatis.htm>
- Barutçugil, İ. (2000). *Bilgi yönetimi*. Active Bankacılık ve Finans Dergisi, April-May(12). Retrieved June 3, 2006 from http://www.makalem.com/Search/ArticleDetails.asp?nARTICLE_id=367
- Barutçugil, İ. (2002). *Bilgi yönetimi*. İstanbul: Kariyer Yayıncılık. .
- Çelik, A. E. and Perçin, S. (2000). Entelektüel sermayenin işletme bazında ölçülmesi ve değerlendirilmesi. *Muhasebe ve Denetime Bakış Dergisi*, 1(2), 111-118.
- Dalkir, K. (2005). *Knowledge management in theory and practice*. Burlington: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Davenport, T. and Prusak, L. (1998). *Working knowledge: How organizations manage what they know*. Boston, Massachusetts: Harvard Business School Press.
- Drucker, P. (2000). *Gelecek için yönetim*. (F. Üçgan, Çev.). Ankara: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Edvinsson, L. (1997). Developing intellectual capital at Skandia. *Long Range Planning*, 30(3), 366-373.
- Edvinsson, L. and Malone, M. S. (1997). *Intellectual capital: Realizing your company's true value by finding its hidden brainpower*. New York: Harper Business..
- Ercan, M. K., Öztürk, M.B. and Demirgüneş, K. (2003). *Değere dayalı yönetim ve entelektüel sermaye*. Ankara: Gazi Kitabevi.
- Ercan, M. K., Öztürk, B., Küçükkaplan, İ, Başçı, E. S. and Demirgüneş, K. (2006). *Firma değerlemesi: Banka uygulaması*. İstanbul: Literatür Yayıncılık.
- Ertuğrul, M. (2000). Bilgi çağında işletmelerin yeni kaynağı: Entelektüel sermaye. *Active Bankacılık ve Finans Dergisi*, 15. Retrieved June 7, 2006 from http://www.bilgiyonetimi.org/cm/pages/mkl_gos.php?nt=182
- Hovardaoğlu, S. (1994). *Davranış bilimleri için istatistik*. Ankara: Hatiboğlu Yayınları.
- Iynn, B. (2000). Entelektüel sermaye gelecek bin yılın katma değer başarısında anahtar. *Muhasebe ve Denetime Bakış Dergisi*, 1(2), 119-126.
- Köksal, B. (1985). *İstatistik analiz metotları*. İstanbul: Çağlayan Kitabevi.
- Miller, D. and Shamsie, J. (1996). The resource-based view of the firm in two environments: The Hollywood film studios from 1936 to 1965. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 39(3), 519-543.
- McDermott, R. (1999). Why information technology inspired but cannot deliver knowledge management. *California Management Review*, 41(4), 103-117.

- Öge, S. (2002). Entelektüel sermaye, işletme için yeni bir değer. *Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 16(5-6), 175-200.
- Nonaka, I. and Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sağsan, M. (2004). Bilgi yönetiminin kavramsal çerçevesi ve Başkent Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Bilgi ve Belge Yönetimi Bölümü. *Active Bankacılık ve Finans Dergisi*. Retrieved January 22, 2005 from http://www.bilgiyonetimi.org/cm/pages/mkl_gos.php?nt=442
- Polanyi, M. (1958). *Personal knowledge*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Polanyi, M. (1966). *The tacit dimension*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Saruhan Ş. C. and Sulaoğlu, T. (2005). *Entelektüel sermaye: Teori ve uygulamadan bir örnek: Arçelik*. Retrieved February 5, 2005 from <http://www.isletme.istanbul.edu.tr/duyurular/kongrebook/58/kongre.htm>
- Stewart, T. A. (1991). Barinpower: How intellectual capital is becoming America's most valuable asset. *Fortune*, 123(11), 44-60.
- Stewart, T. A. (1997). *Entelektüel sermaye*. (N. Elhuseyni, Çev.). İstanbul: Mess Yayınları.
- Şamiloğlu, F. (2002). *Entelektüel sermaye*. Ankara: Gazi Kitabevi.
- Şamiloğlu, F. (2003). Entelektüel sermayenin muhasebe ve finansman alanlarında yarattığı yeniden yapılanma ihtiyacı. *MUFAD Muhasebe ve Finansman Dergisi*, 19, 128-134.
- Şamiloğlu, F. (2006). Entelektüel sermaye: İMKB'de hisse senetleri işlem gören bankalar üzerine bir uygulama. *MUFAD Muhasebe ve Finansman Dergisi*, 31, 78-89.
- Yörük, N. and Erdem, M. S. (2006). Farklı entelektüel sermaye ölçme yöntemlerinin stratejik karar alma sürecine etkileri. *Marmara Üniversitesi Muhasebe-Finansman Araştırma ve Uygulama Dergisi*, 6(15),59-71.