

# ***THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT***

## **Knowledge Sharing Practice and Its Effectiveness: A Case of Ambo University**

**Abdissa Desalegn Gudeta**

Lecturer, Public Service College of Oromia, Ethiopia

### **Abstract:**

*This paper has provided a framework for characterizing the various tools methods, practices and technologies available to knowledge sharing practitioners. It provided a high-level overview of a number of key terms and concepts, describes the framework, provided examples of how to use it, and explores a variety of potential application areas. The business of universities is all about knowledge. This means almost all universities are responsible for creating and sharing knowledge for the benefit of the overall organization. The basic focus of this research paper is to examine to what extent these different knowledge sharing are well managed that, they contribute for the sustainable development of the concerned nation. To exhaust the research; the investigator were use a mixed research design approach where both qualitative and quantitative techniques were be used. Questioners and face-to-face interview were used to collect quantitative and qualitative data respectively. To rigorously analyze the collected data, the researcher was adopting percentage, Average and frequency. The major findings addressed the problem the existing knowledge was not being effectively disseminated throughout the organization, resulting in low awareness and organizational culture as a result of failure to exploit available knowledge. The study is limited to Ambo university. Based on the findings of the study, the researcher drawn some recommendations to the management of the Ambo university considered in this study.*

**Keywords:** Tacit knowledge, knowledge sharing, exprience sharing, knowledge Management

## **1. Introduction**

### *1.1. Background of the Study*

Knowledge sharing /management/ is increasingly recognized as a critical steps of organizational resource and in recent years, many organizations have engaged in the development and implementation of knowledge management systems (KMS) (Alvin and Leidner,2001).One major trend with the development is globalization. The world is fast becoming one interdependent global market place. With regard to this, the main contributor will be the knowledge and skills of the workforce, which will be the key competitive weapon for the 21<sup>st</sup>century. In today's changing world, knowledge becomes the major factor in creating competitive business advantage. According to Sang et al. (2002), the field of knowledge management has in the organizations since1990s.

Knowledge sharing is not well defined in the literature partially because the research areas have not been very active. Knowledge sharing has been defined as providing one's knowledge to others as well as receiving knowledge from others (Dixon, 2002b, Davenport, 2000, Birch am- Connolly, 2005). A more pragmatic description of knowledge sharing is "the process through which one unit is affected by the experience of another" (Argot, 2003). We adopt the following definition of (Willem, 2002), #Knowledge sharing process is defined as exchange of knowledge between at least two parties in a reciprocal process allowing reshaping and sense-making of the knowledge in the new context ;. Today, many organizations are concerned about how organizational members share their knowledge and accordingly have set up some incentives to motivate them to make their knowledge available to the organization or to retrieve knowledge stored in the corporate repositories when needed (Gupta, 2004).

Knowledge sharing can be compared to organizational citizenship behavior or pro-social organizational behavior. These are positive social acts carried out to produce and maintain the well-being and integrity of others (Connelly, & Kelowna, 2003). Pro-social behaviors include acts such as helping, sharing, donating, cooperating and volunteering. Knowledge sharing is not necessarily synonymous with pro-social behavior. Indeed, knowledge sharing may involve significant effort or sacrifice. Yet, one of the critical success factors for knowledge creation, transfer and sharing was that employees willingly contribute their knowledge or expertise to the company (Etienne, Dyer, Hoopoes, & Harris, 2004).

→ #generally, no knowledge sharing means the concerned organization will automatically decline even to death;

Knowledge sharing is part of everyday organizational life; it recognizes the personal nature of people's knowledge gained from experience (Awed and Ghazi, 2004). Implementing knowledge sharing in the work environment is limited by many factors such as culture, polices, strategies, technologies and even the personality of workers; which can be considered the most important factor.

Knowledge sharing in African and other Ethiopia countries is not much developed culture to share their knowledge and ideas between individuals, groups and teamwork in the work areas and other related generation too. It is a problem to understand the level of developments in Ethiopian universities in knowledge sharing. Recently in Ethiopia, there are an increased understanding and recognition at national level on the importance of knowledge sharing practice in educated workforce to economic growth and national development, and that greater access to higher education is a pre-requisite in knowledge sharing practice within organizations and universities. To this end, major and rapid initiatives are being taken to expand higher learning institutions in the country for contribution of knowledge sharing roles.

*However, no one still knows what the knowledge sharing practice of the university looks like. No assessment is conducted in this area. This is why the researcher takes the initiative to conduct research to examine what the knowledge sharing practice in Ambo University looks like. Generally, the total profile of workers in the university is 18 (eighteen) management bodies (presidents, vice-presidents and Directors), 279 (two hundred seventy nine) practitioners /Administrator/ and 145 (one hundred forty five) instructors /Academicians/.*

### *1.2. Statement of the Problem*

Effective knowledge sharing in higher education is the problem within different situations and there are varieties of reasons for knowledge sharing implementation problems. Ultra (2005) found that the emphasis was on cultural, organizational and human aspects as potential levers or inhibitors of knowledge sharing. Further, authority also noted that several academics commented on the relatively slight consideration of cultural and people issues in the knowledge management literature. A key reason for lack of knowledge sharing practice viability was the unwillingness of employees to share their knowledge effectively with their peers.

Many knowledge management scholars advice that for effective knowledge sharing to exist, there should be active organizational routines, effective reward system, effective employee assignment policy, participatory leadership styles, latest information technology infrastructures, mechanisms of converting tacit knowledge in to explicit knowledge and/or explicit knowledge in to tacit knowledge, and less career Plateauing (Bergeron, B., 2003; Brown & Duguid, 1991; Morrison & Brantner, 1992, and Greer , R. C. 2001)

Ambo University is not seen strategically working to minimize factors that decelerate its overall knowledge sharing trends. Although the university has produced a five-year strategic plan, Knowledge is not managed in a planned manner. This lack of plan leads the university to create and share knowledge randomly. Not only lack of knowledge sharing plan, there is also employee misplacements in some teams. The researcher also practically observed that employees hold some position /job/ and leave position/job/ most of the time without any feasible reason and assigned on different position without related of their professionals. For instance, the fifteen library workers, no one have specialization of diploma or degree in library science or related fields. The majority of them study in Human Resource Management, Accounting and Agricultural (University human resource profile and assignment report).

I have had also a chance to hold discussion regarding the knowledge sharing trend of the university with different instructors, management bodies and practitioners for many times because of my work relationship with them. They are frequently heard complaining the information exchange mechanism of the university. From these different exposures, I again come to understand that workers are not in a position to get relevant information at the right time because of lack of active organizational routines, reward system, assignment policies, and adequate information technology infrastructures (Quarter report).

Generally, I have a personal presumption that much knowledge in university remains buried in the mind of the knowledge workers, because of the above problems. After understanding these, all challenges that the university has faced and is facing in its knowledge sharing practice, I decided to investigate and then describe to what extent the university is effective in its knowledge sharing practice.

### *1.3. Literture Review*

#### 1.3.1. Overview of Knowledge and Knowledge Sharing

Knowledge sharing has been identified as a major focus area for knowledge management. The importance of this topic lays in the fact that it aims to link the individual level, where knowledge resides, and the organizational level, where knowledge is applied and attains value. In the dynamically changing world of business, the competitiveness of companies depends heavily on the possibility to find, for a given problem, the right knowledge in the right moment. Knowledge is #Information resident in people's minds, which is used for making decisions in unknown contexts. While knowledge must be in the mind of a knowledge worker (or automated process) to be productive, dormant or transient knowledge can be stored for subsequent retrieval and application by the knowledge worker Maier, (2007)

There are many definitions of knowledge, the one used in this research is that, Knowledge comprises all cognitive expectancies & observations that have been meaningfully organized, accumulated and embedded in a context through experience, communication, or inference that an individual or organizational actor uses to interpret situations and to generate activities behavior and solutions no matter whether these expectancies are rational or used intentionally (Maier, 2007). Experts have defined Knowledge sharing as the storing, sharing and utilization of knowledge information in an organization for specific business advantages. According to Monica, (1998), Knowledge sharing is experiences, information that can be communicated or shared.

According to the argument of (Bergeron, 2003), the history of knowledge creation and knowledge, sharing goes many years back to the civilization of Babylonians, Egyptians, and Romans. In Mesopotamia, about 5,000 year ago, people began to lose track of the thousands of baked-clay tablets that are used to record legal contracts, tax assessment documents, sales documents, and legal records. The solution they forwarded was to start the first institution dedicated to storing and sharing these records, the library (Bergeron, 2003). Gradually, through the advent of different large and small scale industries especially in 19<sup>th</sup> century, the concept of apprentice,

apparent ship, training centers and universities comes to existence to make the concept of knowledge and knowledge sharing more formal (Bergeron, 2003).

### 1.3.2. The Concept of Knowledge

Davenport (1997) argues that knowledge is neither data nor information. Academics have debated the meaning of “knowledge” since the word was invented, but let us not get into that here. Alvin and Lieder (1999) define knowledge management (KM) as “a systemic and organizationally specified process for acquiring, organizing, and communicating both tacit and explicit knowledge of employees so that other employees may make use of it to be more effective and productive in their work;”. O’Dell et al., (1998) define KM as “a conscious strategy of getting the right knowledge to the right people at the right time and helping people share and put information into action in ways that strive to improve organizational performance.” Beckman (1999) define KM as “the formalization of and access to experience, knowledge and expertise that create new capabilities, enable superior performance, encourage innovation and enhance customer value.

According to Davenport (1997), “data are simple, absolute facts and raw material that, in and of themselves, represent observations, or facts out of context, and therefore, not directly meaningful and may be of little use”. Information is data that have been linked with other data and converted into useful context for specific use. Knowledge goes a step further; it is that which is believed, and value based on the meaningful organized information from the human mind through experience and communication with guidance for action and is a much more implicit entity.

Following this logic, knowledge is embodied in a general framework based on the integrated learning and thinking of the information derived from data from multiple sources, to be the knowledge as an integrated and interlinked series of stages, ending with wisdom, as Therefore, knowledge is on the basis of a real function to the process of obtaining the information, sharing it, interpreting and transferring it into stable scientific facts that are intellectually used by the individual, team or organization. Ballinger et al. (2004) modified a hierarchy of knowledge as here under.



Figure 1: Hierarchy of knowledge  
Source: Ballinger et al. (2004)

### 1.3.3. What Is Knowledge Sharing?

Knowledge sharing is not an easy concept to define. It is often used to mean the same thing as knowledge transfer and knowledge management. Knowledge sharing is a broader concept than simple transfer of knowledge, emphasizing the process of or social interaction for knowledge exchange (Gupta & Govindarajan, 2000). However, it is a narrower concept than knowledge management, which includes knowledge creation, transfer, and sharing. Many scholars have tried to define knowledge sharing in the college and universities.

Knowledge sharing indicates that there is no all-round definition of knowledge sharing. Many researchers have defined knowledge sharing from their own point of view. Some researchers even considered knowledge sharing; knowledge flows and knowledge transfer as exchangeable terms and defined them as such. For instance, Alvin and Lieder (2001) liken knowledge sharing to knowledge transfer and define it as the process of disseminating knowledge throughout the organization. The dissemination can happen between individuals, groups or organizations using any type or number of communication channels. Similarly, Gupta and Govindarajan (2000), equating knowledge sharing to knowledge flows theorize that knowledge flows comprise of five elements: value of the source knowledge, willingness of the source to share knowledge, media richness of the communication channel, willingness of the recipient to acquire knowledge and the absorptive capacity of the recipient.

Davenport and Prussic (1998) define knowledge sharing as process that involves exchanging knowledge between individuals and groups. Connelly and Kelowna (2003) define knowledge sharing as “A set of behaviors that involve the exchange of information or assistance to other. It is separate from information sharing, which typically involves management making information on the organization available to employees. Whereas knowledge sharing contains an element of reciprocity, information sharing can be unidirectional and unrequested”. Knowledge sharing activities are generally supported by knowledge management systems. However, human resource constitutes only one of the many factors that affect the sharing of knowledge in organizations, such as organizational culture, trust, and incentives. The sharing of knowledge constitutes a major challenge in the field of knowledge management because some employees tend to resist sharing their knowledge with the rest of the organization.

One prominent obstacle is the notion that knowledge is property and ownership thus very important. In order to counteract this, individuals must be reassured that they will receive some type of incentive for what they create. However, the risk in knowledge sharing is that individuals are most commonly rewarded for what they know, not what they share. If knowledge is not shared, negative consequences such as isolation and resistance to ideas occur. Shared knowledge offers different viewpoints and possible solutions to problems. To promote knowledge sharing and remove knowledge sharing obstacles, the organizational culture should encourage discovery and innovation. This will result in the creation of organizational culture.

#### 1.3.4. Why Knowledge Sharing?

The ultimate goal of Knowledge Sharing is to distribute the right content to right people at right time. The system therefore must enable us quickly and effectively to find relevant information & expertise and that can aid into decision-making & problem solving. Hence, the tacit knowledge resides in the minds of individuals, in their skills, experiences, value judgments.

Gurteen (1999) found four importance values of knowledge sharing that Knowledge is an intangible product, which includes ideas; processes and information. These intangible products are taking a growing share of global trade from the traditional, tangible goods of manufacturing economy. Knowledge sharing is important for creating a new knowledge in order to achieve competitive advantage. Knowledge sharing is important because of the increasing turnover of staff. People do not keep the same job for life any more. When someone leaves an organization their knowledge walks out of the door with them. Therefore, sharing has the power to carry on the knowledge. Many organizations have problem of “we don’t know what we know”. Expertise learnt and applied in one part of the organization is not leveraged in another.

Individuals are often the most difficult source to document because they feel that sharing what they know will make them expandable or that their knowledge on any given subject is what makes them unique. Another biggest challenge for Knowledge Sharing is each time employees leave their job; they carry what they know with them. If they share tacit knowledge among employees, it ensures that pertinent employees’ knowledge stay around long after the employees leave the company.

#### 1.3.5. Classification of Knowledge

This section deals with different types of knowledge. Different knowledge theorists argue that different types of knowledge exists. Some other common methods of defining knowledge is to categorize knowledge into different forms. For instance, Monika (1994), following the work of Polanyi (1966), categorizes knowledge into two forms: explicit and tacit. Explicit knowledge, according to the researcher, it is a knowledge that can be formalized, documented, archived, codified, and can easily be communicated or transferred between individuals. This includes theoretical approaches, manuals, databases, plans, business documents, guidelines, process models etc. Explicit knowledge represents knowledge that the individual holds consciously in mental focus, in a form that can easily be communicated to others (Karl, 2004). Explicit knowledge is resides in the human mind, behavior, and perception.

Tacit knowledge, in contrast, is deeply rooted in individual’s actions, experiences, ideals, values and is far more difficult to write down or formalize. Tacit knowledge represents internalized knowledge that an individual may not be consciously aware of. Polanyi (1966) summarizes the fundamental nature of tacit knowledge in the phrase “We know more than we can tell”. He exemplifies tacit knowledge by providing everyday example such as the ability to recognize the face of an acquaintance. Tacit knowledge is documented and public; structured, fixed-content, externalized, and conscious. It can be captured and shared.

Organizations play an important role in activating the explicit and tacit dimensions of knowledge and in providing a forum for the knowledge spiral through four modes of knowledge creation: socialization, externalization, combination and internalization. Socialization refers to the exchange of tacit knowledge among members through the social interactions and shared experiences. Externalization refers to the translation of tacit knowledge into explicit knowledge through models, concepts, metaphors, analogies, stories etc. Combination refers to the generation of new explicit knowledge by combining and bundling together different bodies of explicit knowledge and internalization refers to the creation of new tacit knowledge from explicit knowledge. All of these conversion modes are highly interdependent and tangled.

#### 1.3.6. Knowledge Management Process

The concept of knowledge management is raised here because it has a strong impact on the practice of knowledge sharing. Many scholars argue that knowledge management involves many step-by-step activities. Among these, those proposed by Bergeron. (2003) is considered as creation, modification, use, Archiving, transfer, Translation, User access and Disposal. According to him, the stages of knowledge management process of the first phase of Knowledge creation life cycle, information is authored internally by knowledge workers, acquired through outsourcing, or purchased from an outside source. This phase starts with a requirement specification that provides the author or acquiring agent with a description of the information needed (Bergeron, 2003).

In the second phase of Knowledge modification information was modified to suit the immediate and likely future needs of knowledge workers and management. The primary issues related to the modification phase of the Knowledge Management life cycle include moral rights, the degree of author involvement, assigning responsibility for the sign-off process, making decisions as to the reversibility of modifications to information and verifying ownership of information (Bergeron, 2003). In third phase of Knowledge use life cycle, information was employed for some useful purpose. The range of potential uses for information is virtually unlimited, and depends on the organization, the needs, and activities of knowledge workers within the organization (Bergeron, 2003).

The fourth phase of archiving information involves storing it in a form and format that will survive the elements and time and still be accessible and usable by knowledge workers in the organization. Archiving can involve printing, making electronic copies in several formats on a variety of media, or even outsourcing to an off-site storage facility accessed over the Internet (Bergeron, 2003). The fifth phase transfer or communications of information from one person or place to another is a prerequisite for an efficient knowledge management system. The key issues in the transfer phase of the knowledge management life cycle include cost, security, and transfer time. All participants in the knowledge transfer process should take a due attention to the direct and indirect costs of transferring knowledge (Bergeron, 2003).

In the sixth phase of translation knowledge management life cycle, information is translated from its original form into a form more suitable for a new purpose. For example, a table of numerical data may be transformed into three-dimensional graphs; a sound file might be translated into a graphic or sonogram; or the data in the table might be condensed into a concise statistical summary

(Bergeron,2003). A characteristic of most knowledge management systems is information hiding, in a sense that not all information in the corporation is openly available to everyone. Typically, limited access to the information is provided to knowledge workers as a function of their position in the company and their need to know (Bergeron, 2003).

In disposing phase although all information collected and generated in the course of conducting business may be valuable to someone at some point in the future, from a practical perspective, information with limited future value is discarded to save space and reduce overhead. The method of identifying what information to save and what to destroy should follow corporate policy as well as governmental rules. The primary issues surround the destruction of information in the disposal phase of the knowledge management life cycle are cost, the most appropriate level of security, assessing the value of information and a variety of enabling technologies (Bergeron, 2003). To what extent the organization is effective in all the above listed activities has an impact on knowledge sharing practices of the concerned organization. This means, the more they are effective in these processes the more they are effective in knowledge sharing and vice-versa.

#### 1.3.7. Knowledge Worker

A knowledge worker is someone who is employed because of his or her knowledge of a subject matter, rather than ability to perform manual labour. They are individuals who are valued for their ability to act and communicate with knowledge within a specific subject area (Bergeron, 2003).

They are expected to advance the overall understanding of that subject through focused analysis, design, and/or development of the concerned subject matter. They use research skills to define problems and to identify alternatives. Fuelled by their expertise and insight, they work to solve problems, in an effort to influence company decisions, priorities, and strategies (Bergeron, 2003).

Generally, knowledge workers are found across a variety of professionals like IT technologists, teachers, librarians, lawyers, architects, physicians, nurses, engineers, scientists and others (Bergeron,2003). According to (Drucker, 1964), knowledge workers are individuals who have high level of education and specialist skills combined with the ability to apply these skills to identify and solve problems.

#### 1.3.8. Knowledge Sharing Modes

This part deals with converting tacit knowledge in to explicit knowledge and/or explicit knowledge in to tacit knowledge. Here, many scholars raised the question that #How different types of knowledge might be shared among different stakeholders.; There are multiple modes of knowledge sharing, are Socialization (sharing tacit knowledge by sharing experiences), Externalization (translating tacit knowledge into explicit knowledge using metaphors, models, and rules), Combination (systematizing explicit concepts into a knowledge system by analyzing, categorizing, and repurposing information), and Internalization (converting explicit knowledge into tacit knowledge through simulations, action learning, and on-the- job experiences). Additionally, many knowledge management literatures support the idea that most knowledge (both explicit and tacit) can be shared informally through job experiences, relationships with peers, relationships customers, relationships with managers and mentors (Brown & Duguid, 1991).

#### 1.3.9. Knowledge Deletion and Archiving

This concept is about disposing passive knowledge strategically by using different planned tactics. Although the trend of many organizations shows that they dispose the knowledge they think passive randomly, this is the dangerous way of disposing knowledge because it may unlawfully and/or unethically hurt the one who should not be hurt and again may unlawfully and/or unethically benefit the one who should not be benefited (Monika, 1991).

Generally, irrelevant or outdated knowledge has to be systematically removed from the organization's active knowledge base, such as outdated reports, dead links or obsolete themes and topics and other similar knowledge. According to the recommendation of (Bergeron, 2007), the most expensive meekness of deposing knowledge is deleting and archiving. The selection of the knowledge to be deleted or archived is an important task as otherwise the organizational knowledge base is cluttered with outdated or even wrong documents, links or structures making it less efficient for employees to retrieve the knowledge needed (Bergeron,2007).

#### 1.3.10. Factors that Affect Knowledge Sharing Organizational Culture and Knowledge Sharing

Organizational Culture is widely understood as a set of shared values, beliefs, customs, practices, principles and routines that underpin the behavior of an organization and its members, usually cultivated steadily over a long period (O'Dell, 2001). Many authors point out that organizational culture is the not only a critical success factor for KS, but also the most difficult and important factor to address, particularly if the appropriate culture does not already exist (Davenport et al, 1998).

Among the various components of organizational culture suggested to be important to knowledge sharing are: trust, common subcultures, frames of reference, meeting times and places, broad ideas about work, absorptive capacity, belief that knowledge is a common advantage, openness to other people's views, tolerance for mistakes and need for help. Other aspects of the organizational culture relevant to promoting informal knowledge sharing include knowledge fairs, open forums and chat rooms (Ford and Chan, 2003). In some organizations, there is a low awareness or realization of the value and benefit of possessed knowledge to others. Hierarchical, position based status and formal power issues might also act as inhibitors. In other organizations, there might be a general lack of time and resources to share knowledge Ridge, (2005). Categorized organizational culture related barriers as follows: organizational relationships, organizational climate, organizational structuring and organizational imperative.

### 1.3.11. Technology as Enablers of Knowledge Sharing

The technologies available to enable the Knowledge sharing practice extend from low-technological tools, such as pen and paper to high-technology expert systems and virtual reality displays Bergeron, (2003). Knowledge management (Hansen et al. 1999) the main role of technology is seen in enabling and facilitating interaction among people for knowledge sharing. The aim is to create a connected virtual environment for knowledge exchange by allowing knowledge seekers to identify and communicate with knowledge sources (Handpick and Hassan, 2003). When developing knowledge management solutions that support virtual socialization including e-mail, bulletin boards, chat rooms, whiteboards, audio and video-conferencing. They also cover various specialized groupware applications, and integrated portals, intranets and extranets.

According to Hein (2004), technology support refers to knowledge sharing by enabling the communication, collaboration provision of knowledge storing the accumulated knowledge and retrieve knowledge. A comprehensive survey of best knowledge management practices (Pan and Scarborough, 1998), reveals that most organizations implement some kind of technology to connect people and enable their interaction and collaboration. However, there are differences among researchers regarding the value of virtual (technology-mediated) interaction in comparison with real (face-to-face) interaction in knowledge management. Some researchers warn that technologies lack the emotional richness and depth of real, live, in-person interaction (Santos us, 2001), and are unable to fully develop relationships and an understanding of complex situations. Others argue that communication mediated by technology is no less effective than face-to-face communication. More and more cyber-communities are also beginning to challenge traditional ideas about communities' needs for a physical presence.

### 1.3.12. Employee Attitude and Knowledge Sharing

Bartok and Srivastava (2002) define knowledge sharing as the action in which employees diffuses relevant information to others across the organization. According to Bock and Kim (2002), knowledge sharing is the most important part of KM. The ultimate goal of sharing employees' knowledge is its transfer to organizational assets and resources Dawson, (2001). Additionally sharing activities have to be voluntary and cannot be forced (Kaiser & Miles, 2002).

An employee's attitudes and competencies may impede knowledge sharing. Szulanski, et al (1996) finds that many employees are unaware of the importance of sharing and transferring knowledge. Some individuals possess an attitudinal "unwillingness to share" due to personal insecurity, such as a fear of being seen as ignorant and therefore unfit for job advancement or new career opportunities. This is sometimes described as the notion that "knowledge is power" (Dun Ford, 2000; Grander & Kogut, 2002; Hendricks, 1999; Szulanski, 1996). Employees may also fear a loss of superiority and knowledge ownership after sharing their own personal knowledge (Bartok & Srivastava, 2002; Szulanski, 1996).

### 1.3.13. Financial Rewards and Knowledge Sharing

According to the insight of Frees et al. (1999), financial reward encourages people to share the knowledge they possess in their mind. Their advice is that financial reward is a best instrument by which organizations can exploit the knowledge in the mind of the knowledge workers. Based on the argument of Wiesenberger & Sells (1994), if individuals are to be encouraged to share novel and potentially useful ideas with the organization, rewards should be offered that convey the message that all ideas are valued and that the organization is not interested in evaluating or controlling creativity. Furthermore, offering nonfinancial rewards strongly facilitate idea sharing among stakeholders in the organization. In his study, Tampon (1993) also identified four key motivators for knowledge workers. These are personal growth, occupational autonomy, task achievement quality and relevance to the organization, money rewards

### 1.3.14. Organizational Structure and Knowledge Sharing

Many scholars also argue that organization structure can accelerate or decelerate the degree of knowledge sharing practice in the given organization. The general principle is that the more the organization structure is web based or team based, the more the degree of knowledge sharing and vice versa. According to the view of Mein Tick, (2006), companies must able to make their structure flat so that workers can communicate freely to each other. This facilitated the knowledge sharing process of the organization.

### 1.3.15. Employee Relation and Knowledge Sharing

According to Armstrong, (2010), the starting point of the employment relationship is an undertaking by an employee to provide skill and effort to the employer in return for which the employer provides the employee with a salary or a wage. Accordingly, employees are responsible to share the knowledge they possess for the overall effectiveness of the organization. For this to occur there should be smooth employment relationship among key stakeholders of the organization. Whenever the either side is not in a position to discharge its legal or implied responsibilities concerning employment relation, the constructive relationships among key stakeholders will be impeded.

This in turn leads to the downturn of knowledge sharing practice that is a key factor in creating a learning organization; enmity spirit will develop in that organization and then no one is willing to give or take active knowledge from one another. He also advised that particularly, human resource specialists should contribute to the development of a positive and productive employment relationship by undertaking in advance effective recruitment interviews; conducting induction or orientation; encouraging the development of performance management; encouraging the use of personal development plan, learning and development programs; training; adopting a general policy of transparency; effective grievance handling procedures; policy of equal opportunities; on time promotion; ensuring equity, fairness and consistency in rewarding knowledge workers (Armstrong, 2010).

### 1.3.16. Employee Assignment and Knowledge Sharing

The way employees are assigned to some position has its own positive and negative impact on the effectiveness of knowledge sharing. According to scholars, workers should be placed according to their field of specialization. Murray, (2002) for example, argued that employee assignment is very important as those of recruitment and selection. He used employee assignment and employee placement interchangeably. For him, employee placement (employee assignment) is fitting a person to the right job. It is about placing individuals with the proper KSA on the proper position. The basic theme here is that placing proper workers on the proper position saves their knowledge from remaining buried in the mind of employees Murray, (2002).

### 1.3.17. Leadership vs Knowledge Sharing

According to Monika and Toyama (2005) leadership is a vital knowledge sharing which requires active commitment from all the members of the organization, not just from a few members. The commitment of leaders at different levels also plays a pervasive role in accelerating and decelerating knowledge sharing trends. The way they behave, the fairness they exercise while leading, the way they approach individuals, teams, and the general leadership styles they introduce have an impact on knowledge sharing practice. According to the article produced by Rao, (2005), top management must themselves embrace KS culture, practices, and tools. They must demonstrate that they have internalized the KS message. This must be communicated with external audiences as well.

### 1.3.18. Organizational Routines and Knowledge Sharing

Organizational routines are any formal and informal trends of organizations that accelerate or decelerate knowledge creation and sharing practices. They include procedures, rules, regulations, daily programs and schedules that are vital to the day- to- day activities of the business. They can also be viewed as mechanisms for knowledge creation, utilization, and storage. Generally, in order for an organization to have the best chance for success at knowledge sharing, there should be active routines in the organizations (Feldman and Pentlands, 2003). These can operate at the individual level, among groups of individuals, across an entire organization, and inter-organizationally. The operation of these routines can result in the accomplishment of a significant portion of the organization's activities particularly by accelerating knowledge sharing.

### 1.3.19. General Barriers for Knowledge Sharing

Knowledge sharing is not free of barriers. According to the argument of Bundt (2000), learning organizations can face tremendous obstacles during their knowledge sharing practice. Among them, the most expensive ones are; lacking willingness for sharing knowledge, lacking willingness for absorption, complicated employment relations, missing common language, misinterpreting or distortion of information or knowledge, anti-cultural philosophies, passive leaders, poor organizational routines, lack of work autonomy and others (Andreas, 2010).

## **2. Research Method**

### *2.1. Description of the Study Area*

The study is carried out in Ambo University, which is located in Oromia regional state west Shewa zone of Ambo town. Ambo University is a federal higher learning institution, that established by 1939, in Ambo town. It is pioneer higher learning institutions in Ethiopia. Primarily the university established within the aim to promote and advance academics, Knowledge and skills in all aspects of Sciences and sustainable developments in Ethiopia. Since its establishment, the University exerting paramount efforts in significant contributions in the country's overall development by building the capacity of development agents through short, medium and long-term trainings in various fields. After passing through various developmental stages, it has recently become independent with a status of a university organized into colleges and academic departments.

The University has immense location advantages mainly related to its proximity to the capital city of Addis Ababa and its excellent climate to attract competent staff to work closely with other institutions by sharing material as well as human resources in knowledge sharing.

### *2.2. Sampling Design and Populations*

The population of the study was 442 (four hundred forty two) of the university from different level of position involved in knowledge sharing activities. The sample size used was 113 (details for this sample selection will be indicated in the table below); the respondents were selected on the basis of purposive and proportionate stratified sampling techniques. A purposive non-probability sampling technique was used to get both detail and relevant information. On the other hand, proportionate probability sampling technique was considered to address each and every respondent to the questionnaires according to their size in the total population. From the population, the researcher only chooses three levels of positions which where the Management bodies (president, Vice presidents and Directors) (5), Instructors (Academicians) (37) and Practitioners (71). For Academicians and practitioners a proportionate sampling was used. Finally, the investigator gathered detail qualitative data by in-depth face-to-face interview with the purposefully selected management bodies of the university.

Dr. John Curry, Professor of Educational Research, North Texas State University, provided his research students (Fall, 1984) with the "rule of thumb" on sample size as under: L. R. Gay suggests 10% of large populations and 20% of small populations as minimums. Using Gay's suggestion, the sample of this designed as follows.

Size of Population	Sampling Percent
0-100	100%
101-1,000	10%
1,001-5,000	5%
5,001-10,000	3%
10,000+	1%

Table 1: Sample Size Rule of Thumb

Source: - Research Design and Statistical Analysis for Christian Ministry, 4th ed. (2006) Rick Young

Then, the ratio of each stratum will be multiplied by the total sample size. This can be computed as follows:

No	Descriptions	Total number of each strata	Ratio of each strata to total population (N)	Each ratio multiplied by total sample size	Sample to be taken from each stratum.(n)
1.	Management bodies	18	18/442	0.04 x 113	5
2.	Instructors	145	145/442	0.32 x 113	37
3.	Practitioners	279	279/442	0.63x113	71
	Total	442			113

Table 2: Samples selected from each strata

Source: Own construction for this study, 2013

### 2.2.1. Data Sources

For the sake of achieving the purpose of this study, relevant data was collected from both primary and secondary sources:

### 2.2.2. Primary Data

The Primary data sources were management bodies, Instructors and Practitioners'; that contacted using questionnaires, interviews and focus group discussions.

### 2.2.3. Secondary Data

The secondary data was collected from university brochures, journals, working papers and previous studies. In addition, statistical documents, minutes, official work performance reports and unpublished documents from different offices of Ambo University workers and related documents to BPR & HRM was used as sources of secondary data.

### 2.3. Data Analysis

Data analysis is carried out using qualitative and quantitative descriptions. To analysis the entered data, different analytical methods were used. The collected data was processed by using MS- Excel spreadsheet. Using this excels sheet, different tables, percentages and average were computed.

The data collected through different instruments in-depth face-to-face interview, structured questionnaires, and structured observation were being adopted to gather relevant data. To support the primary data, in addition to primary information, the study used documents from secondary data, also gathered from different books, brochures, and strategic plan of the university. Therefore, in these study in-depth interviews discussions and questioners was used in order to get sufficient information about knowledge sharing practice of Ambo University.

## 3. Results and Data Interpretation

This chapter is concerned with respondents' demographic profile, data presentation, data analyses, discussions, and data interpretations. As it was indicated in the proposal designed for this purpose, quantitative and qualitative data was collected from primary sources by using questioner and face-to-face interview as a technique respectively. Accordingly, the investigator produced structured questioners based on the reviewed literatures. To make the information obtained from questioners more detail, semi structured interview questions were designed.

The interview was being conducted from the management bodies, within public Relation and Alumni director of the university. To avoid information distortion audio recorder was being used to capture all data in addition to capture down when he respond. The interview was conducted in his office. It took around an hour to conduct the interview. For the purpose of consistency and simplicity, both quantitative (data from interview) and qualitative data (data from questioner) are presented, analyzed, discussed, and interpreted simultaneously.

### 3.1. Respondents Profile

In this section, the demographic profiles of Management bodies, practitioners and instructors are examined in the form of table.



No	Variables	Descriptions	Frequencies	Percent
1.	Sex	Male	43	61
		Female	28	39
		Total	71	100
2.	Age	18-25	14	20
		26-32	26	37
		33-40	22	31
		>40	9	12
		Total	71	100
3.	Service Year	<1	3	4
		1-3	28	40
		3-5	17	24
		>5	23	32
		Total	71	100
4.	Educational background of respondent	Management	16	24
		Agriculture	17	24
		Accounting	13	18
		Engineering	11	15
		IT	8	11
		Others	6	8
		Total	71	100
5.	Educational Level of respondent	PhD	0	0
		graduate	3	4
		Under graduate	18	25
		Diploma	50	71
		Total	71	100

Table 3: Profile of practitioners

Source: Own survey, 2013

When the practitioners are examined sex wise, 43 (61 %) of them are males and the remaining 28 (39 %) are females. This implies that the proportion of male employees is much larger than that of female employees in the sampled of the university.

As far as age of respondents is concerned 14 (20 %) of them are the respondents are between the ages of 18-25; 26 (37 %) of them are between the ages of 26-32. While 22 (31 %) of them are between the ages of 33-40, 9 (13 %) of them are above 40 years in the university. From this, it can be understood that the university consist of all age groups with majority productive age of 18-25 years. In Service year wise, 3(4%) of them stays in the university for less than one year; 28 (40 %) of workers stay in the college for 1-3 years; 17 (24%) of the workers have 3-5 years of service; and 23 (32%) of workers have worked in the university for more than five years. From this, it can be understood that the university has great employee retention in the compound.

From the view point of educational background of the respondent, 16 (23%) of practitioners have management background; 17 (24%) of the have Agriculture back ground; 13 (18%) of them are from accounting back ground; 11 (15%) of them are from engineering background; and 8 (11%) of them are from information technology, and 6 (8%) of them are from other educational background. From this, one can understand that most of the respondents of educational background are from Agricultural background. From the table above educational level wise, none of them is at PhD levels; 3 (4%) of the respondent are at graduate level; 18 (25%) of the respondent are Bachelor holders and that most of the respondents are diploma holders 50 (71%).

### 3.1.1. Leadership Styles

- Evaluation 1: The University follows participatory leadership style.

S.No.	Items	Evaluator	Value	Frequency	Total points	Weight (%)
1	Participative Leadership style	Management bodies	5	4	20	80
			4	1	4	20
			3	0	0	0
			2	0	0	0
			1	0	0	0
Total			-	5	24	100%
Average value			-	-	4.8	-
2	Participative Leadership style	Instructors	5	26	130	70
			4	4	16	11
			3	4	12	11
			2	2	4	5
			1	1	1	3
Total			-	37	163	100%

Average value			-	-	4.4	-
3	Participative Leadership style	Practitioners'	5	46	230	65
			4	11	44	15
			3	8	24	11
			2	4	8	6
			1	2	2	3
Total			-	<b>71</b>	<b>308</b>	<b>100%</b>
Average value			-	-	<b>4.3</b>	-

Table 4: participatory leadership styles

Source: Own survey, 2013

From the above Table 4, the percentage value of the respondent is clear that 80 % from the total respondents of management bodies strongly agree regarding participative leadership style in the university. Only 20 % of the respondents are neutral about the participative leadership style of knowledge sharing in the university. None of them is not disagree the participative management of the university management bodies.

As far as practitioners are concerned, 80 % of them are strongly agree that there is a participatory leadership style in the university; 11 % of them are neutral on the statement, and 9 % of them are not in a position to give their idea concerning the participative leadership style of the university. Therefore, there is a participative leadership style in the university.

As far as instructors are concerned, 81 % of them are strongly agree that there is a participatory leadership style in the university; 11 % of them are neutral on the statement, and 8 % of them are not in a position to give their idea concerning the participative leadership style of the university.

From the above table 4 the average values of the respondent in the participative leadership style, all management bodies, instructors and practitioners gave 4.8, 4.3 and 4.4 average values respectively. These three average values show almost all knowledge workers are agree in the existence of participatory leadership style in the college. The average 4.5 ( $\frac{4.8+4.3+4.4}{3}$ ) also shows that all knowledge workers gave the average value almost close to 5 which shows there is agreement that the university follows participatory leadership style.

### 3.1.2. Current Leadership Styles

- Evaluation 2: The current leadership style strongly facilitate knowledge sharing

S.No.	Items	Evaluator	Value	Frequency	Total points	Weight (%)
1	Current Leadership style	Management bodies	5	3	15	60
			4	1	4	20
			3	1	3	20
			2	0	0	0
			1	0	0	0
Total			-	<b>5</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>100%</b>
Average value			-	-	<b>4.4</b>	-
2	Current Leadership style	Instructors	5	28	140	76
			4	5	20	15
			3	1	3	3
			2	1	2	3
			1	1	1	3
Total			-	<b>37</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>100%</b>
Average value			-	-	<b>4.4</b>	-
3	Current Leadership style	Practitioners'	5	32	160	45
			4	15	20	21
			3	9	27	13
			2	14	28	20
			1	1	1	1
Total			-	<b>71</b>	<b>236</b>	<b>100%</b>
Average value			-	-	<b>3.3</b>	-

Table 5: current leadership styles

Source: Own survey, 2013

From Table 5 above it can be understood that, majority of management bodies 80 % belief that the current leadership style in the university facilitates knowledge sharing; and 20 % of them are not in a position to give their idea on to what extent the current leadership style accelerate Knowledge sharing in the university and none of them are not disagree in the idea. From this we can understand that good leadership in the university to facilitate knowledge sharing practice.

From instructors' point of view, majority of them 91% agree that the existing leadership style facilitate Knowledge sharing; 6 % of them disagree with the statement and 3 % of them are not in a position to give their idea on the statement. So the existing leadership style facilitating knowledge sharing practice in an organization.

Regarding Practitioners', 66 % of them agree that the leadership style in the university facilitates knowledge sharing; 21 % of them are disagree with the statement and 13% of them are not in a position to give their idea about the statement. Hence we conclude that the current leadership facilitating the knowledge sharing practice in the university.

From the above point of view the average of knowledge workers, in the university are 4.0 ( $\frac{3.3+4.4+4.4}{3}$ ) show that all knowledge workers agree the current leadership style of the university facilitate knowledge sharing.

### 3.1.3. Employee Reward Package (Financial, Non-Financial)

➤ Evaluation 1: The University has motivating reward package (financial & non-financial)

S.No.	Items	Evaluator	Value	Frequency	Total points	Weight (%)
1	Motivating Reward package	Management bodies	5	2	10	40
			4	1	4	20
			3	1	3	20
			2	1	2	20
			1	0	1	0
Total			-	5	20	100%
Average value			-	-	4	-
2	Motivating Reward package	Instructors	5	6	30	16
			4	4	16	11
			3	10	30	27
			2	11	22	30
			1	6	6	16
Total			-	37	104	100%
Average value			-	-	2.8	-
3	Motivating Reward package	Practitioners'	5	21	105	30
			4	12	48	17
			3	18	54	25
			2	13	26	18
			1	7	7	10
Total			-	71	240	100%
Average value			-	-	3.3	-

Table 6: employee rewards

Source: Own survey, 2013

As indicated from the Table 6, 60% of management bodies strongly agree/agree that there is a motivating reward package in the university. 20 % of them are disagreeing about the reward package of the university and 20% of them are neutral from the idea of the current reward package of the university. While 27 % of instructors are agreed on the issue, 46 % of them are not agree on the motivating power of the current reward package. 27 % of instructors have no Opinion. Therefore, there is no reward package in the university.

In similar manner from the above table 47 % practitioners are agree on the reward package of the university ,28% not agree in the current rewarding package of the university and 25% are not willing to share their idea on the reward package of the university. So we conclude that there is no reward package in the university.

The average response of all management bodies, instructors and practitioners are almost approaches to 3. That means ( $\frac{4+3.3+2.8}{3}$ ). The average values are almost all very similar and it shows that not all knowledge workers are satisfied with the financial reward package of the university.

### 3.1.4. Employee Reward Package

- Evaluation: 2 the existing reward package or system facilitates knowledge sharing in the university

S.No.	Items	Evaluator	Value	Frequency	Total points	Weight (%)
1	Existing Reward package	Management bodies	5	1	5	20
			4	2	8	40
			3	1	3	20
			2	1	2	20
			1	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			-	<b>5</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>100%</b>
Average value			-	-	<b>3.6</b>	-
2	Existing Reward package	Instructors	5	5	25	14
			4	3	12	8
			3	15	45	41
			2	10	20	27
			1	4	4	10
<b>Total</b>			-	<b>37</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>100%</b>
Average value			-	-	2.8	-
3	Existing Reward package	Practitioners'	5	10	50	14.2
			4	15	60	21.1
			3	11	33	15.4
			2	23	46	32.3
			1	12	12	17
<b>Total</b>			-	<b>71</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>100%</b>
Average value			-	-	<b>2.8</b>	-

Table 7: Existing reward packages

Source: Own survey, 2013

According to the data obtained from the respondents of Table 7 above understand that 60% of management bodies are agrees on the existing reward package of the university and 20 % of the management bodies are not agree on reward package in facilitating knowledge sharing mechanism of the university. Lastly, 20% of them are not give their opinion. Therefore, the management bodies are agreed on the existing reward package can facilitate knowledge sharing in the university.

While 22% instructors are, agree on the idea. 37% are not agreeing existing reward packages accelerate knowledge sharing in the university and 41% of them are not giving the idea on the statements. Out of the total respondents of practitioners 35.3% of them are agree on the existing reward package of Ambo University facilitate knowledge sharing practice,49.3% of them are not agree on the ideas and 15.4% of the respondents are not give the response on the idea.

The average response of the three strata as indicated on table is 3. ( $\frac{3.6+2.8+2.8}{3}$ ). From this point almost all similar to those, they gave their ideas they are disagree that the existing reward packages accelerate knowledge sharing.

Here, when I asked to describe whether the university has adequate reward package and to what extent the current reward package accelerate knowledge sharing practice. From interviewers, the university has good reward package and reward system; and still important to make them better. They indicated that; they provide financial and non-financial reward for teams, which have best practice to be scaled-up. They quoted rewards given to IT team members as an example. They also argue that the university is active in giving non-financial rewards particularly learning and growth opportunities.

Form both the interview and formal observation; instructors are forced to study master's degree and PHD degree in the program, which they not prefer, fields in foreign and national universities. Around three of the instructors, for example, were obliged to follow their master's degree in distance program. This is not what instructors need.

Accordingly, all instructors in all department are obliged to attend either distance or weekend program (except law because there is no distance and summer program in law). Most instructors who attend or began to attend the education in distance program are not satisfied with it and started to learn additional degrees in weak end program with their own cost. While as more scholarship opportunities given in India and china but not allowed to westerns universities.

Accordingly, the information from the interviewers again, knowledge workers, especially instructors are denied promotions & career developments. The reason that the university put is that promotion is hold by government countrywide. Although scholars like Armstrong, (2010) recommend that reward packages must be revised by taking in to account different factors such as inflations, the management in university is passive in revising its reward package by conducting internal and external relativities(from the interview).

3.1.5. Employment Relationship Policy

- Evaluation: 1. The University has effective employee relationship policy

S.No.	Items	Evaluator	Value	Frequency	Total points	Weight (%)
1	Effective employee relationship policy	Management bodies	5	2	10	40
			4	0	0	0
			3	1	3	20
			2	1	2	20
			1	1	1	20
<b>Total</b>			-	<b>5</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>100%</b>
Average value			-	-	<b>3.2</b>	-
2	Effective employee relationship policy	Instructors	5	6	30	16
			4	12	24	32
			3	14	42	39
			2	2	4	5
			1	3	3	8
<b>Total</b>			-	<b>37</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>100%</b>
Average value			-	-	<b>2.7</b>	-
3	Effective employee relationship policy	Practitioners'	5	12	60	17
			4	8	24	11
			3	17	51	24
			2	13	26	18
			1	21	21	30
<b>Total</b>			-	<b>71</b>	<b>182</b>	<b>100%</b>
Average value			-	-	<b>2.6</b>	-

Table 8: Employment relation policies

Source: Own survey, 2013

When we look at the responses obtained from the table above 8 out of five respondents, 40% of the employee relationship of Ambo University is good and they agree on that while, 40% of the employees are not agree on the employee relationship of the university. In similar manner, 20% of the respondents are not give their opinion in the idea of employee relationship in the university.

Regarding the instructors 38% of the respondents are agree on the employee relationship of the university, 13% of them are disagree and 39% are not give their opinion. From this, most instructors' does not agree in the employee relationship policy.

Regarding the practitioners 28% of the respondents are agreed on current employee relationship of Ambo University, 48% of them are not agreed on the idea. Similarly, 24% of them are not giving their opinion on the idea. From the table the average of the respondents are responses  $2.8 \left( \frac{3.2+2.6+2.7}{3} \right)$  and it shows that all employees not agree on the relationship of employees.

Generally, the response regarding employment relationship policy of Ambo University summarized as majority of management bodies agree that there is positive relationship among workers and managers in the university and this relationship can facilitate knowledge sharing. Although majority of practitioners and instructors are not agree that there is no positive employment relationship in the university, only 48% of the practitioner and 48% of instructors believe that there is employment relationship in the university. From this there is not much expected relationship in facilitate knowledge sharing practice in the university.

3.1.6. Employment Relationship Policy

- Evaluation: 2. The current employee relationships facilitate knowledge sharing.

S.No.	Items	Evaluator	Value	Frequency	Total points	Weight (%)
1	Current employee relationship policy	Management bodies	5	3	15	60
			4	2	8	40
			3	0	0	0
			2	0	0	0
			1	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			-	<b>5</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100%</b>
Average value			-	-	<b>4.6</b>	-
2	Current employee relationship policy	Instructors	5	16	80	43
			4	12	48	32
			3	5	15	15
			2	1	2	4
			1	2	2	6

<b>Total</b>			-	37	147	100%
Average value			-	-	4	-
3	Current employee relationship policy	Practitioners'	5	27	135	38
			4	13	42	18
			3	14	42	20
			2	8	16	11
			1	9	9	13
<b>Total</b>			-	<b>71</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Average value</b>			-	-	<b>3.4</b>	-

Table 9: Current employee relation relationships  
Source: Own survey, 2013

From the frequency distribution table above 9, it is possible to learn that all most all management bodies are belief that current employment relationship facilitates knowledge sharing; none of them are disagree on the current employee relationship of the university. Only 56% and 75 % of practitioners and instructors respectively think that the current employment relationships accelerate knowledge sharing. Majority of the respondents agreed that there is positive relationship among workers and managers in the university and this relationship can facilitate knowledge sharing.

From the table above the average of the respondents are responses 4 ( $\frac{4.6+4+3.4}{3}$ ) and it shows that all most all employees are agree on the relationship of employees in the university. Under this dimension, the interviewees are asked to describe to what extent the current employee relation facilitate knowledge sharing among key stakeholders. They respond that their university is on good status concerning employee relationship both externally and internally. There is strong relationship among stakeholders internally and externally. Generally, from the percentage and average values of evaluation criteria and interview data, there is good employment relationship in the universities and this employment relationship facilitates knowledge sharing.

### 3.1.7. Employee Assignment

- Evaluation 1: The current assignment committees are free, neutral and well experienced

S.No.	Items	Evaluator	Value	Frequency	Total points	Weight (%)
1	Assignment committees are free, neutral	Management bodies	5	2	10	40
			4	1	4	20
			3	0	0	0
			2	1	2	20
			1	1	1	20
<b>Total</b>			-	<b>5</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100%</b>
Average value			-	-	<b>3.4</b>	-
2	Assignment committees are free, neutral	Instructors	5	10	50	27
			4	8	32	21
			3	7	21	19
			2	5	10	14
			1	7	7	19
<b>Total</b>			-	<b>37</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>100%</b>
Average value			-	-	<b>3.2</b>	-
3	Assignment committees are free, neutral	Practitioners'	5	10	50	14
			4	12	48	17
			3	18	24	25
			2	20	60	28
			1	11	11	16
<b>Total</b>			-	<b>71</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Average value</b>			-	-	<b>2.7</b>	-

Table 10: Current employee assignment committee  
Source: Own survey, 2013

From the table above 10, majority of practitioners 44% think that the assignment committees of the university are not free, neutral and well educated; concerning instructor, 48% of them are agree and willing to give their idea on to what extent the assignment committees are free, neutral and well experienced; at the end majority of management bodies agree that the current assignment committees are free, neutral and well experienced.

From the average value stated above table again, the lowest average value is the value given by practitioners and the highest average value is what given by management bodies. The average value given by instructors is more than that of practitioners and less than the

average value given by management bodies. The average value (3.1) shows that all knowledge workers gave the average value of 3.1, which shows their silence concerning the statement. Generally, majority of management bodies and instructors agreed on the proposed statement; and majority of practitioners disagrees on the statement. This implies that workers in different teams perceive the current assignment committees in different ways.

From the current condition of the university, the assignment committees are responsible to assign only practitioners. Both instructors and management bodies are formally hired and assigned from external labour market through intensive recruitment and government assignment. They have little relationship with the assignment committees concerning placement. When we see the value each stratum gave from this frequency distribution table, those who gave less value are practitioners who have the direct relationship with the committees. From this statement, it is possible to say the perception that the existing assignment committees have some problem. They may not be free, neutral and not well experienced or educated.

From the interviewee's data reflect their idea on whether employees assigned properly and to what extent this assignment facilitate knowledge sharing. The interviewer said that the assignment committees are free, neutral and well experienced. They are elected temporarily whenever the need arise. The committees are five in number. While the top management of the university nominates three of them and two of them are selected by the coming together of workers representative.

Regarding employment policy, they replied that the university has no guideline that leads the workers assignment. They use both labour law and federal Civil service proclamation 515/2007 and manuals of civil Service Bureau. According to the human resource Director of the university, there is also employee misplacement in the university. He said that those who are law and accounting in profession are assigned as documentation facilitators in different teams. In this case they work simply by observing what others do and the knowledge they gain from formal learning is remain buried in their mind. The reason they put is that they have no place to use the knowledge in the university. The university prefers to make them work by the knowledge they gain from informal learning rather than downsizing them.

Generally, majority of practitioners (they are the one with direct contact with the assignment committees) belief that the current employer assignment committees are not free, neutral, well-educated and experienced. The way they assign workers endanger knowledge flow. Knowledge workers are assigned without their field of specialization. The university is not in a position to produce its own internal policy (based on the regional and federal labor and civil servant proclamation). From the percentage values, average values, and interview data, there is a poor employee assignment practice in the university. The association between the current employee assignment practice of the university and its knowledge sharing practice is also a weak positive.

### 3.1.8. Employee Attitude

- Evaluation 1: what is the attitude of employees in knowledge sharing experiences?

S.No.	Items	Evaluator	Value	Frequency	Total points	Weight (%)
1	Attitude of employees	Management bodies	5	2	10	40
			4	2	8	40
			3	1	3	20
			2	0	0	0
			1	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			-	<b>5</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>100%</b>
Average value			-	-	<b>4.2</b>	-
2	Attitude of employees	Instructors	5	18	90	49
			4	10	40	27
			3	2	6	5
			2	3	6	8
			1	4	4	11
<b>Total</b>			-	<b>37</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>100%</b>
Average value			-	-	4	-
3	Attitude of employees	Practitioners	5	19	95	27
			4	17	68	23
			3	12	36	17
			2	14	28	20
			1	9	9	13
<b>Total</b>			-	<b>71</b>	<b>236</b>	<b>100%</b>
Average value			-	-	<b>3.3</b>	-

Table 11: Employee attitudes in the university

Source: Own survey, 2013

Regarding the employee attitude in knowledge sharing practice of Ambo University, indicate from the table above 11 is 80% of the management bodies agree on the employee positive attitude of knowledge sharing experience in the university and 20% of them are no response on the idea. While as majority of instructors and practitioners also agree on the idea. The average of knowledge workers

accept that there is good attitude between employees in the university in knowledge sharing mechanisms. From these different perspective of what the attitude of knowledge sharing in the university is seems like is good and appreciated for other norms too.

### 3.1.9. Organizational Routines

- Evaluation: 1. The University has sound systems, policies, procedures, and programs to make knowledge flow effective and efficient.

No,	Items	Evaluator	Value	Frequency	Total points	Weight (%)
1	sound systems, policies, procedures, and programs	Management bodies	5	2	10	40
			4	1	4	20
			3	1	3	20
			2	1	2	20
			1	0	0	0
Total			-	5	<b>19</b>	100%
Average value			-	-	<b>3.8</b>	-
2	sound systems, policies, procedures, and programs	Instructors	5	9	45	25
			4	14	56	39
			3	5	15	14
			2	2	4	6
			1	6	6	16
Total			-	37	<b>126</b>	<b>100%</b>
Average value			-	-	<b>3.4</b>	-
3	sound systems, policies, procedures, and programs	Practitioners'	5	29	145	41
			4	13	42	18
			3	8	24	11
			2	11	22	16
			1	10	10	14
Total			-	<b>71</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>100%</b>
Average value			-	-	<b>3.4</b>	-

Table 12: Organizational policies, procedures

Source: Own survey, 2013

As it can be understood from the table above 12, majority of management bodies & instructors gave very similar percentage of 60% and 64 % respectively with the values of regarding to what extent the current organizational routines are effective and at the same time facilitate knowledge sharing among different stakeholders. The respondents of practitioners 59% agree in the organizational routine to facilitate knowledge sharing in the university.

Both percentage and average values  $3.5 \left( \frac{3.4+3.4+3.8}{3} \right)$  almost show that, more than others, management bodies agree that the current organizational routines are sound enough to undertake the day-to-day activities of the university. On the other hand instructors and practitioners are both equally understand about effective organizational routines.

According to the interviewees' idea, there are no intentionally designed organizational routines for the very purpose of knowledge creation and knowledge sharing. Generally, from both the percentage and average values and the data obtained from interview, the university has no intentionally designed organizational routines for the sake of knowledge sharing. The current organizational routines are hardly support the flow of knowledge from the source to end users. The university is also not aware of the role of organizational routines in facilitating knowledge sharing practices.

### 3.1.10. Information Technologies

- Evaluation 1: The University has well educated, and experienced IT technologist.



S.no.	Items	Evaluator	Value	Frequency	Total points	Weight (%)
1	University has well educated, and experienced IT technologist	Management bodies	5	2	10	40
			4	3	12	60
			3	0	0	0
			2	0	0	0
			1	0	0	0
Total			-	5	22	100%
Average value			-	-	4.4	-
2	University has well educated, and experienced IT technologist	Instructors	5	11	55	30
			4	16	64	43
			3	4	12	11
			2	3	6	8
			1	3	3	8
Total			-	37	140	100%
Average value			-	-	3.7	-
3	University has well educated, and experienced IT technologist	Practitioners'	5	21	105	30
			4	24	96	34
			3	6	18	8
			2	11	22	15
			1	9	9	13
Total			-	71	250	100%
Average value			-	-	3.5	-

Table 13: well educated information technologist  
Source: Own survey, 2013

The result of study shows that from the table above 13 majority of the management bodies are agrees on the well-educated and organized as well as experienced information technologist in the university compound. 73% of the instructors are agree on the idea of well-educated and experienced It professional in the university, 11% of them are not give their opinion and also 16% of them are disagree on the point. 64% of the practitioners are agree and 8% of them are not response on the statement of well-educated and well experienced It professional in the university, while as 28% of them are not agree on the point. Finally, from the average of the percentage values, majority of knowledge workers agree that the university has adequate IT infrastructures, well educated, and experienced IT technologist. Therefore, it is possible to say that majority of knowledge workers agree that the university has adequate IT infrastructures and IT technologist.

### 3.1.11. Current Information Technologies

- Evaluation 2: The current IT technology of the university facilitate knowledge sharing

S.No.	Items	Evaluator	Value	Frequency	Total points	Weight (%)
1	The current IT technology of the university facilitate knowledge sharing	Management bodies	5	2	10	40
			4	2	8	40
			3	1	3	20
			2	0	0	0
			1	0	0	0
Total			-	5	21	100%
Average value			-	-	4.2	-
	The current IT technology of the university facilitate knowledge sharing	Instructors	5	9	45	24
			4	14	56	37
			3	5	15	14
			2	4	8	11
			1	5	5	14
Total			-	37	129	100%
Average value			-	-	3.4	-
	The current IT technology of the university facilitate knowledge sharing	Practitioners'	5	18	90	25
			4	31	124	44
			3	9	27	13
			2	8	16	11
			1	5	5	7
Total			-	71	262	100%
Average value			-	-	3.6	-

Table 14: current information technology of the university  
Source: Own survey, 2013

Based on the percentage values, majority of knowledge workers 80 % of management bodies, 61% of instructors and 69 % of practitioners agree that the existing IT infrastructure facilitate knowledge sharing.

Regarding the disagreement only 25%,of instructors and 18 % practitioners, are disagree and no one of management bodies are disagree on the ideas. The disagree ideas that the current IT infrastructure does not facilitate knowledge sharing. The remaining ones are not in a position to give their idea on the statement. According to the average values, the three strata gave very similar average value. All practitioners, instructors and management bodies reflect their agreement on the statement by giving average values respectively. Both percentage and average values indicate that the current IT infrastructure accelerate knowledge sharing among key stakeholders.

From the interview data, the respondents were being asked to answer on whether the current IT infrastructures facilitate knowledge sharing practice. From the interview, the university has invested a huge amount of capital on expanding different IT infrastructures. The University of public relations and Alumni management director added “They able to save much knowledge by working in collaboration with more experienced institutions in foreign countries like Belgium”. Generally, from the percentage& average values of an interview data, it is possible to summarize that the current technological infrastructure facilitate knowledge sharing practices.

### 3.1.12. The Current Organization Structure

- Evaluation 1: The current organization structure of the university facilitates knowledge sharing

S.No.	Items	Evaluator	Value	Frequency	Total points	Weight (%)
1	The current organization structure of the university facilitates knowledge sharing	Management bodies	5	1	5	20
			4	3	12	60
			3	1	3	20
			2	0	0	0
			1	0	0	0
Total			-	5	20	100%
Average value			-	-	4	-
	The current organization structure of the university facilitates knowledge sharing	Instructors	5	11	55	30
			4	16	64	44
			3	6	18	16
			2	2	4	6
			1	1	1	4
Total			-	37	142	100%
Average value			-	-	3.8	-
	The current organization structure of the university facilitates knowledge sharing	Practitioners'	5	17	85	24
			4	24	96	34
			3	14	42	20
			2	10	20	14
			1	6	6	8
Total			-	71	249	100%
Average value			-	-	3.5	-

Table 15: current organizational structures

Source: Own survey, 2013

From the table above 15; 80% of management bodies are agree on the current organization structure of the university facilitates knowledge sharing ,20 % of them are not give their opinion and none of them are not disagree on the point. From the respondent of instructors 74% of them are agree on the ideas of current organization structure of the university facilitates knowledge sharing, 16% of them are not give their response on the issues, while 10 % of them are not agree on the statement of current organization structure of the university facilitates knowledge sharing. Regarding the practitioners 58% of them are agree on the idea,20% of them are not response on the statements 22% are not agree on current organization structure of the university facilitates knowledge sharing. From the average point of view almost 3.7 ( $\frac{4+3.5+3.8}{3}$ ) shows that they agree that the current organization structure facilitate knowledge sharing in the university.

The interview data also shows that from this practical observation and the interview I conducted with the selected directors; I learned that the university has adopted team based organizational structure. They argued that this structure employee empowerment and this empowerment in turn facilitate knowledge exchange among team members. They also use the concept of proximity in their office lay out. All team members are in one room as much as possible. If they cannot be in one room because of their number, they must be in the very close room according to their office lay out principle. Generally, from the percentage values and interview data, the current organization structure facilitates knowledge sharing.

### 3.1.13. Knowledge Disposing Tactics

- Evaluation 1. Do you have knowledge disposing strategies in the university?

S.No	Respondents	Evaluations criteria	Frequency	Weight in %
1	Management bodies	Yes	1	20
		No	2	40
		I don't know	2	40
		Total	5	100
2	Instructors	Yes	18	49
		No	8	23
		I don't know	11	28
		Total	37	100
3	Practitioners	Yes	18	25
		No	28	39
		I don't know	25	36
		Total	71	100

Table 16: knowledge disposing strategy

Source: Own survey, 2013

From the table above 16 Concerning practitioners, majority of them (36 %) are not willing to give their idea on the statement under consideration; the highest number of them (39 %) disagrees that the university has no knowledge disposition mechanism; at the end, a small amount of them 25 % agree that the university has a trend of disposing passive knowledge on time.

Regarding from the instructors perspectives, majority of them 49 % agree that the university has the mechanisms to dispose passive knowledge on time; some of the them are 28% not willing to give their idea on the issue; at the end, a small amount of them 23% are disagree that the university has a trend of disposing passive knowledge before they are shared. Finally, the management bodies of the university agree 20% of them and 40% of them are disagrees 40% of them are not give response on the ideas. From this, we can conclude that the university has no trend of disposing passive and active knowledge as intended.

Regarding knowledge disposition, the interviewed director told me that there is no knowledge disposition mechanism as a strategy. This actually is one way of disposing passive knowledge. However, there is no means of identifying active knowledge from that of the passive ones. According to my practical observations and the complaint I heard from different instructors and trainers for a long period of time, almost all newly produced modules and training materials are the copy of the old ones. The writers simply copy from the old module using a copy command and, then pest it on the new one using the pest command. From this, we conclude that the university is very weak in disposing passive knowledge. It has no strategy to identify passive knowledge from the active ones. This means, both passive and active knowledge are shared together.

### 3.1.14. Mechanism of Knowledge Sharing Experiences in the University

- Evaluation 1: Are there mechanisms through which employees share experience among each other?

No,	Respondents	Evaluations criteria	Frequency	Weight in %
1	Management bodies	Yes	3	60
		No	2	40
		I don't know	0	0
		Total	5	100
2	Instructors	Yes	24	65
		No	12	33
		I don't know	1	2
		Total	37	100
3	Practitioners	Yes	29	41
		No	32	45
		I don't know	10	14
		Total	71	100

Table 17: Employees sharing experience

Source: Own survey, 2013

From the above Table 17 majority of the management bodies are mechanisms through which employees share experience to different organizations among the organizations and externally too. Regarding the instructors 65% of them are agree on mechanisms employees share experience in the university through different mechanisms, 33% are not agree on the idea and 2% of don't give their responses. The practitioners 45% are almost not agree on the ideas, 41% of them are agree on mechanisms through which employees share experience on knowledge sharing and 14% of them are not give their opinion.

From the interview, the director of public relation and Alumni director of the Ambo University emphasis that we have knowledge sharing mechanism between different institutions and university on knowledge sharing mechanisms of through which our employees share their opinion and knowledge of training, workshops and different bazaar in the university in different situation.

### 3.1.15. The Over All Success Faced During Knowledge Sharing In University

- Evaluation 1. Do you think that the university is successful in knowledge sharing?

No	Respondents	Evaluations criteria	Frequency	Weight in %
1	Management bodies	Yes	1	20
		No	4	80
		I don't know	0	0
		Total	5	100%
2	Instructors	Yes	14	38
		No	16	44
		I don't know	7	18
		Total	37	100%
3	Practitioners	Yes	28	40
		No	35	49
		I don't know	8	11
		Total	71	100%

Table 18: the success of university knowledge sharing

Source: Own survey, 2013

From the table, majority of practitioners 49%, majority of instructors 44%, & majority of management bodies 80% belief that the university has not effective in sharing knowledge among stakeholders. This indicates that the university is not successful in its knowledge sharing practice.

### 3.1.16. The Over All Challenges Faced during Knowledge Sharing in University?

- Evaluation 1. What challenges university faces during knowledge sharing?

S.No	Respondents	Evaluations criteria	Frequency	Weight in %
1	Management bodies	a	0	0
		b	1	20
		c	1	20
		d	1	20
		e	0	0
		f	2	40
		Total	5	100%
2	Instructors	A	12	32
		B	5	14
		C	9	24
		D	0	0
		E	11	30
		f	0	0
		Total	37	100%
3	Practitioners	A	20	28
		B	15	21
		C	14	20
		D	15	21
		E	7	10
		F	0	0
		Total	71	100%

Table 19: Challenges the college faced during knowledge sharing

Source: Own survey, 2013

From this table, different knowledge workers feel different reasons that hinder the university from being effective in knowledge sharing. To see them separately, 20%, 0 %, & 21 % of management bodies, Instructors and practitioners respectively belief that there is less or no reward for knowledge sharers; while as all of management bodies responds that, there is lack of awareness in employees

to share knowledge, majority of instructors and practitioners are also response that there is lack of awareness and weak organizational routines;

20%, 14%, & 21% management bodies , Instructors and practitioners respectively belief that there is lack of commitment from management side ; 0%, 0%, & 10 % management bodies , instructors and practitioners respectively belief that there is no knowledge sharing policy; 20 %, 24%, & 20 % management bodies , instructors and practitioners respectively belief that employees are not committed for knowledge sharing and finally no one propose another reason other than those listed in the questioner. At the end, Interview with director of Public relations and Alumni director of the university was asked to describe to what extent the university is successful in its knowledge sharing practice. The director answered that although now all most in a good positions and good status regarding knowledge their sharing practices. They also belief that there are limitations and more has to be done on this area.

For the question raised regarding what challenges they faced in their knowledge sharing practice, particularly, the director of Public relations and Alumni of the university put as a reason that there are lack of awareness about knowledge sharing, lack of commitment from management side, employees are not committed to share knowledge, and Knowledge sharer are denied adequate reward.

From the average values and interview data of both criteria 15 and criteria 16, the university is not successful in its knowledge sharing practice. Even, they cannot know whether it is successful or not. Because there is no awareness on this area. Knowledge is shared randomly and very occasionally. From the interview data, they are not in a position to think at least whether knowledge obstacles exist or not so that they can design tactics to make them at least minimum.

#### **4. Major Finding, Conclusions and Recommendations**

##### *4.1. Major Findings*

###### 4.1.1. Regarding Leadership vs Knowledge Sharing

From all the percentage values, Average values, and the interview, the major findings investigated in knowledge sharing of Ambo University; is that majority of practitioners, instructors and management bodies are beliefs that participatory leadership is adopted in the university and these current leadership styles also facilitates knowledge sharing in the university.

###### 4.1.2. Regarding Reward Packages

The major findings under this variable both the percentages, the average and information obtained from interview, majorities of knowledge workers disagree that the current reward package facilitates knowledge sharing among key knowledge workers. The university is not willing to give non-financial rewards such as learning opportunities according to knowledge workers want, particularly instructors' need in their relative areas of specializations.

###### 4.1.3. Regarding Employment Relations

From the point of this idea the interview data, other analysis shows that there is good employment relationship in the university and this employment relationship facilitates knowledge sharing in the university.

###### 4.1.5. Regarding Employee Assignment and Positioning

The major findings from the percentage values, Average values and interview data, indicate that there is a poor employee assignment practice in the university. The association between the current employee assignment practice of the university and its knowledge sharing practice is almost weak and misplacement of employee without their relative professions.

###### 4.1.4. Regarding Organizational Routines (Policies, Procedures, Programs, Rules, and Regulations)

The university has no intentionally designed organizational routines for the sake of knowledge sharing. The current organizational routines are hardly support the flow of knowledge from the source to end users. The university is also not aware of the role of organizational routines in facilitating knowledge sharing practices.

###### 4.1.5. Regarding Information Technology Infrastructures

Generally, from the percentage & average values and interview data, it is possible to summarize that there is adequate IT infrastructure in the university and this infrastructure facilitate knowledge sharing practices in the university.

###### 4.1.6. Regarding Organization Structure

The university has its own hierarchical organizational structure and this current organization structure facilitates knowledge sharing.

###### 4.1.7. Concerning Success and Challenge They Face during Knowledge Sharing

From the percentage values and interview data, the university is not successful in its knowledge sharing practice. From the interview data, they are not in a position to think whether knowledge obstacles exist or not. So that they can design tactics to make them at least minimum. It generally faced and is facing the challenges of designing and then aligning leadership styles, reward packages, employee relations, employee assignments and employee positioning strategies with its knowledge sharing practices. There is also a little awareness about the knowledge sharing practice on the overall success of the organization.

#### 4.2. Conclusions

Based on the finding of the study, there is a good association between the existing leadership style and the knowledge sharing practice of the university. From all these facts, it is possible to conclude that there is a participatory leadership style in the university, this leadership style facilitates knowledge sharing practices, and the university has poor reward package. From the interview, non-financial benefits such as learning opportunities are not given in line with the workers particularly, instructors' need. There is no career development for knowledge workers. The university is also very weak in conducting internal and external relationships concerning reward package. This leads poor reward package spontaneously kills the knowledge sharing practice in the university.

From the percentage and average values of evaluation and interview data, there is good employee relationship in the university and this employment relationship facilitates knowledge sharing and shows that the university has the problem in assigning knowledge workers. According to the respondent, the current employee assigning committees are not free, neutral and fair. There is also employee misplacement, which is intentionally occurred rather than downsizing workers. The university also not designed in a position to take knowledge sharing as one basic issue but, it has good position in IT infrastructure to the knowledge sharing practices.

Majority of the respondents of knowledge workers are agree that the existing organizational structure aids knowledge flow from one extreme to the other with insignificant obstacles. Generally, although the university is able to implement a team based organization structure, which is recommended by many scholars as something good to facilitate knowledge sharing. But the way they assign can hinder the team based organization structure from facilitating knowledge sharing. At the last respondents was asked to judge the overall success of the university in sharing knowledge is not success full in its knowledge sharing practice. The university also faced many challenges in its knowledge sharing practice. Some of the major challenges from the findings are: lack of awareness about knowledge sharing, lack of commitment from management side, employees are not committed to share knowledge, weak organizational routines, and Knowledge sharer are denied adequate reward.

#### 4.3. Recommendations

From the overall findings, there is a participatory leadership style in the Knowledge sharing practice of Ambo University requires changes the leadership style facilitates knowledge sharing practices. The initial findings clearly suggested the level of acceptance among the respondents of this study toward implementing knowledge sharing initiatives in their organization is positive. They were very supportive about the implementation, practices and culture.

Knowledge sharing within the university is dependent on changing employees' attitudes and behaviors to willingly share their knowledge. Based on this premise, obviously the respondents need to be convinced that the planned and proposed changes will bring about improvement and progression to their organization life. Unless and until these conditions are fulfilled, no significance change will become visible to the organization. The sharing knowledge depends on the attitude of people within that culture. If members of the culture are reluctant to share their knowledge, then there will be no way that the knowledge can be shared effectively.

The great problem of the university is lack of employee assignment policy. Its current assignment policy such as a BPR manual also becomes an obstacle in bringing workers to position particularly the team leaders. To solve such problem the university should able to have effective assignment policies in align with BPR document. From the overall finding, the current organizational routines are passive to facilitate knowledge sharing practices. There is also less awareness on to what extent active organizational routines accelerate the practice of knowledge sharing among stakeholders and solve by awareness creation concerning the impact on organizational routines on knowledge sharing.

The university has very poor in its knowledge edition and knowledge disposition mechanism. It has create awareness on the importance of knowledge edition and disposition, Knowledge workers should have an opportunity to expose themselves to different discussions, forums, and workshops and even further learning so that they examine the knowledge in their mind. In general, the university faced the challenge of strategically thinking leadership styles, reward packages, organizational routines, employee assignments and positioning mechanisms from the viewpoint of knowledge sharing. There is also no awareness concerning to what extent knowledge sharing is important for the overall success of the organization and the university should be create awareness about the concept of knowledge sharing practices and included knowledge sharing as one asset in the overall strategy of the university.

#### 5. References

- i. Alvin M.; Dorothy E. (1999). Knowledge Management Systems: Issues, Challenges, and Benefits
- ii. Alvin, M. and Lieder, D.E. (2001) Knowledge Management and Knowledge Management Systems: Conceptual Foundations and Research Issues, *Miss Quarterly* (25:1), Pp. 107-136.
- iii. Alwis R, Seedier-De, Hartmann E (2008).The Use Of Tacit Knowledge Within Innovative Companies: Knowledge Management in Innovative Enterprises. *J. Knowl. Manage.* 12(1): 133-147.
- iv. Andreas, (2010), organizational barriers, issues and challenges.
- v. Argot, I, Civil, B & Reagan, R (2003) Managing Knowledge In Organizations: An Integrative Framework And Review Of Emerging Themes. *Management Science*, 49, 571-582
- vi. Armstrong, M, Brown, D and Reilly, P (2010) Evidence-based Reward Management, Kogan Page, London.
- vii. Awed, E.M. And Ghazi, M.H. (2004), Knowledge Management, Pearson Education, Inc, Upper Saddle River.
- viii. Bartok, K. Srivastava,(2002). Encouraging knowledge sharing: The role of organizational reward systems. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 9(1),
- ix. Beckett, (1989) Forbidden Knowledge, *New Scientist*121, 76.new publish.

- x. Beckman, T. (1999). The Current State of Knowledge Management. In J. Liebowitz (Ed.), *Knowledge Management Handbook*: Curs Press.
- xi. Bergeron, (2003). 'Essentials of Knowledge Management'. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc
- xii. Birch am-Connolly, H., Corner, J & Bowden, S (2005) An Empirical Study Of The Impact Of Question Structure On Recipient Attitude During Knowledge Sharing. *The Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management*
- xiii. Bock, G. W, Kim, Y. G. (2002). Breaking the myths of rewards. *Information Resources Management Journal*, 15(2), 14–21.
- xiv. Brooking, A. (1999) *Corporate Memories, Strategies for Knowledge Management*. Thompson Business Press, London.
- xv. Brown, J. S., and Duguid, P. (1991) *Organizational Learning and Communities of Practice*," *Organization Science* (2:1), Pp. 40-57. *Case Study, Knowledge Management Research & Practice*, 1(1), 11-27.
- xvi. Connelly, C. E., & Kelowna, K. (2003) Predictors of Employees Perceptions of Knowledge Sharing Cultures. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal*, 24(5/6), Pp. 294-301
- xvii. Davenport, T. H., And Prussic, L. (1997) *Working Knowledge: How Organizations Manage What They Know*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston.
- xviii. Davenport, T., & Prussic, L (2000) *Working Knowledge*. Harvard Business School Press.
- xix. Davenport, T., Prussic, L. (1997) *Working Knowledge*," Harvard Business School Press, Boston,
- xx. Dawson, R. (2001). Knowledge capabilities as the focus of organizational development and strategy. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 4(4), 320–327.
- xxi. Detienne, k, Dyer, G, Hoppers, C, & Harris, S, (2000).effective knowledge management and direction for future research culture.
- xxii. Dixon, N. (2002) the Neglected Receiver of Knowledge Sharing. *Ivey Business Journal*.
- xxiii. Drucker, (1964). *Knowledge Worker: new target for management*. Christian Science Monitor. Retrieved June 3, 2009 from <http://drucker.cgu.edu>.
- xxiv. Dun Ford, R. (2000). Key challenges in the search for the effective management of knowledge in management consulting firms.
- xxv. Feldman and Pent lands, 2003, re-conceptualizations organization unit 6<sup>th</sup> edition, London.
- xxvi. Ford D.P. and Chan Y.E. (2003) *Knowledge Sharing in a multi-cultural setting: A*
- xxvii. Frees et al. (1999), and Tesluk et al (1997), *Managing knowledge for competitive advantage*.
- xxviii. Grander, & Kogut, B. (2002). Dialogue on organization and knowledge. *Organization Science*, 13(3), 224–231.
- xxix. Grant, R. M. (1996) *Toward A Knowledge-Based Theory of the Firm*, *Strategic Management Journal* (17), Pp. 109-122.
- xxx. Gupta J.; Sharma S. (2004). *Creating Knowledge Based Organizations*,Pp-114-118.
- xxxi. Gupta & Govindarajan, (2000) *Knowledge Management's Social Dimension: Lessons from Nucor Steel*, *Sloan Management Review* (42:1) Pp. 71-80.
- xxxii. Gupta, K., & Michailova, S (2004) *Knowledge Sharing In Knowledge-Intensive Firms: Opportunities and Limitations of Knowledge Codification*.
- xxxiii. Gurteen, (1999). *Creating a Knowledge Sharing Culture*.
- xxxiv. Handpick M. and Hassan H. (2003), *The Search for an Integrated KM Framework'*, Chapter 1, pp 3-34, Hassan H. and Handpick M. (Eds) *Australian Studies in Knowledge Management*, UOW Press, Wollongong.
- xxxv. Hein, (2004). 'Knowledge Sharing on Tap,' *Inside knowledge magazine*.
- xxxvi. Hendricks, (1999). Why share knowledge? The influence of ICT on the motivation for knowledge sharing. *Knowledge and Process Management*, 6(2), 91–100
- xxxvii. Kaser & Miles, R. E. (2002). Understanding knowledge activists successes and failures. *Long Range Planning*, 35(1), 9–28.
- xxxviii. Law she, C. H. And Steinberg, M. C. *Studies In Synthetic Validity I: An Exploratory Investigation Of Clerical Jobs*. *Personnel Psychology* (1955), 8, 291-301.
- xxxix. Law, C.H. (1975). A Quantitative Approach to Content Validity. *Personnel Psychology*, 28, 563–575.
- xl. Lee, D. D., & Ann, J. H. (2005). Rewarding Knowledge Sharing Under Measurement Inaccuracy. *Knowledge Management Research & Practice*, 3, 229-243.
- xli. Maier (2007): *Knowledge Management Systems*, sixth edition pp, 233-235.
- xlii. Monika , (1991). "The Knowledge Creating Company." *Personnel Psychology*, 28, 563–575.
- xliii. Monika I.; Von K., Georg (2009). "Tacit Knowledge and Knowledge Conversion"
- xliv. Monika, I. & Takeuchi, and H. (1995) *The Knowledge Creating Company: How Japanese Companies Create The Dynamics Of Innovation*". New York: Oxford University Press.
- xlv. Monika, I. (1994) *A Dynamic Theory Of Organizational Knowledge Creation*, *Organization Science*, (5:1) Pp. 134-139.
- xlvi. Murray, P. (2002), "Knowledge management as a sustained competitive advantage", *Ivey Business Journal*, Vol. 66 No. 4, pp. 71-7.
- xlvii. Nanjappa A. Grant, (2003). *Constructing On Constructivism: The Role of Technology*"
- xlviii. O'Dell, C, & Grayson, J. C. (2001) *If Only we knew What We Know: The Transfer of Internal Knowledge and Best Practice*, New York: The Free Press
- xlix. Pan and Scarborough (1998). *Culture, Structure, Technology*. Von Krogh, et al (2000). *Knowledge Vision, Manage Conversations, and. Mobilize Knowledge*.
1. Polanyi, M. *The Tacit Dimension*, London,( 1996) UK: Rutledge and Kean.

- li. Prussic, L. (1998). What's Up With Knowledge Management: A Personal View, In J.Cortada & J. Woods (Eds.), the Knowledge Management Year Book (Pp. 1-7). Boston: Butterworth Heinemann.
- lii. Rao, (2005). Review: Knowledge Management: concepts and best practices. Journal of Information and Knowledge Management, 3(2), 123-5.
- liii. Rick Young,(2006) Research Design and Statistical Analysis For Christian Ministry,4th Ed.
- liv. Ridge, (2005). Three-Dozen Knowledge Sharing Barriers Managers Must Consider. Journal of Knowledge Management, 9(3), 18-35.
- lv. Santos,(2001) KM and Human Nature, CIO.com "In the Know", [http://www.cio.com/knowledge/edit/k121801\\_nature.html](http://www.cio.com/knowledge/edit/k121801_nature.html).
- lvi. Szulanski, G. (1996). Exploring internal stickiness: Impediments to the transfer of best practice within the firm. Strategic Management Journal, 17 , 27-43.
- lvii. Ultra, V. (2005), Knowledge Management Effectiveness Factors: The Role of HRM. Journal of Knowledge Management, 9(4), 70-86.
- lviii. Willem, A., & Scarborough, (2002) Structural Effects On Inter-Unit Knowledge Sharing