



**A STUDY ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN KNOWLEDGE SHARING AND  
ORGANISATIONAL LEARNING**

**BİLGİ PAYLAŞIMI VE ÖRGÜTSEL ÖĞRENME ARASINDAKİ İLİŞKİ ÜZERİNE BİR  
ÇALIŞMA**

**Mustafa ZEYADA**

PhD Student, Kastamonu University Social Sciences Institute, woow8814@yahoo.com,  
Kastamonu/Turkey

**Prof. Dr. Yavuz DEMIREL**

Kastamonu University Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences,  
ydemirel@kastamonu.edu.tr, Kastamonu/Turkey

**ABSTRACT**

The combination of knowledge sharing and organisational learning is of significant importance to organisations. If the organisation is able to share its knowledge and improve its learning, it becomes more efficient and effective. This study begins by discussing and presenting previous studies on how to exchange knowledge among employees and how to involve organisational learning to improve and develop the organisation. The methodology used was a questionnaire distributed to 200 staff members of the Department of Administrative Affairs of the Libyan Ministry of Justice. The intent of the questionnaire was to study the areas of learning and knowledge sharing among the selected staff. The number of questionnaires received was 164. Four were rejected for incomplete responses, leaving 160 (80%) of the sample as suitable for statistical analysis. As a result of the study, a positive relationship was found between job-based outside department knowledge sharing /job-based inter-department knowledge sharing and free knowledge sharing and organisational learning. Finally, this study found a positive relationship between freedom of knowledge sharing and organisational learning. This paper also makes key recommendations regarding the development of organisational learning and knowledge sharing in the Libyan Ministry of Justice.

**Keywords:** Knowledge, Knowledge Sharing, Learning, Organisational Learning.

**ÖZ**

Bilgi paylaşımı ve örgütsel öğrenmenin birleşimi, örgütler için büyük önem taşımaktadır. Eğer örgütler bilgi paylaşımını ve örgütsel öğrenmeyi geliştirebilirlerse, daha verimli ve etkili olurlar. Bu çalışma, çalışanlar arasında bilgi alışverişinin nasıl yapılacağı ve organizasyonun geliştirilmesi ve geliştirilmesi için örgütsel öğrenmenin nasıl dahil edileceğine ilişkin önceki yapılan çalışmaların tartışılması sonucu şekillenmiştir. Bu bağlamda, Libya Adalet Bakanlığı İdari İşler Dairesinde çalışan toplam 200 çalışana yönelik bir anket çalışması yapılmıştır. Anketin amacı, örgütsel öğrenme ve bilgi paylaşımı arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemektir. Dağıtılan anketlerden 164'ünden geri dönüş sağlanmıştır. Ancak dört anket eksik cevaplandırıldığı için değerlendirilmeye alınmamıştır. Dolayısıyla 160 anket üzerinden istatistiksel analizler yapılmıştır. Çalışmanın sonucunda, işe dayalı bölüm içi bilgi paylaşımı, işe dayalı bölüm dışı bilgi paylaşımı ve serbest bilgi paylaşımı ile örgütsel öğrenme arasında pozitif ilişki tespit edilmiştir. Çalışma aynı zamanda, Libya Adalet Bakanlığı'nda örgütsel öğrenme ve bilgi paylaşımının geliştirilmesine ilişkin önemli tavsiyelere yer verilmiştir.

**Anahtar kelimeler:** Bilgi, Bilgi Paylaşımı, Öğrenme, Örgütsel Öğrenme.

**1. INTRODUCTION**

Libya is attempting to change its consumer economy based on oil revenues to an industry-based economy that relies on service quality to manage the difficulties that it faces in the 21st century. Knowledge is a key resource in organisations and knowledge administration has become a very familiar topic. As mentioned by Nonaka and Konno (1998), learning is a process of explaining and changing the practice of sharing, distributing, making and perceiving as related to knowledge. Managing learning is a way to clarify and develop a method for the distribution, administration, organisation and understanding of organised

knowledge. Knowledge is an asset to be decided on, formed and directed (Bogdanowitz & Bailey, 2002). Typically, employees and employers in an organisation exchange knowledge (O'Dell & Grayson, 1998). Knowledge distribution is a manner through which one exchanges knowledge and ideas through consultations to devise additional information or views. Hislop (2002) stated that the link between workers' beliefs and behaviours, the sharing of knowledge and workers seeking to share their knowledge represents a two-way method that connects the beliefs and behaviour with the passion of employees and encourages them to participate in information sharing (Alam & Abdullah, 2009).

According to Cheng (2002), information participation can help employees better understand their businesses and receive personal attention within the organisation. Once the information is obtained, the organisation can enjoy a sustainable competitive advantage. Many employees relate by sharing their information (Chow et al., 2000). These authors determined that this event occurs because employees fear the loss of valuable knowledge and their jobs. Learning aims to acquire skills, perspectives, strategies and knowledge transfer, and learning accompanies innovation, recognition, creativity, creation and innovation of new knowledge (Amin et al., 2001).

The main objective of organisational learning is to improve the characteristics and volume of performance and service delivery. In addition, organisations that learn faster should increase their strategic capabilities to enable them to better promote their competitive advantages. These attitudes, behaviours and organisational learning strategies are guidelines for organisations to realise superior long-term performance (Garcia-Morale et al., 2006).

Continuous learning is a process that takes place over time. Those who seek continuous learning acquire knowledge, improve their performance, master acquiring and imparting knowledge and work to change or modify their behaviours with the assistance of the new knowledge gained. Knowledge, innovation and creativity are the cornerstones of continuous learning. Knowledge is not enough for organisations, which must be able to apply that knowledge in their behaviours and practices until they adjust and evolve from their processes. As a result, that official in the Department of Justice provide increased learning opportunities for all staff to improve their performance is appropriate (Angazi et al., 2016).

## **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

This article provides a context from the literature regarding both practical and theoretical expressions that underpin the methodology.

### **2.1. Knowledge and Knowledge Sharing**

According to Davenport and Prusak (1998), knowledge is a fluid mix of framed experience, values, contextual information, and experts that provide a structure for assessing and integrating different expertise plus knowledge'. In the system, knowledge is usually displayed not only in records or wardrobes but also in organisational styles and courses. Knapp (1998) defined knowledge as 'information at work, where information is applied accurately for a particular purpose and/or during a specific task'. Burke (2000) defined knowledge as 'the meaning derived from other information and knowledge'. The aforementioned most comprehensive definition of knowledge is that which is mentioned by Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995), who stated that individual knowledge can typically be described as 'the theoretical and practical know-how associated with personal values believed to arrive at through accumulated experience and that direct individual decisions'.

According to Cabrera and Cabrera (2002) and Wang et al. (2008), the exchange of information at work is through the explicit or implicit dissemination of opinions, expertise, talents or technology among workers, individually or as a group. This knowledge is transmitted through both vertical and horizontal changes. Sharing knowledge from participants requires interacting with one another, either face-to-face or through written documents and virtual communities Behnke (2010). Sharing knowledge at work may require knowledge or knowledge of when or why (Al-Zu'bi, 2011). Such sharing may include documents related to work, regulations, work procedures or personal experiences (Lu et al., 2006), and can include knowledge of and in forms such as organisational news and individual communication.

Storytelling, reciprocal meetings and industrial training are methods of sharing traditional knowledge'. Additionally, information technology devices such as collaborative software e-mail and online meetings create more ways to share space and time (Al-Zu'bi, 2011). A decrease in knowledge-sharing results in knowledge losses, which historically have led to organisational inefficiencies. Most studies indicated that

knowledge sharing is a subsystem within the knowledge administration process, on the one hand, or a subsystem for knowledge administration and sharing knowledge, on the other hand.

## 2.2. Application of Knowledge

Application of knowledge allows for individual and collective learning, which creates new knowledge (Kubaisi, 2005). Employees must realise that knowledge is available to them and that they have the right to act on and apply it through the support of a culture of learning and change. Laudon and Laudon (2004) argued that a lack of knowledge sharing and the implementation of real problems faced by organisations are not useful to these entities. Instead, they are considered systemic penalties of administrative decision-making that become supportive through decision-making systems.

## 2.3. Important Characteristics of Knowledge:

We can list the important characteristics of the knowledge as follows (Sharp, 2007):

- ✓ Human use of skills acquired through experience;
- ✓ Linked to its organisational context and value when specifically designed for it;
- ✓ Exchange effective, valuable and/or competitive advantages of organisations, especially when applied in their organisational context;
- ✓ Should be available in an appropriate form wherever and whenever necessary throughout the organisation; and
- ✓ Has value when it can be shared and shared with others.

## 2.4. Organisational Learning

One approach of organisations is to build, develop and organise knowledge about their activities and cultures, and to increase organisational efficiency through better use of their staffs' talents and expertise (Dodgson, 1993). Goh and Richards (1997) described organisational learning in terms of single and double learning. Individual learning requires strategies, goals and values that remain constant in a reflective learning cycle. Double-loop learning involves thinking about and perhaps modifying the basic assumptions that support strategies, goals and values (Argeres & Shawn, 1978). Determining whether one or both types of learning occur in an organisation and measuring the effectiveness of learning in an organisation are important, and one or both options should be identified within the organisation. Organizational learning, error detection and the correction process. Organizational learning is guiding behavior with results drawn from the past (Garvin, 1999). Organizational learning is the end result of sharing collective experiences, knowledge, organizational beliefs and values. Studies in organisational learning have identified a particular dimension of organisational learning, such as those by Marquardt and Reynolds (1993) and Denton (1998) and Goh (1998), which adopted a general model of distance learning for organisational learning:

- ✓ A strategy for organisational learning (strategic dimension);
- ✓ Flexible organisational structure that supports the learning process within organisations (organisational dimension); and
- ✓ Organisational culture that supports organisational learning (cultural dimension).

## 3. METHOD

### 3.1. Data and Sample

The research was descriptive and was carried out as a field study. The randomly selected sample included 200 employees from the Department of Administrative and Financial Affairs of the Libyan Ministry of Justice. The sample was given a questionnaire prepared for assessment, testing, verification of the study hypotheses and to study learning areas and exchange of knowledge among the selected staff. The number of responses received was 164. Four questionnaires were dropped for incomplete responses, and 160 (80%) valid responses were used.

### 3.2. Research Hypotheses

To achieve the objectives of the study, the following hypotheses were developed and tested.

1. H<sub>1</sub>: Appositive relationship exists between job based outside department knowledge sharing and organisational learning.
2. H<sub>1</sub>: A positive relationship exists between job-based inter-department knowledge sharing and organisational learning.
3. H<sub>1</sub>: Appositive relationship exists between freely shared knowledge and organisational learning.

### 3.3. Analyses

Table 1 indicates the reliability and validity of the study variables according to the Cronbach's alpha scale (> 65%), which was very good. Thus, the researcher was allowed to conduct statistical analysis and obtain good results. The reliability of the knowledge-sharing scale was 75% and the organisational learning scale was 90%.

**Table 1: Reliability and Validity of Scales**

	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
Knowledge Sharing Scale (Pham, 2015)	,75	16
Organisational Learning Scale (Vander Slice, 2014)	,90	11

This study was designed to establish the relationship between organisational learning and knowledge sharing among employees. Factor analysis was used to determine the validity of the sample size and the data. Table 1 indicates that all values are valid for the analysis and that the measures used in and the sample size of the study is valid for the analysis and consistent with the organisational learning scale and the knowledge-sharing parameters.

Factor1 (KSF1): Job-based outside department knowledge sharing.

Factor2 (KSF2): Job-based inter-department knowledge sharing.

Factor3 (KSF3): Freely sharing knowledge.

#### 3.3.1. Factor Analysis: Knowledge Sharing & Organisational Learning

**Table 2: Factor Analysis-Knowledge Sharing**

##### KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy		.717
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-square	465.500
	Df	91
	Sig.	.001

##### Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigen values			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotated Component Matrix (Factors and Loading)		
	Total	% of Variance	Cum. %	Total	% of Variance	Cum. %	1	2	3
1 (KSF1)	3,148	24,213	24,213	3,148	24,213	18,014	,822		
2 (KSF1)	2,006	15,428	39,641	2,006	15,428	34,222	,783		
3 (KSF1)	1,279	9,836	49,477	1,279	9,836	49,477	,690		
4 (KSF1)	1,058	8,136	57,614				,529		
5 (KSF2)	,929	7,143	64,757					,707	
6 (KSF2)	,773	5,949	70,706					,680	
7 (KSF2)	,701	5,395	76,100					,588	
8 (KSF2)	,699	5,380	81,481					,551	
9 (KSF2)	,603	4,637	86,118					,502	
10 (KSF3)	,566	4,357	90,475						,709
11 (KSF3)	,489	3,762	94,237						,598
12 (KSF3)	,422	3,249	97,486						,574
13 (KSF3)	,327	2,514	100,000						,524

Note: KS: Knowledge Sharing

Table 2 explains the results obtained from the analysis of the knowledge-sharing factor. Table 2 clearly indicates that this factor is explained by three main factors with total scores of 18.014, 34.22 and 49.477. This sample efficiency factor (KMO) were .717 and the level of validity of the scale, at 0.05, was high.

**Table 3 Factor Analysis: Organisational Learning KMO and Bartlett's Test**

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy		,866
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-square	711,559
	df	36
	Sig.	,001

**Total Variance Explained**

Component	Initial Eigen values			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		Total Variance Explained	Factor Loading
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance		
1 (OL1)	4,955	55,052	55,052	4,955	55,052	55,052	,663
2 (OL2)	,870	9,670	64,722				,721
3 (OL3)	,738	8,205	72,926				,763
4 (OL4)	,619	6,873	79,800				,777
5 (OL5)	,478	5,311	85,110				,740
6 (OL6)	,441	4,898	90,009				,730
7 (OL7)	,369	4,096	94,104				,794
8 (OL8)	,326	3,627	97,732				,766
9 (OL9)	,204	2,268	100,000				,715

Note: OL; organisational learnin

Table 3 presents the results of the validity analysis on organisational learning. Organisational learning illustrates one factor and a variance of 55.052%. The reliability coefficients were very high. In addition, the load factor values were generally higher than 0.50. From Table 3, the sample adequacy factor was calculated as .866, indicating that the scale has high validity. Through the analysis presented from Tables 2 and 3, the scale was decided as having high validity.

### 3.3.2 Research Findings

According to Table 4, the results of the statistical analysis of the demographic data show that the largest participation rate (30.0%) was for the 31–40 age group, followed by the 41–50 age group (28.1%) and the less than 30 age group (23.8%). The lowest percentage was for the age group older than 50 years (18.1%). The percentage of women was slightly higher than that of men (51.3%) and men relative to education levels for male employees (48.1%). The percentage of students receiving a bachelor's degree was 48.1%, followed by 22.5% (13.8%), secondary certificate holders (12.5%) and holders of PhD degrees (3.1%). As shown in Table 4, the highest percentage of practical experience in an organisation or work life, respectively, was from 11 to 15 years (40.0% and 35.6%).

**Table4 Characteristic Demographics of Sample (N= 160)**

Items	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Gender	Male	77	48,1	48,1
	Female	82	51,3	51,3
	Unanswered	1	,6	,6
	Total	160	100	100
	Married	109	68,1	68,1
	Signal	49	30,6	30,6
	Unanswered	2	1,3	1,3
	Total	160	100	100
Age	Less than 30	38	23,8	23,8
	From 31 to 40	48	30,0	53,8
	From 41 to 50	45	28,1	81,9
	More than 51	29	18,1	100,0
	Total	160	100,0	100,0
Education	H- school degree	20	12,5	12,5
	Institute degree	36	22,5	35,0
	Bachelor's degree	77	48,1	83,1
	Master's degree	22	13,8	96,9
	PhD degree	5	3,1	100,0
	Total	160	100,0	100,0



Experience in Life	Less than 5 years	11	6,9	6,9	6,9
	From 5 to 10	41	25,6	25,6	32,5
	From 11 to 15	64	40,0	40,0	72,5
	More than 16	43	26,9	26,9	99,4
	Unanswered	1	,6	,6	100,0
Total	160	100,0	100,0		
Experience in Current	Less than 5	18	11,3	11,3	11,3
	From 5 to 10	50	31,3	31,3	42,5
	From 11 to 15	57	35,6	35,6	78,1
	More than 16	35	21,9	21,9	100,0
	Total	160	100,0	100,0	

**Table 5. Descriptive Statistics**

Organisational Learning and Knowledge Sharing	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Organisational learning	3,4799	,74898	160
KSF1: Job-based outside-departmental knowledge sharing	3,0156	,82163	160
KSF2: Job-based intra-departmental knowledge sharing	3,9137	,58819	160
KSF3: Freely sharing knowledge	2,9063	,73691	160

Table 5 presents the descriptive statistics produced by SPSS for the final study data, indicating the average weight for 160 responses on knowledge sharing and organisational learning. The information on descriptive statistics does not influence the regression analysis. However, the data in Table 5 were useful to summarise the means and standard deviations for the values of all of the variables collected from survey participants.

**Table 6. Relationship between Knowledge Sharing and Organisational Learning**

		Organisational Learning	KSF1	KSF2	KSF3
Organisational Learning	Pearson Correlation	1			
	Sig. (two-tailed)				
	N	160			
KSF1	Pearson Correlation	<b>,244**</b>	1		
	Sig. (two-tailed)	,002			
	N	160	160		
KSF2	Pearson Correlation	<b>,213**</b>	<b>,217**</b>	1	
	Sig. (two-tailed)	,007	,006		
	N	160	160	160	
KSF3	Pearson Correlation	<b>,197*</b>	<b>,394**</b>	,097	1
	Sig. (two-tailed)	,013	,000	,221	
	N	160	160	160	160

\*\* The correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed). \* the correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed). . the correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed).

Included in the descriptive statistics, the correlation table contains a matrix that uses Pearson's correlation coefficient values, one-tailed significance and the number of cases that contribute to the correlation, as shown in Table 6. Through the results, the researcher revealed that the field of knowledge sharing is positively related to the field of organisational learning at a statistical significance (0.01) and by an amount (0.244). Departments have a positive correlation with the field of organisational learning at a statistical significance (0.05) and by an amount (0.213), and the knowledge-sharing function is as follows.

The exchange of knowledge is freely related to the field of organisational learning at a statistical significance (0.05) and by an amount (0.197). Given the previous findings, a positive relationship exists between the organisational learning variable, the knowledge-sharing variable and the three variables arising from the knowledge-sharing variable.

This result confirms the validity of the hypotheses of the study. The results of the hypotheses are as follows.

1. H<sub>1</sub>: A positive relationship exists between job-based outside department knowledge sharing and organisational learning. (Accept)
2. H<sub>1</sub>: A positive relationship exists between job-based inter-department knowledge sharing and organisational learning. (Accept)
3. H<sub>1</sub>: A positive relationship exists between freely sharing knowledge and organisational learning. (Accept)

Of these findings, we can say that the objectives of the study have been achieved. The results indicate a good level of knowledge-based external exchange of work and organisational learning among the staff in the Department of Administrative and Financial Affairs at the Ministry of Justice. The first hypothesis is realised, and a good positive relationship exists with inter-departmental knowledge management, knowledgesharing and organisational learning. Finally, a positive relationship exists between the knowledge of free learning and organisational learning and the achievement of the third hypothesis. This result shows that sharing knowledge and learning in an organisation has positive effect on employees. This study is in line with that of Al-Zu'bi (2011) entitled, 'Organisational Citizenship and Impacts on Knowledge Sharing: An Empirical Study'. The study was conducted in Jordan and showed that the behaviour of organisational citizenship enhances knowledge sharing. The study of Alam et al. (2009) entitled, 'Assessing Knowledge-Sharing Behaviour among Employees in SMEs: An Empirical Study', emphasised that the equivalence, trust, technology and cultural factors are mainly influenced by the knowledge exchange process—according to Cabrera and Cabrera (2002) and Wang et al. (2008)—at work with respect to explicitly or implicitly disseminating views, experiences, talents or technology among workers individually or as groups. This knowledge moves vertically and horizontally through changes. Sharing knowledge requires participants to interact with one another, either face-to-face or through written documents and virtual communities.

#### 4. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study was conducted in a theoretical framework developed from previous studies in this field to determine whether a relationship exists between the exchange of knowledge and organisational learning among the staff at the Department of Administrative and Financial Affairs of the Ministry of Justice. Given the statistical analysis of the sample data used in this study, the researcher reached the following results.

1. A positive statistically significant relationship exists between knowledge exchange and organisational learning factors.
2. The degree of knowledge-sharing practice is high among the Department of Management staff at the Ministry of Justice, as is the case with organisational learning but to a lesser degree.
3. This study had a limited scope as defined by employees of the Department of Administrative and Financial Affairs of the Ministry of Justice. Therefore, the results of this study cannot be extended to other departments at the Ministry.

#### Recommendations

- ✓ Develop a strategy to consolidate the concept of knowledge and its importance, programmes and applications through training programmes, seminars and scientific conferences.
- ✓ Establish specialised section of knowledge in the organisational structure that manages knowledge and promotes the culture of knowledge sharing and dissemination throughout the Ministry.
- ✓ Promote participation in knowledge through communication and mass gatherings, and the establishment of lectures, seminars and active participation in scientific conferences inside and outside the Ministry.
- ✓ Search for new knowledge through modern means of communication that benefit from World Wide Web (Internet) services.
- ✓ Monitor the knowledge generated by the experiences of individuals at the Ministry, keep them in a database and make them useful and available to researchers and reviewers.
- ✓ Adopt a comprehensive building at the Ministry for processing organisational learning, spread a culture of learning and provide an environment conducive to such a culture.
- ✓ Adopt an organisational structure that allows democratic relations, encourages communication and participation and gives way to creative ideas.

#### REFERENCES

- Alam, S. S., Abdullah, Z., Ishak, N. A., & Zain, Z. M. (2009). Assessing knowledge sharing behaviour among employees in SMEs: An empirical study. *International Business Research*, 2(2), 115.
- Al-Zu'bi, H. A. (2011). Organizational citizenship behavior and impacts on knowledge sharing: An empirical study. *International business research*, 4(3), 221.

- Amin, A., Bargach, S. A. A. D., Donegan, J. I. M., Martin, C, Smith, R., Burgoyne, M., & Kornberg, R. (2001). Building a knowledge-sharing culture. *Oilfield Review*, 13(1), 48-65.
- Angazi, H., Keshtmand, Z., & Moradi, M. (2016). Regression analysis of organizational learning (OL) and knowledge management (KM) on organizational Citizenship behavior (OCB)-A case study: youth and sports departments of Kermanshah province. *European Journal of Physical Education and Sport Science*.
- Argyris, C. and Donald, S. (1978). *Organizational learning: A theory of action perspective*. reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Behnke, T. M. (2010). *Knowledge sharing at work: An examination of organizational antecedents*. St. Ambrose University.
- Bogdanowicz, M. S., & Bailey, E. K. (2002) The value of knowledge and the values of the new knowledge worker: generation X in the new economy. *Journal of European industrial training*, 26(2/3/4), 125-129.
- Burke, M. (2000). *Thinking together: new forms of thought system for a revolution in military affairs* (No. dsto-rr-0173). Defiance science and technology organisation Salisbury (Australia).
- Cabrera, A., & Cabrera, E. F. (2002). Knowledge-sharing dilemmas. *Organization studies*, 23(5), 687-710.
- Cheng, M.Y. (2002). Socialising knowledge management: The influence of the opinion leader, *Journal of Knowledge Management Practice*, 3(3).
- Chow, C. W., Deng, F. J., & Ho, J. L. (2000). The openness of knowledge sharing within organizations: A comparative study of the United States and the People's Republic of China. *Journal of Management Accounting Research*, 12(1), 65-95.
- Davenport, T. and Prusak, L. (1998). *Working knowledge - how organizations manage what they know*, Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Davenport, T. H., & Prusak, L. (1998). *Working knowledge: How organizations manage what they know*. Harvard Business Press.
- Denton, J. (1998). *Organisational learning and effectiveness*. Routledge 11 New Fetter Lane London.
- Dodgson, M. (1993). Organizational learning: a review of some literatures. *Organization studies*, 14(3), 375-394.
- Garcia-Morales, V. J., Lopez-Martin, F. J., & Llamas-Sánchez, R. (2006). Strategic factors and barriers for promoting educational organizational learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 22(4), 478-502.
- Garvin, D.A., (1999). *Öğrenen bir örgüt yaratmak, bilgi yönetimi, (Çeviren, Gündüz Bulut), İstanbul: BZD Yayın İletişim*.
- Goh, S. C. & Richards, G. (1997). Benchmarking the learning capability of organizations. *European Management Journal* 15(5), 575-583.
- Hislop, D. (2002). Managing knowledge and the problem of commitment, *The Third European Conference on Organisational Knowledge, Learning, and Capabilities*, Astir Palace, Athens, 5-6 April, 2002.
- Knapp, E. M. (1998). Knowledge management. *Business & Economic Review*. 44(4), 3-6.
- Kubaisi Salahuddin "Knowledge Management "Arab Organization for Administrative Development Egypt (2005)
- Laudon, K. C., & Laudon, J. P. (2004). *Management information systems: Managing the digital firm*. New Jersey, 8.
- Lu, L., Leung, K., & Koch, P. T. (2006). Managerial knowledge sharing: The role of individual, interpersonal, and organizational factors. *Management and Organization Review*, 2(1), 15-41.
- Marquardt, M. & Reynolds, A. (1993). *A review of "The Global Learning Organization"* New York, Irwin.
- Ming Yu, C. (2002). Socializing knowledge management: The influence of the opinion leader. *Journal of Knowledge Management Practice*, 3(3), 76-83.



- Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge-creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*. Oxford university press.
- Nonaka, L., & Konno, N. (1998). The concept of 'ba': Building a foundation for knowledge creation, *California Management Review*, 40(3), 40-54.
- O'dell, C., & Grayson, C. J. (1998). If only we know what we know: Identification and transfer of internal best practices. *California management review*, 40(3), 154-174.
- Pham, P. H. (2015). *Correlates of Knowledge-Sharing Behaviors among Public Housing Authorities*, Doctoral Dissertation, Walden University.
- Rhodes, J., Hung, R., Lok, P., Ya-Hui Lien, B., & Wu, C. M. (2008). Factors influencing organizational knowledge transfer: implication for corporate performance. *Journal of knowledge management*, 12(3), 84-100.
- Sharp, P. (2007). MaKE first steps—how a definition of knowledge can help your organisation. *The Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management*, 5(4), 487-496.
- Vander Slice, G. (2014). *Strategic optimization of organizational learning and tacit knowledge sharing in knowledge intensive organizations*, Doctoral Dissertation, Alliant International University.
- Wang, C. L., Ahmed, P. K. & Rafiq, M. (2008). Knowledge management orientation: construct development and empirical validation. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 17(3), 219-235.