Eylül 2014 Cilt:22 No:3 Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi 1229-1242

ACADEMIC KNOWLEDGE AND PERSONAL KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT IN A DEVELOPING UNIVERSITY: A CASE STUDY

Çise ÇAVUŞOĞLU, Hüseyin UZUNBOYLU
Near East University, Atatürk Education Faculty, Nicosia, North Cyprus

İlk Kayıt Tarihi: 09.09.2013 ***Yayına Kabul Tarihi: 11.04.2014***

Abstract

This study aimed to find out the approaches of academic staff towards Personal Knowledge Management (PKM) in a developing university in Northern Cyprus by focusing on the four PKM strategies and techniques, i.e. obtaining, saving, using, and sharing knowledge. The study was designed as a case study where a questionnaire was distributed to all academics at the university. Mean scores and independent sample t-tests were used in the analysis. The findings suggest that in this developing university, general attitudes of the staff towards PKM strategies are positive. However, while strategies for effectively using and saving knowledge were widely used, strategies for obtaining new information and sharing it with colleagues were not so popular. Significant differences were found in all dimensions between the staff who had publications at national scientific meetings and those who hadn't.

Keywords: *Knowledge management, personal knowledge management, developing university, academic staff*

GELİŞMEKTE OLAN BİR ÜNİVERSİTEDE AKADEMİK BİLGİ VE KİŞİSEL BİLGİ YÖNETİMİ: BİR ÖRNEK DURUM ÇALIŞMASI

Özet

Bu çalışma Kuzey Kıbrıs'ta gelişmekte olan bir üniversitede çalışan akademik personelin Kişisel Bilgi Yönetimi'ne (KBY) karşı olan tutumlarını bilgi edinme, saklama, kullanma ve paylaşma boyutlarını ele alarak incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Çalışma bir durum çalışması olarak desenlenmiş olup, üniversitedeki tüm akademik personele konuyla ilgili hazırlanan bir anket dağıtılmıştır. Veri analizi ortalama ve t-test hesaplamaları kullanılarak gerçekleştirilmiştir. Bulgular sözkonusu üniversitede akademik personelin KBY'ne olan genel tutumlarının olumlu olduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Ancak, bilgiyi kullanma ve saklama yöntemleri etkili biçimde kullanılırken, yeni bilgi edinme ve bilgi paylaşımına yönelik yöntemlerin akademisyenler arasında pek yaygın olmadığı ortaya çıkmıştır. Analiz edilen tüm boyutlarda ulusal toplantılarda bilimsel yayını bulunan ve bulunmayan akademisyenler arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı farklar bulunmştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Bilgi yönetimi, kişisel bilgi yönetimi, gelişmekte olan üniversite, akademik personel*

1. INTRODUCTİON

Unlike the industrial era, where manufacturing and producing good quality commodities were enough to become the leader of world economy, knowledge and information have proved to be the new sources of power in world economy. Alfred Toffler (1990) was one of the first to point out that "knowledge" is in fact the main source of power. Accumulation and successful utilization of knowledge is the main catalyst for change and further development. As the body of knowledge produced in various fields of science and literature increases, a greater need for managing the existing knowledge as well as organizing the newly produced ones becomes inescapable. It is clear now that people who are good at obtaining, saving, using, and sharing knowledge are the ones who are successful and powerful (Barutçugil, 2002; Gorelick, April, & Milton, 2004, Sánchez, 2010). Therefore, getting better at knowledge management practices has become one of the primary goals of every sector, including higher education (Dereceli, 2011).

The idea behind Knowledge Management (KM) is that knowledge brings power only when it is managed correctly. The term "KM" was first used in the business world to pinpoint the importance of knowledge in increasing profits. Later, it is realized that KM, in fact, is not only needed to increase the money earned by an organization but also necessary to meet customer demands, to bring about an organizational culture, and to increase knowledge itself. In this way, organizations are able to adapt to the social and philosophical changes that take place in the society (Hellstöm, 2004; Yeniçeri, 2002). They are also able to increase their chances of survival, which is the main struggle in today's competitive business markets (Hellstöm, 2004; Paul, 2005).

Many scholars agree that knowledge management has four main dimensions. These are obtaining, saving, using and sharing knowledge. If a person wants to manage knowledge productively, first of all he/she needs to know where and how knowledge can best be obtained. It is very much necessary to utilize reliable sources and maintain a flow of information in order to be able to manage knowledge successfully (Davenport & Prusak, 1998, as cited in Başaran, 2002). Especially in big organizations, obtaining the most reliable knowledge in the least possible amount of time is very important in terms of increasing the quality of the product. After a piece of knowledge is obtained, it must be kept because the more knowledge one possesses the more possibilities of development he/she has (Davenport & Prusak, 1998, as cited in Başaran, 2002). However, being able to identify useful and useless knowledge and organizing saved knowledge requires another step in knowledge management. One of the most important dimensions of knowledge management is that it requires knowledge to be shared with others. Stevenson (2001) points out that the more knowledge is shared, the more it becomes useful to the organization it is used in. Moreover, sharing knowledge increases the amount of explicit knowledge by bringing up tacit knowledge (Fullan, 2002; Henczel, 2004). As a result, the shared knowledge has less chances of getting lost in case that an individual leaves the organization.

Considering the main principles of KM, it is clear that as places where knowledge is produced, saved, used, and most importantly shared, educational institutions need to utilize KM. As Paul (2005) states, institutions of higher education have to keep up with the changes that take place in their hosting societies. This is the only way that they can survive with so many competitors providing the same quality education for the same amount of demand (Latagan, 2011). Since the information age is turning societies into knowledge-based communities, they demand better educational services where knowledge is the main source of supply. Consequently, higher education institutions must adopt KM practices in order to meet the demands of the societies that they are in, as well as keeping their places as the source of scientific knowledge (Birol, Dağlı & Silman, 2010; Hellstöm, 2005; Paul, 2005; Petrides & Guiney, 2002). According to Becerra-Fernandez and Stevenson (2001), people at the managerial positions in educational institutions, such as school principals, deans or chief academic officers, are responsible for bringing about the necessary change in the organizational structure so that KM processes can best be exploited. This change must start with the management: Chief Academic Officers (CAOs) must become Chief Knowledge Officers (CKOs) (Stevenson, 2001). CKOs are managers who manage processes to increase the knowledge sharing and production within the organization. Moreover, Fullan (2002) points out that knowledge is a social entity and leaders of schools should create atmospheres where knowledge can be shared within the school and outside the school. Stevenson (2000) goes further to state that school administrators are responsible for providing the necessary technological and social settings to process and increase knowledge in order to facilitate the transfer of tacit knowledge into explicit knowledge. Eriş (2012) has also argued that it is important to improve not only the KM skills of school administrators but also teachers to effectively develop the educational outcomes.

Each organization is composed of individuals who are obliged to manage some kind of knowledge at every point of their work. If each individual in the organization learns and uses the techniques and strategies of KM, then the total productivity of the organization will increase. This refers to Personal Knowledge Management (PKM) (Higgins, 2004). According to Higgins (2004), PKM can increase the amount of knowledge production and knowledge sharing, empowering both the organization and the individual in terms of KM. Besides the points in KM listed above, PKM includes another important step: knowing yourself. If a person knows his/her learning style, for instance, he/she will have a greater chance of obtaining better and more reliable information in a relatively short time because he/she will know where to look and how to look for information (Higgins, 2004). Thus, the more the individuals know themselves, the better they will perform. As individuals will be using PKM in the best way they can, the organization will be using KM to increase the quality of its services (Sánchez, 2010).

The literature includes numerous research related to the subject of KM. However, most of this work is in the fields of business administration and/or economy. KM in education is a relatively new issue and research related to it is just being fo-

cused on. The very first academic meeting about KM in education took place in San Francisco, California (Pedrides & Nodine, 2003). According to the results of this meeting, KM is an approach that can be used in any institution, however, must be designed according to the structure and aims of the institution at hand. There are three essential elements of KM. These are the human, the process, and the technology. If these elements are combined appropriately according to the make-up of the organization, then KM can be successful (Pedrides & Nodine, 2003).

Researchers stress that KM is not a magical system that ensures successful knowledge creation. As Oakley (2003) points out, educational practices must be combined with business based KM practices, only by following the guidelines of scientific research. This is the sole way of reaching a systematic KM approach in education (Keser, 2013; Ross, 2013). In 2003, Steyn carried out a research focusing on the effects of a postgraduate KM course in students' knowledge production skills. He states that KM is not a technological process where knowledge is put into a computer and retrieved when necessary. It is a human-based social process where knowledge is shared for more knowledge production. The results of the study showed that the participants benefitted from the KM course they have attended (Steyn, 2003). In another study, Elmhodt (2004) found that using a technology-based KM system and excluding the social aspects of KM will trim down knowledge production and knowledge sharing in any organization. In order to overcome these problems, an organizational learning approach must be adopted. According to Küçükoğlu (2005), organizational learning can be promoted by anticipating possible organizational problems, improving the technological framework of schools, enhancing the social relationships among teachers, being open to change, and involving teachers in the decision making processes.

According to Stankosky (2005), KM must be recognized as a separate academic discipline. In an effort to evaluate research universities' use of KM processes and strategies, Coukos-Semmel (2003) found that KM strategies are used at an average level whereas KM processes are used below average level. The same study also indicated that the most commonly used KM strategy is technology and the least common strategy is evaluation. Moreover, the results showed that there are significant differences between state and private universities in terms of the use of leadership strategies and transfer processes. In their study of usage of knowledge management tools by academic staff in Russia, Turkey, the UK, and Canada, Birol, Dağlı and Silman (2010) found that KM tools were not effectively used or implemented by universities in the developing countries, which considerably slowed down the processes of knowledge production and sharing by universities. In the long run, KM can help educational institutions to improve when it is combined with openness to change, vision, determination, leadership, and stability (Pedrides & Nodine, 2003).

Although it was first meant to increase economical profits, knowledge management is also believed to increase knowledge production practices in educational institutions (Latagan, 2011; Pedrides & Nodine, 2003; Stevenson, 2000; Stevenson 2001;

Steyn, 2003). It is advocated by Stankosky (2005) that knowledge management has to be recognized as an academic discipline on its own because people and organizations that are knowledgeable about KM become more successful in whatever field they work. Moreover, academic research that is based on strong theoretical grounds and that is designed according to scientifically approved methods are needed in the field of KM (Coukos-Semmel, 2003; Benli, 2011). By recognizing KM as an academic discipline, more quality research will be conducted and KM practices will be improved (Coukos-Semmel, 2003; Stankosky, 2005; Çınar, Çakmak & Uzunboylu, 2009). As mentioned earlier, in order to manage knowledge in the most fruitful way, the personnel must be informed individually about PKM techniques and strategies (Kuijpers, 2011). In this way, both the amount of knowledge kept in the educational institution will be increased, and there will be a genuine recognition of KM as an academic discipline.

Before any academic step can be taken forward, however, scientific research related to the attitudes of the academic staff, who are expected to use PKM, must be known. Thus, this research is designed to carry out a case study in a developing university in North Cyprus to find out the approaches of academic staff towards PKM. More specifically, it aims to investigate which PKM strategies and techniques staff members use. These strategies and techniques will be investigated at four main levels, which are obtaining, saving, using, and sharing knowledge. The following research questions will serve as the basis of this research:

1. Are the strategies and techniques of PKM used by academic staff in NEU?

2. Which strategies and techniques of PKM are preferred by the academic staff in NEU?

a. Which strategies and techniques are used by academic staff in NEU to obtain knowledge?

b. Which strategies and techniques are used by academic staff in NEU to save knowledge?

c.Which strategies and techniques are used by academic staff in NEU to use knowledge?

d. Which strategies and techniques are used by academic staff in NEU to share knowledge?

2. METHOD

2.1. Research Design

The study was designed as a case study. The field of investigation was chosen as Near East University, a developing university in Northern Cyprus. The university was

established in 1988. Currently, NEU has 15 faculties with providing quality education at undergraduate and graduate levels. NEU has been developing both academically and physically with its staff from more than 15 different countries and its enormous campus. The university hosts a student population from 18 different countries, primarily from North Cyprus, Turkey, Palestine, Iran, as well as other European countries. Moreover, it is an official member of both European University Association and International Association of Universities. In the current study, the university was taken as the case and academic staff from all faculties was included.

2.2. Participants

The participants in this study were the academic staff in Near East University (NEU). 381 academic personnel, who were officially employed in NEU during the time of the study, make up the population of the study. Participation in the study was entirely voluntary. Although the questionnaires were sent to every faculty according to the staff lists, not all of them were completed and returned. Part of these questionnaires that were returned empty belonged to the academics who worked in administrative positions and had very limited time. Others included part-time staff who did not come to the university on a daily basis and were difficult to reach. Eventually, the main reasons for returning the questionnaires empty were mentioned as time constraints and inability to contact some of the academic staff. This can be explained as a challenge faced due to the developing nature of the university. As a result, responses from a total of 77 participants were included in the study.

As mentioned earlier, all the academic staff in NEU was taken as participants. The titles of the participants varied from research assistants to professors. Of the 77 participants, 9 were research assistants, 41 were lecturers, 8 were doctors, 14 were assistant professors, 3 were associate professors, and 2 were professors. 41, 6% of the participants were females whereas 58, 4% were males. The participants were also asked to state their nationalities; however, four participants did not fill in this part. 79, 5% of the participants were Turkish Cypriot, 6, 8% were Turkish and 13, 7% were from other countries. There were 60 full-time and 17 part-time staff in the study. The years that they have been working in academia were also investigated and it was found that a majority of the participants have been working in academia for 11-15 years (25%). Only four participants stated that they have been working as academics for more than 20 years. This clearly shows that the university is in a state of continuous development with its staff being young and dynamic.

2.3. Data Collection Tools and Procedures

A questionnaire was designed and developed by the researcher to investigate the approaches of academic staff in NEU as a developing university towards personal knowledge management. There were two parts in the questionnaire. In the first part, the participants were asked to state their gender, nationality, academic title, work status (full-time/pat-time), years in academia, academic field and the number of publi-

cations in national/international journals and academic meetings. Data collected from the first part of the questionnaire is used in statistical calculations as independent variables.

The second part of the questionnaire included 34 different statements related to Personal Knowledge Management (PKM). Participants were asked to state their level of agreement or disagreement with the statements on a five-point Likert scale. In order to establish the validity and reliability of the questionnaire, a number of steps were followed. Initially, the questionnaire consisted of 40 items related to the participants' attitudes towards PKM. Following a review by two experts in the field, 2 items were taken out of the list in order to maintain the content and construct validity. Minor changes were done following their advice on the remaining items. In addition, validity was further established using factor analysis. Four items, whose load factor was estimated below 0.40 was also removed from the list of statements. As a result of the factor analysis, items were grouped according to their relevance to the four dimensions of PKM explained earlier, i.e. how knowledge is obtained (items 3, 21, 4, 5, 13, 6, 8, 23), how it is stored (items 19, 18, 20, 9, 17), how it is used (items 16, 22, 11), and how it is shared with others (items 30, 34, 29, 32, 24, 33, 25, 26, 27, 31, 28). Besides these four dimensions, 7 items dealt with the general attitudes of the staff towards PKM (items 14, 2, 1, 10, 15, 12, 7) and the total number of items in the final version of the questionnaire added up to 34. For measuring the reliability of the questionnaire, the Cronbach alpha (α) value was calculated for each dimension as .656 for obtaining knowledge, .482 for storing knowledge, .870 for sharing knowledge and .630 for the general attitudes of the staff towards PKM. The overall alpha score for the reliability of the 34-item questionnaire was calculated to be .890, which is considered to be high (Tavakol & Dennik, 2011).

Following the validity and reliability tests, the questionnaire was distributed to the whole university via faculty and departmental secretaries. Due to the busy schedules of the academic staff, it took approximately two months to collect the questionnaires back.

In the analysis phase, data collected through the questionnaires were put into the SPSS 12.0 statistical analysis program. While the data were being put into the program, some parts of the data were combined together to increase the reliability of the results (Khakpour, 2012). First of all, the data collected about the nationality of the participants were combined and analyzed as in two categories. These categories were "Turkish Cypriot" and "Other." Second, the groups related to academic titles of the participants were reduced to two: "Staff with a PhD" and "Staff without a PhD." The rationale for this change was that PhD is considered as a sign of achievement in terms of developing academic knowledge. Thus staff with PhDs would be expected to have greater PKM skills and would be using more of the PKM strategies. Finally, the participants were asked to state the number of their publications in (national and international) academic journals and meetings respectively. During the analysis phase,

it was found more fruitful to analyze these variables as "Has publication" and "Hasn't got publication" in each category, instead of analyzing the number of publications for each participant. Finally, mean calculations, independent sample t-tests and one way ANOVA were used to analyze the data collected (Khakpour, 2012).

3. RESULTS AND DİSCUSSİON

The mean score for the general attitudes of the academic staff toward PKM was calculated as 4.16, which indicates a very high positive attitude toward PKM strategies. The highest mean score (4.40) belonged to the first item, which was "Knowledge management is necessary for the sustainability of personal development." This item was related to the general attitudes of the academic staff towards PKM. On the other hand, the lowest mean score is observed in the item related to obtaining knowledge. This item read: "There are certain sources that I use while obtaining knowledge." And the calculated mean score was 2.38 for this item (see Table 1).

Table 1. Responses to different dimensions of Knowledge Management (KM)

Statement	$\bar{x}$	σ
1. Knowledge management is necessary for the sustainability of personal development.	4.40	.69
2. People can become masters in their fields through knowledge management.	4.16	.81
3. While I am studying, I choose some topics and focus on those in my study.	4.19	.90
4. I save time for my academic studies on a regular basis.	3.88	1.0
5. I exactly know where to start while obtaining knowledge.	4.32	.72
6. I am aware of my learning style.	4.35	.79
7. While getting academic knowledge, I am careful about using strategies that match with my learning style.	4.26	.77
8. I can easily identify "useful" and "not useful" knowledge for me.	4.34	.72
9. I evaluate a piece of knowledge by the source of that knowledge.	3.48	1.24
10. I evaluate a piece of knowledge by thinking about how helpful it has been/ will be for the solution of a problem.	4.09	.95
11. I evaluate a piece of knowledge by how easily it is obtained.	2.48	1.40
12. I periodically evaluate my personal academic knowledge.	3.62	1.04
13. I easily recognize the knowledge I need.	4.31	.71
14. While making a decision, I consider every single piece of knowledge I have.	4.16	.86
15. I never throw knowledge away. I keep everything, assuming it may be helpful one day.	4.27	.79
16. There are certain sources that I use while obtaining knowledge.	2.38	1.20
17. I keep the knowledge that I use in my academic studies in my computer.	4.18	1.05
18. I keep my academic knowledge in classified files in my computer.	3.97	1.19
19. I can easily find knowledge/files in my computer whenever I need them.	4.35	.91

Statement	$\bar{x}$	σ
20. It does not take me a long time to put the new knowledge into the related files.	4.22	.94
21. It does not take me a long time to find what I am looking for in my computer.	4.26	.89
22. It does not take me a long time to reach new knowledge while searching via the computer.	3.69	1.18
23. It does not take me a long time to find what I am looking for in the library.	3.57	1.15
24. I always share the academic knowledge that I have with others.	4.10	.95
25. I use the information technologies such as intranet connections, e-mailing, or instant messaging, while I am sharing knowledge.	3.78	1.22
26. I put personal information on my web page.	2.40	1.32
27. I put the knowledge based practices that I believe I am good at on my web page.	2.62	1.41
28. I follow the academic studies done in our university.	3.62	1.10
29. I share the knowledge that I believe is academically important with my colleagues.	4.26	.88
30. The speed that knowledge reaches other people is important for me.	4.05	1.02
31. We periodically meet with related people to share new knowledge that we have.	2.91	1.23
32. I encourage people who work with me to share the knowledge they possess.	3.73	1.18
33. I use group work in my academic studies.	3.57	1.30
34. I give opportunities to people who work with me to organize the knowledge that they have/gain.	3.78	1.01

There were only 5 items with a mean score lower than 3.00, which is assumed to indicate a neutral position. These items were "I evaluate a piece of knowledge by how easily it is obtained." (item 11), "There are certain sources that I use while obtaining knowledge." (item 16), "I put personal information on my web page." (item 26), "I put the knowledge based practices that I believe I am good at on my web page." (item 27), and "We periodically meet with related people to share new knowledge that we have." (item 31). Interestingly, these items were related to obtaining and sharing knowledge. Apart from these 5 items, the mean scores for the remaining items were above 3.00, which can be considered as evidence for a positive attitude toward the use of PKM techniques and strategies among the academic staff, especially in using and saving knowledge. This finding indicates that the academic staff in this university seems to use PKM strategies for effectively using and saving knowledge that they already have, while they are not so positive about using PKM strategies to obtain new information and to share it with their colleagues. This may be attributed to the competitive nature of the academic environment within this developing university as well as a lack of KM vision and culture within the university, which is necessary to successfully implementation of PKM strategies (Pedrides & Nodine, 2003; Baykasoğlu 2012).

The total mean score for females' PKM use (130.78) was slightly greater than the total mean score for males (129.07). No difference was found between the two groups

in any of the four dimensions of PKM. Although the mean scores for obtaining knowledge for foreigners (59.40) was greater than that of Turkish Cypriots (56.31), when the group statistics were compared in terms of nationality, again no significant differences were found ($p > .05$). When the mean scores of different dimensions are observed for different variables, it can be seen that the scores are very close to each other. However, when the total mean scores are analyzed, it can be said that there are slight differences between the scores (see Table 2). The total mean score of staff holding a PhD was 132.19, whereas the total mean score of staff without PhD was 128.48. For working status, the full-time staff had a total mean score of 128.73 and part-time staff had a score of 133.47. When the groups are analyzed in terms of the field they work in, the staff working in natural sciences seems to have a fairly higher total mean score (mean=133.59) than the social sciences group (mean=127.67). Although the total mean scores vary from each other slightly, the independent sample t-tests did not reveal any significant differences between the groups in terms of holding a PhD, working status (full-time or part-time), field of study, years in academia ($p > .05$).

Table 2. PKM use according to gender, nationality, title, status and subject/field

Dimensions		General		Obtain		Save		Use		Share		Total	
Variables		$\bar{x}$	σ	$\bar{x}$	σ	$\bar{x}$	σ	$\bar{x}$	σ	$\bar{x}$	σ	$\bar{x}$	Σ
Gender	Female	12.47	1.76	56.97	7.12	17.19	3.27	16.88	2.80	27.28	7.51	130.78	18.47
	Male	12.42	1.82	56.62	6.83	16.27	2.77	16.31	2.30	27.44	5.50	129.07	14.92
Nationality	Turkish Cypriot	12.50	1.69	56.31	6.65	17.05	2.75	16.71	2.53	27.16	6.94	129.72	16.38
	Foreign	12.73	2.02	59.40	8.17	15.47	3.56	16.07	2.69	28.27	4.70	131.93	18.28
Title	Without PhD	12.30	1.88	56.44	6.60	16.64	3.10	16.34	2.81	26.76	7.02	128.48	17.00
	With PhD	12.70	1.59	57.37	7.54	16.67	2.90	16.93	1.84	28.52	4.85	132.19	15.23
Status	Full-time	12.37	1.82	56.43	7.05	16.38	3.14	16.40	2.57	27.15	6.20	128.73	16.70
	Part-time	12.71	1.65	57.94	6.43	17.59	2.32	17.06	2.33	28.18	7.06	133.47	15.15
Subject/	Natural Sciences	12.59	1.99	57.69	6.74	17.62	1.97	16.93	2.33	28.76	6.34	133.59	14.67
Field	Social Sciences	12.39	1.65	56.37	6.95	16.04	3.43	16.26	2.67	26.61	6.26	127.67	17.15

The groups were also analyzed according to the publications they have in different academic venues, including national scientific journals, national scientific meetings, international scientific journals, and international scientific meetings (see Table 2).

The lowest total mean score for these variables was 124.80, and was observed in the group who did not publish any articles in any of the scientific journals or meetings. The highest total mean score was observed in the group who published articles at national scientific meetings (mean = 136.78). When the independent sample t-test was run for these groups, the only significant difference was found between these two groups ($p < .05$). This indicates that PKM strategies are essential in getting published in the academia and staff with positive attitudes towards PKM strategies also seems to produce more publishable documents. No difference was found for other variables.

Table 3. PKM use according to publications in different academic venues

Dimensions		General		Obtain		Save		Use		Share		Total	
Variables		$\bar{x}$	σ	$\bar{x}$	σ	$\bar{x}$	σ	$\bar{x}$	σ	$\bar{x}$	σ	$\bar{x}$	Σ
National Refereed Journals	No Publication	12.13	1.84	55.91	6.70	16.52	3.09	16.22	2.68	26.63	6.81	127.41	16.82
	Published	13.17	1.40	58.78	6.46	16.96	2.84	17.30	1.94	29.13	4.87	135.35	14.17
Interntl. Refereed Journals	No Publication	12.26	1.82	56.26	7.08	16.50	3.18	16.46	2.60	26.52	6.74	128.00	16.95
	Published	12.87	1.63	57.96	6.47	17.00	2.56	16.74	2.36	29.39	4.97	133.96	14.50
National Scientific Meetings	No Publication	12.00	1.94	55.29	7.15	16.09	3.23	15.87	2.71	25.56	6.47	124.80	16.91
	Published	13.06	1.32	58.84	6.07	17.44	2.50	17.50	1.88	9.94	5.33	136.78	12.91
Interntl. Scientific Meetings	No Publication	12.19	1.85	56.02	6.34	16.40	2.88	16.38	2.26	26.83	6.18	127.83	14.70
	Published	12.83	1.62	57.93	7.68	17.03	3.20	16.80	2.91	28.23	6.67	132.83	18.60

4. CONCLUSİON

The findings of this study indicate that in NEU, the techniques and strategies of PKM are generally perceived with a positive attitude by the academic staff. The four dimensions of PKM, which are obtaining, saving, using, and sharing knowledge, are perceived as equally important. However, the fact that there are no significant differences between most of the variables set forth indicates that there needs to be an awareness raised among academics in terms of PKM and its techniques and strategies. The only significant difference was found between the groups who had publications at national scientific meetings and those who hadn't. Surprisingly, there was no difference, for example, between the staff who held a PhD and those who didn't. This can be interpreted as a consequence of the fact that NEU is still a developing university. Academic studies produced by the university staff are increasing day by day and PKM strategies are newly being used within the university. However, the academic staff needs to be informed about these strategies and techniques so as to accelerate the rate of development and knowledge production and sharing within the university. Although the technological infrastructure being up-to-date is extremely important in implementing new organizational cultures is extremely important (Smeureanu & Isa-

ila, 2011), as Elmhodt (2004) pointed out, increasing only the technological facilities within any organization will not bring effective KM about unless these developments are combined with the social aspects of KM processes. Only in this way can a culture of knowledge sharing be promoted within universities such as Near East University. The earlier the development occurs, the more quality education can be provided, and the more contributions can be made to the academic world of knowledge. If every single member of the academic staff uses these strategies in his/her studies, then overall, the organization, i.e. the university in this case, will be developing rapidly and with a higher rate of quality.

5. REFERENCES

Barutçugil, İ. (2002). *Bilgi Yönetimi* [Knowledge management]. İstanbul: Kariyer.

Başaran, M. (2002). *İşletmelerde bilginin yönetilmesi ile ilgili olarak geliştirilen modeller ve bir araştırma* [Models developed related to knowledge management in business organizations and a case study]. Unpublished MBA thesis. İstanbul: İstanbul University.

Baykasoğlu, N. (2012). A museum example in art and design education. *Global Journal of Arts Education, 2, 1-6*

Becerra-Fernandez, I., & Stevenson, J. M. (2001). Knowledge management systems & solutions for the school principal as chief learning officer. *Education, 21*(3), 508-518.

Benli, E. (2011). The effect online-based prepared posters on students attitude toward science and technology course. *Global Journal of Information Technology, 1, 1-4*

Birol, C., Dağlı, G., & Silman, F. (2010). Usage of knowledge management tools: UK and Canada versus Russia and Turkey in a comparative study. *Euroasian Journal of Educational Research, 38.*

Coukos-Semmel, E. (2003). *Knowledge management in research universities: The processes and strategies*. Chicago, IL: Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, 21-25 April 2003 (ERIC document no: ED477439).

Çınar, İ., Çakmak, S. & Uzunboylu, H. (2009). The evaluation of attitudes' towards research of the students' studying library database via Moodle. *International Journal of Lerning and Teaching, 1*(1), 2-9.

Dereceli, Ç. (2011). The effect of tai-chi on internal- external locus of control levels in primary school students with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. *Global Journal of Guidance and Counselling, 1, 8-14*

Elmhodt, C. (2004). Knowledge management and the practice of knowledge sharing and learning at work: A case study. *Studies in Continuing Education, 26*(2), 327-339.

Eriş, H. (2012). Competencies of primary school administrators in implementing managerial knowledge management in North Cyprus. *Cypriot Journal of Educatial Sciences, 7*(3), 177-188.

Fullan, M. (2002). The role of leadership in the promotion of knowledge management in schools. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 8*(3/4), 409-419.

Gorelick, C., April, K., Milton, N. (2004). *Performance through learning: Knowledge management in practice.* Burlington, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Hellstöm, T. (2004). Between a rock and a hard place: Academic institutional change and the

problem of collective action. *Higher Education, 48*, 511-528.

Henczel, S. (2004). Supporting the KM environment: The roles, responsibilities and rights of information professionals; constructive thoughts on knowledge management. *Information Outlook.* Retrieved November 14, 2009, from www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0FWE/is_1_8/ai_n6108110/print

Higgins, S. (2004). Your say: Personal knowledge management. *Knowledge Management Magazine (Online), 7*(7). Retrieved November 15, 2009.

Keser, H. (2013). A Turkish Scale for Elementary School Students Self Perceptions of Computer Game. *World Journal on Educational Technology, 5*, 215-222.

Khakpour, A. (2012). Methodology of comparative studies in education. *Contemporary Educational Researches Journal, 2*, 20-26.

Kuijpers, M. (2011). Professionalizing teachers in career dialogue: an effect study. *Global Journal of Sociology, 1*, 1-6.

Küçükoğlu, A. (2005). Örgütsel öğrenme ve öğrenmenin engelleri [Organizational learning and obstacles in learning]. *Milli Eğitim, 33*(166), 138-147.

Latagan, M. (2011). The role of quality education in national higher education system compatible with European Union. *Contemporary Educational Researches Journal, 1,* 22-30.

Oakley, A. (2003). Research evidence, knowledge management and educational practice: Early lessons from a systematic approach. *London Review of Education, 1*(1), 22-33.

Paul, D. A. (2005). Higher education in competitive markets: literature on organizational decline and turnaround. *The Journal of General Education, 54*(2), 107-138.

Pedrides, A., & Nodine, T. R. (2003). *Knowledge management in education: Defining the landscape.* Santa Clara, CA: Institute for the Study of Knowledge Management in Education. (ERIC document no: ED 477 349).

Petrides, L., & Guiney, S. Z. (2002). Knowledge management for school leaders: An ecological framework for thinking schools. *Teachers College Record, 104*(8), 1702-1717.

Ross M. S. (2013) It Takes a City to Raise a Systemic Reform: Early Outcomes From the Say Yes City-wide Turnaround Strategy in Syracuse. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences.* 8, 63-77

Sánchez, A. M. (2010). Personal knowledge management by the knowledge citizen: The generation aspect of organizational and social knowledge-based development. In K. Metaxiotis, F. J. Carrillo, & T. Yigitcanlar (Eds.), *Knowledge-based development for cities and societies: Integrated multi-level approaches.* USA: IGI Global.

Smeureanu, I. & Isaila, N. (2011). New information technologies for an innovative education. *World Journal on Educational Technology, 3*(3), 177-189.

Stankosky, M. (Ed.). (2005). *Creating the discipline of knowledge management: The latest in university research.* Burlington, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Stevenson, J. M. (2000). A new epistemological context for education: Knowledge management in public schools. *Journal of Instructional Psychology.* Retrieved November 14, 2009 from http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0FCG/is_3_27/ai_66355141/print

Stevenson, J. M. (2001). Modern practice, pragmatism, philosophy in higher education administration: Knowledge leadership of th chief academic officer. *College Student Journal.* Retrieved Novermber 14, 2009, from http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0FCR/is_2_35/

ai_77399623/print

Steyn, G. M. (2003). Creating knowledge management through management education: A case study of human resource management. *Education*. Retrieved November 15, 2009, from http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3673/is_200304/ai_n9232390/print

Tavakol, M. & Dennik, R. (2011). Making sense of Cronbach's alpha. *International Journal of Medical Education, 2*, 53-55.

Toffler, A. (1990). *Third Wave*. New York: Bantam.

Yeniçeri, Ö. (2002). *Örgütsel değişimenin yönetimi – Sorunlar, yöntemler, teknikler, stratejiler ve çözüm yolları* [Management of organizational change – Problems, methods, techniques, strategies, and solutions]. Ankara: Nobel.