CHAPTER - 2

KNOWLEDGE AUDIT: A REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Purpose of the present chapter is to focus on scanned literature on “Knowledge Audit: An Analytical study”.

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Review of relevant literature is an important step for research. After formulating research problem, the process of reviewing the related literature was started. The relevant data was collected from various sources like books, journal articles, e-sources, etc.

A bibliography is a basic information source for finding out researches carried out in the subject of Library and information science. Different bibliographies are available for this purpose. Association of Indian Universities (AIU) published the bibliography of doctoral dissertations in social sciences can be a basic material in this regard. All the bibliographies published by Association of Indian Universities (AIU) since 1980-81 to the recent one, i.e. of 1993 published in 1997; Delhi University (1990); and Inter-University Board of India (1974) were referred. In support of this, the bibliography of research in library and information science in India compiled by Pathak and Ramaiah (1986); Kumar (1987) were scanned as they have covered research conducted at M. Lib. I. Sc., M. Phil, and Ph. D. level.

The websites of INFLIBNET (2011) as well as Vidyanidhi (2011) were searched for thesis database and it was found that studies were carried out on the topic information management by Dixit (1991), Gaddagimath (1995), Chiplunkar (2002), Vijay Kiran (2002), Lomte (2003), Naushad (2004), Pant (2009) while studies on information management system were conducted by Bhattacharya (2004), Mukhopadhyya (2005), Narkar (2006). The topic knowledge management was covered by Pillania (2004), Suchipriya (2005), Babu Lal (2005), Janardan (2005), Arora (2006), Datta (2007), Raman (2008), Senthilraja (2009). However no research has been carried out on the topic
“Knowledge Audit”. Therefore researcher has undertaken the topic ‘Knowledge Audit: An analytical study’. The bibliographies and bibliographic database.

In addition to this a few books and many research articles printed as well as e- sources related to present study have been reviewed by the investigator. Starting from definitional analysis, Audit, Information, Knowledge, Information Audit, Knowledge Audit, etc.

2.2 DEFINITIONAL ANALYSIS

2.2.1 Audit

Audit means to go through the process of examining and verifying an organization’s financial records and supporting documents. (Ward, 2009); an examination of systems, programming and datacenter procedures in order to determine the efficiency of computer operations, a systematic process of objectively obtaining and evaluating evidence regarding assertions about economic actions and events to ascertain the degree of correspondence between those assertions and established criteria and communicating the results to interested users, is a Latin word meaning “he hears”, in its modern sense, an audit is process whereby the accounts of business entities, including charities, trusts and professional firms, are subjected to security in such details as will enable the auditors to form an opinion as to their accuracy, truth and fairness. This opinion is embodied in an audit report. Before conducting the audit, the auditor should examine the relevant books, statements and records. He should call for explanation on different aspects, ask for such information as he deems fit. He should then apply his judgment in the light of all these available material. After going through all records, he will be able to certify that the cost is correct, true and fair (Answer, 2010).

2.2.2 Information

Information is the meaning that a human assigns to data by means of conventions used in their presentation, data that has given shape. It may be considered as processed data, data plus the meaning, which has to be a result of human action. (Seetharama, 1999); facts and data organized to characterize a
particular situation (Wiig, 1999); Processed data, (Bollinger and Smith 2001); Organized data (Bhatt, 2001; Perez et al., 2002); an expression of knowledge (Stonier, 1990); the result of organizing, processing, and interpreting data, thus transforming the findings into facts that are useful to decision makers (Ojeda, 1994); processed data into a form that is meaningful to the recipient and is of real or perceived value in current or prospective actions or decisions, groups of nonrandom symbols in the form of text, images or voice representing quantities, actions and objects (Gordon, Margrethe, and Olson, 1984; Hollnagel, 1980); a flow of messages, (Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1995).

2.2.3 Knowledge

Knowledge is a sum total of information conserved by civilization, perception of the agreement or disagreement of two ideas (Clark, 2004); totality of the ideas conserved by the humans. In this sense, Knowledge = Universe of Ideas (Ranganathan, 1990); fluid mix of framed experience, values, contextual information, and expert insight that provides a framework for evaluating and incorporating new experiences and information. It originates and is applied in the minds of knower. In organizations, it often becomes embedded not only in documents or repositories, but also in organizational routines, processes, practices, and norms (Davenport and Prusak, 1998; 1998a; 2000; Quintas, 2002; organized information in people’s heads (Badenoch et al., 1994; Maponya, 2004; Kharade and Thomas, 2004); information that is relevant, actionable, and based at least partially on experience, Knowledge is more personal, human resource based and usually acquired through experience and/or observation (Leonard and Sensiper, 1998); form of high value information combined with experience, context, interpretation, and reflection that is ready to apply to decisions and actions (Devenport et al., 1998); as much about the perception arising from information…refracted through the individual’s personal lens (Fowler and Pryke, 2003); meaningful information means knowledge (Bhatt, 2001; Herder et al., 2003; Perez et al., 2002); and commitments and beliefs created from messages (Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1995a); core competency, which is based on collective learning of an organization. This involves knowing how to coordinate diverse operational skills and integrate them with multiple strains of distinctive capabilities (Prahlad, and Hamel, 1990); consist of three elements:
know, learn, and edge (Chaudhary, 2005); multifaceted and complex, being both situated and abstract, implicit and explicit, distributed and individual, physical and mental developing and static, verbal and encoded (Blackler, 1995); reflects the intentions of the humans who create it and interpret it (Samiotis, Poulomenakou and Doukidis, 2003); an activity which would be better described as a process of knowledge (Polanyi, 1969); alive because it changes continuously…transferred through human interaction (Nonaka, 1994); as a key resource for the firm, has become the most strategic resource in the new business environment. (Grant, 1996; Davenport and Prusak, 1998; Zack, 1999a, 1999b; Ordonez, 2002; Saiz, Pena and Lara, 2003; Carrillo, 2006).

### 2.2.4 Information Audit

Information audit is a systematic evaluation of information uses, resource and flows, with a verification by reference to both people and existing documents in order to establish the extent to which they are contributing to an organization’s objectives (Orna, 1999; Robertson, 1996; Botha, 2000); the process of discovering and evaluating the information resources of organizations with the aim of implementing, maintaining or improving management information systems (Buchanan and Gibb, 1998); a process that will effectively determine the current information environment by identifying what information is required to meet the needs of the organizations, a tool that can be used not only to identify strategically significant information resources, but also to identify those tasks and activities that create knowledge and those that rely on the transfer of knowledge from other areas of the organization (Susan, Bus and Bus, 2001); useful management tools which assist in the identification, costing, development and organization of information resources, the author further states that the audit can also be used to determine the contribution made to an organization by their information staff (Theakston, 1998); the first step to ensure a maximum return on investment in knowledge workers and information resources (DiMattia and Blumenstein, 2000).
2.2.5 Knowledge Audit

Knowledge audit is a systematic and scientific examination and evaluation of the organization. The knowledge audit investigates and analyses the current knowledge environment. (Hylton, 2009, 2010; Choy, Lee, and Cheung, 2004); a systematic process through which an organization can understand its knowledge and information needs, what it knows, the information flow and gaps (Anand and Anand, 2007); the all important first major phase or step of a knowledge management initiative, and is used to provide a sound investigation into the company or organization’s knowledge ‘health’, a fact-finding, analysis, interpretation, and reporting activity, which includes a study of the organization’s information and knowledge policies, its knowledge structure and knowledge flow, (Paramasivan, 2003; Admin, 2006); a wide comprehensive examination, review, assessment and evaluation of an organization’s knowledge abilities, its existing knowledge assets and resources, and of its knowledge management activities. The audit brings high visibility to the organizations knowledge assets (Hylton, (2009); to understand the processes that constitute the activities of a knowledge worker, and see how well they address the ‘knowledge goals’ of the organization. (Lauer and Tanniru, 2001); a tool that assets potential stores of knowledge. It is the first part of any knowledge management strategy. By discovering that knowledge is possessed, it is then possible to find the most effective method of storage and dissemination. It can then be used as the basis for evaluating the extent to which change needs to be introduced to enterprise. Part of the knowledge audit is capturing “tacit” knowledge (Liebowitz et al., 2000); a planning document which provides a structural overview of a designated section of an organization’s knowledge as well as details of an organization’s knowledge as well as details of the qualitative and quantitative chunks of knowledge within that designated section (Debenham and Clark, 1994); an important tool for organizations and can be used for different purposes. The knowledge audit can be used to evaluate the competitive effectiveness of the organization by identifying areas of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats and risks (Wigg, 2004; Cheung, et al., 2007; Schwikkard and Toit, 2004; Sharma, and Chowdhury, 2007); important information where it should focus to attain its
goals, to find crucial knowledge which is important for the organization (Abell and Oxbrow, 1999); an examination, review, assessment and evaluation of an organizations’ ability, its existing knowledge assets and recourses, and of its knowledge management activities (Hylton, 2009); also be a planning document which can give an overview of the knowledge of the whole organization or a particular section (Liebowitz, 2000); has three-stages, viz, pre-audit preparation, in-audit process and post-audit analysis, systematic approach is developed (Edwin and Edward, 1996; Hylton, 2009); an assessment of current levels of knowledge usages and interchange; knowledge management propensity within the enterprise; identification and analysis of knowledge management opportunities; isolations of potential problem areas; and an evaluation of the perceived value in knowledge within the enterprise (Capshaw, 1999)

2.3 EVOLUTION OF CONCEPT

2.3.1 Knowledge

Knowledge is a sum total of information conserved by civilization. Knowledge is the perception of the agreement or disagreement of two ideas, (Clark, 2004).

Knowledge is a fluid mix of framed experience, values, contextual information, and expert insight that provides a framework for evaluating and incorporating new experiences and information. It originates and is applied in the minds of knower. In organizations, it often becomes embedded not only in documents or repositories, but also in organizational routines, processes, practices, and norms (Davenport and Prusak 1998).

2.3.2 Types of Knowledge

Knowledge is classified by different experts in different ways there are five categories of knowledge viz.

1. Practical knowledge, which is useful in an individual’s work, decisions, and actions.
2. Intellectual knowledge, which satisfies intellectual curiosity
3. Small-talk and pastime knowledge, which satisfies non-intellectual curiosity or the desire for light entertainment
4. Spiritual knowledge, which relates to religion and mystical experiences
5. Unwanted knowledge, which is outside one’s interests and is usually accidentally acquire (Machlup, 1990).

Knowledge can also be classified as:

- Tacit Knowledge
- Explicit Knowledge
- Cultural Knowledge

2.3.2.1 Tacit Knowledge

Tacit knowledge is the knowledge that a person posses and that it is described as knowledge embedded in the individual’s experience and it has a personal quality, which makes it hard to formalize and communicate (Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1995); it ‘indwells’ in a comprehensive cognizance of the human mind and body. This experience can be communicated and exchanged in a direct and effective way in the socialization process” (Perez-Soltero, et al. 2006); subconsciously understood and applied, difficult to articulate, developed from direct experience and action, and usually shared through highly interactive conversation, story-telling and shared experience (Shehabat, Mahdi and Khoualdi, 2008); personal knowledge embedded in individual experiences and is shared and exchanged through direct, eye-to-eye contact. Clearly, tacit knowledge can be communicated in a most direct and effective way (Nonaka and Takeuchi,1995; Boisot, 1999); knowledge that is hard to encode and communicate. It is ephemeral and transitory and cannot be resolved into information or itemized in the manner characteristic of information (Polanyi, 1962; Polanyi, 1967); more difficult to define, and “is deeply rooted in action, commitment, and involvement in a specific context” Nonaka, 1994); “knowledge-in-action” which presumes that this is knowledge that has not be articulated (Platts and Yeung, 2000); informal, context-specific, it draws on a person’s experience, and is difficult to share, expertise, Further tacit knowledge is personal, context-specific and hard to formalize, and craftsmanship are
examples of tacit knowledge” (Reber, 1993; Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1995a; Polanyi, 1997; Baumard, 1999; Stewart, 1999; Kidwell, et al. 2000; Collins, 2001); highly personal, hard to formalize and therefore difficult, if not impossible, to communicate (Nonaka, 1996); very personal and is not readily available without personal involvement and interest. Tacit knowledge is intuitive and is earned through experience and skill (Polanyi, 1966); “knowing more than you can tell”, that is, knowledge that is so inbuilt with in your own understanding of a process that awareness of this knowledge is not apparent, nor explicable (Polanyi, 1983; Sanchez, 2001); too restrictive, and does not take into account all the knowledge that cannot be formalized, codified, structured and made explicit (Devenport, 2002); the knowledge that people have in their minds. It is much less ‘concrete’ than explicit knowledge. It is more of an ‘unspoken understanding’ about something, knowledge that is more difficult to write down. Tacit knowledge can be difficult to access as it is often not known to others. In fact, most people are not aware of the knowledge they themselves possess or of its value to others. Tacit knowledge is considered more valuable because it provides context for people, places, ideas and experiences. It generally requires extensive personal contact and trust to share effectively. Tacit knowledge is highly personal, hard to formalize, and therefore, difficult to communicate to others” (Nonaka, 1991); not available as a text and may conveniently be regarded as residing in the heads of those working in a particular organizational context. It involves intangible factors embedded in personal beliefs, experiences, and values” (Pan and Scarbrough, 1999); characterized by “analogue” qualities- parallel processing of continuous complex variable (Nonaka, 1994); un-codified knowledge, embedded in individual or collective practices and held in non-language form (Boisot, 1998).

### 2.3.2.2 Explicit Knowledge

Explicit knowledge is the output of tasks and activities that can be documented as reports, databases, procedures, etc., in contrast, can be more precisely and formally articulate. Therefore, although more abstract, it can be more easily codified, documented, transferred or shared. Explicit knowledge is playing an increasingly large role in organizations, and it is considered by some
to be the most important factor of production in the knowledge economy (Shehabat, Mahdi and Khoualdí, 2008; Platts and Yeung, 2000); being an objective element of knowledge, primarily having an impact on process, where as tacit knowledge is accepted as being more “know-how” information residing in an actor’s memory (Wickramasinghe, (2003); formal knowledge that can be packaged as information and can be founding the documents of an organization: reports, article, manuals, patents, pictures, images, video, sound, software etc. (Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1994, 1995); can be articulated in formal language including grammatical statements, mathematical expression, specifications, manuals, and so forth (Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1995); knowledge that the knower can make explicit by means of a verbal statement: ‘some-one has explicit knowledge of something if a statement of it can be elicited from him by suitable enquiry or prompting” (Dummett, 1991); formal and systematic, for this reason it can be easily communicated and shared, in product specifications or a scientific formula or a computer program (Nonaka, 1996; Nonaka, Toyama and Konno, 2001); the first world in the term implies, is knowledge that has been articulated and, more often than not, captured in the form of text, tables, diagrams, product specifications and so on (Nonaka, 1991); can be expressed in formal and systematic language and can be shared in the form of data, scientific formulae, specifications, manuals, and so forth (Nonaka, Toyama and Byosiere, 2001; Polanyi, 1966, 1967, 1997, 1983); shows the discrete discontinuities characteristics of “digital” processing (Nonaka, 1994); increasingly being emphasized in both practice and literature, as a management tool to be exploited for the manipulation of organizational knowledge. Groupware, intranets, list servers, knowledge repositories, database management and knowledge action networks allow the sharing of organizational knowledge (Scarborough, Swan and Preston, 1999; Wenger, McDermott, and Snyder, 2002); systematic and easily communicated in the form of hard data or codified procedures. It can be articulated in formal language including grammatical statements, this kind of knowledge can thus be transmitted across individuals formally and easily” (Pan and Scarborough, 1999).
2.3.2.3 Cultural Knowledge

It is the knowledge which includes assumptions, and beliefs that are used to understand, describe, and explain the reality, as well as conventions, values and significance to new information. These shared beliefs, norms, and values from the frame work in which organizational members construct reality, recognize the new information, and evaluate alternative interpretations and actions (Banka, 2001).

2.3.3 Knowledge Management

2.3.3.1 Information Management

Information Management is seen as the essential prerequisite to knowledge management, a systematic examination of information use, resources and flow, with verification by reference to both people and existing documents, in order to establish the extent to which they are contributing to the organization’s objectives (Orna, 2004); the management of an organization’s information resources in order to improve the performance of the organization’s (Knowledge Management Glossary, 2005).

2.3.3.2 Knowledge Management

Today, the concept Knowledge management is well established and applied almost in all facets of management science and well defined by various management experts as well as information experts. There are numerous definitions of knowledge management to be found in various publications printed as well as web. The following definitions are the most commonly used and cited.

Knowledge Management is the process of identifying, acquiring, evaluating, managing, organizing, filtering, retrieving, capturing, and effectively sharing all of an enterprise’s information assets useful to end users (Davenport, 1998; Skyrme, 1997, 1999; White, 2004; Hansen and Tierney, 1999; O’Dell and Grayson, 1998; Duban, 1998; Vaishnav, 2003). These assets may include databases, documents, policies, procedures, and previously
uncaptured expertise, and experience of individual workers’ is illuminating because it makes very implicit that aspect of knowledge management of including not just conventional information and knowledge units, but also ‘tacit knowledge’ which is known but not captured in any formal or explicit fashion’ (Duhon, 1998); newly emerging, interdisciplinary business model dealing with all aspects of knowledge with in the context of firm, including knowledge creation, codification, sharing, learning, and innovation (Ruggles, 1998; Gold, Malhotra, and Segars, 2001); a fluid mix of contextual information, frame experience, values and experts insight that provides framework for evaluating and incorporating new experiences and information’ (Devenport and Prusak,1998); focuses on ‘doing the right thing’ instead of ‘doing things right’, a framework within which the organization views all its processes as knowledge processes (Paramasivan, 2003); encompasses both the management of information and the management of people, knowledge can not be managed directly only the information about the knowledge possessed by people in organizations can be managed (Streatfield and Wilson, 1999); attempts to manage another dimension altogether: tacit knowledge or the “know-how and learning embedded with in the minds of the people in an organization” (Al-Hawamdeh, 2002; Dueck, 2001); very broad and the design of a knowledge strategy needs to be highly contextual if it is to generate organisational value (McKenzie and Van, 2004); getting the right knowledge to the right people at the right time (Hibbard, 1997); much more than managing the flow of information, it means nothing less than setting knowledge free to find its own paths. It means fueling the creative fire of self questioning in organization. This means thinking less about knowledge management and more about knowledge partnering” (Allee, 1997); growing awareness and value of knowledge in its various forms has been recognized in recent years in an emerging discourse known as knowledge management (Hansen, Nohria and Tierney, 1999; Sieloff, 1999); enables the creation, communication and application of knowledge of all kinds to achieve goals” (Tiwana, 2000); either used as a synonym for information management or for the ‘management of work practices’ which are to improve the sharing of knowledge in an organization (Wilson, 2002); Since the mid-nineties the label knowledge management has attracted much attention while information management has been used less ((Disterer, Kristofiak and
Blitzer, 2002; Ponzi and Koenig 2002); there is no agreement on what constitutes knowledge management (Corrall, 1998; Morrow, 2001); can only be realized, if at all, after a long learning process. Organizational learning is an integral part of knowledge management (Argyris, 1991; Garvin, 1993; Senge, 1990); dealing with the process of creating value from an organization’s intangible assets (Wigg, 1993); a concept that many organizations have been trying to harness with the use of information technology since the 1990’s with limited success (Butler, 2003; Hirschheim and Klein, 1989; Wickramasinghe, 2003); a form of application of strategic management practices to human resources as whole which are the carrying vectors of knowledge’ (Nonaka, 1995); covers identifying what knowledge assets an organization possesses, analyzing how the knowledge can add value, specifying what action are necessary to achieve better usability and added value, and reviewing the use of the knowledge to ensure added value (Liebowitz and Beckman, 1998); one way to develop and apply the organizational knowledge needed to improve library operations and ultimately, library effectiveness. It also enables libraries to generate organizational knowledge for higher education institutions (Townley, 2001); a systematic sharing and exchange of knowledge with external entries. Expanding the scope of knowledge management beyond the single firm focuses attention on intelligent trans-organisational knowledge interface, the points at which the knowledge management structures of different organizations overlap. Those interfaces act as filters for the sharing and exchange of knowledge across organizational boundaries (Chrayannis et al., 2000); involve the entire system of knowledge transfer, from the generation, construction, diffusion and use. This takes librarians beyond their contemporary role of knowledge storing, organizing retrieval and access to the global transformation and creation of information. This is a challenge for librarians and an opportunity to move their activities and to enlarge their sharing to the scholarly communication process (Lucier, 1993); about the development of corporate capability, which is essential if an organization is to develop and lead its market rather than endlessly work to keep up with the demand (Saint, 1999); recognizes value in originality, innovation, agility, adaptability, intelligence and learning (Gray, 1998); stumbling “..on lack of common understanding, agreed standards, and proven processes” (Rossion, 1998); the explicit and systematic
management of vital knowledge and its associated processes of creating, gathering, organizing, diffusion, use and exploitation. It requires turning personal knowledge into corporate knowledge that can be widely shared throughout an organization and appropriately applied (Skyrme, 1997); a form of expertise management which draws out tacit knowledge, making it accessible to improve the performance of organizations, about how the organization’s ‘know-how’ should be structured, organized, located and most effective action at that point in time (Broadbent, 1997); a management technique to maximize the co-ordination and organization of knowledge (Burnstein et al. 2002); creation, storage and retrieval, transfer and application of knowledge (Alavi and Leidner, 2001); a critical set of policies and practices that will boost an organization’s competitive position in the new knowledge-based economy by optimizing the collaboration and knowledge sharing among employees and providing them with the information and knowledge that they need to improve operational efficiency, to innovate, and to sense and respond to new opportunities in the marketplace (Neef, 1999); the deliberate and systematic coordination of the communications, people, processes, structure, and technology of an organization in order to produce sustainable competitive advantage or long-term high performance for the organization. The value and utility in the management of knowledge accrues to the organization through innovation, reuse, and organizational learning. The process of coordination is achieved through the convergence of personal, group, and enterprise action on a knowledge life-cycle. The knowledge life-cycle integrates the identification, creation, acquisition, capture, securing, production, publication, sharing, leveraging, and eventual disposal of knowledge resources and assets with in an organizational memory (Becerra-Fernandez, et al., 2004; Bennet and Bennet, 2004; Dalkir, 2005); an ability of an organization to use its collective knowledge through a process of knowledge generation, sharing and exploitation enabled by technology to achieve its objectives (Bhatt, 2001); as the set of processes that create and share knowledge across an organization to optimize the use of judgment in the attainment of mission and goals. It is an emerging discipline developing on the interstices of organizational psychology, library and information science, economics, and computer science. It involves capturing an organization’s goal related knowledge as well as knowledge of its product,
customers, competitors, and processes, and then sharing that knowledge with the appropriate people throughout the organization. Further knowledge management seeks to support communities of practice in creating and using knowledge. Finally, it accepts the notion that knowledge transmission is primarily a human activity, thus, knowledge management is the art of creating value from an organization’s knowledge assets (Thomas, 1999; Kuhn, 1996); the art of creating value from intangible assets (Sveiby, 1996); a collection of processes that govern the creation, dissemination, and utilization of knowledge in an organization (Newman, 1991); the process of capture, refinement, aggregation and sharing of data and information between employees, departments, subsidiaries and partner organizations to achieve a position of knowledge based competitive advantage (Lomax, 2001); a discipline with the objectives of promoting knowledge growth, knowledge communication and knowledge preservation within an organization (Steels, 1993).

2.4 VIEWS ON KNOWLEDGE AUDIT

Knowledge audit is an accepted management technique, many different types of audits currently exist in the commercial world, e.g. financial audits, communication audits, technical audits, employment audits, and also more recently, information audits or knowledge audits. The major purpose of an information audit or knowledge audit is the identification of users’ knowledge needs as well as how well these needs are met by the information services department (Botha, 2000; Boon, 1990); organization waste billions on knowledge management because they fail to figure out what knowledge they need, or how to manage it in the context of application. It takes little imagination to work out that a knowledge audit would provide an evidence-based approach to help companies or organizations (Sharma and Chowdhury, 2007); a knowledge audit is a planning document, which provide a structural overview of a designated section of an organization’s knowledge as well as details of the qualitative and quantitative characteristics of the individual chunks of knowledge within that designated section (Debenham and Clark, 1994). The document also identifies the knowledge repositories in which those chunks reside. The knowledge audit is scientific measurement of the state of
affairs of specified sections of corporate knowledge. A critical part of a knowledge management methodology is performing a knowledge audit (Liebowitz, 1999).

The knowledge audit may identify the following (Wiig, 1993):

- Information glut or lack of information
- Lack of awareness of information elsewhere in the organization
- Inability to keep side by side of relevant information
- Significant “reinventing the wheel”
- Common use of out-of-date information and
- Not knowing where to go for expertise in a specific area.

A knowledge audit assesses potential stores of knowledge. It is the first part of any knowledge management strategy. By discovering what knowledge is possessed, it is then possible to find the most effective method of storage and dissemination. It can then be used as the basis for evaluating the extent to which change needs to be introduced to the organization. Part of the knowledge audit is capturing “tacit” knowledge. To do this, some organization use communication technologies and virtual teams, including groupware, discussion databases, video conferencing, data conferencing, and team ware.

In a knowledge audit, one should try to identify the knowledge of: People who know the contents of libraries, including feedback from lead customers with product innovations and adaptations, rules of thumb, shortcuts, sources, and constructions in addition to the stores.

Look for opportunities and assess the form of nature, relevance, usefulness, costs, timeliness, and the accuracy of the data collected. Pay close attention to the context, the transformation, and the assumptions along the way.

2.5 **AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF KNOWLEDGE AUDIT**

The aims and objectives of knowledge audit are:

1. Leveraging the organization’s knowledge
2. Creating new knowledge or promoting innovation
3. Increasing collaboration and hence enhancing the skill level of employees (Hylton, 2009).

4. Knowledge audit helps an organization to clearly identify what knowledge is needed to support overall organizational goals and individual and team activities;

5. It gives tangible evidence of the extent to which knowledge is being effectively managed and indicates where improvement are needed;

6. It explains how knowledge moves around in, and is used by, that organization;

7. It provides a map of what knowledge exists in the organization and where it exists, revealing both gaps and duplication;

8. It provides an inventory of knowledge assets, allowing them to become more visible and therefore more measurable and accountable;

9. It provides vital information for the development of effective knowledge management programmes and initiatives that are directly relevant to the organization’s specific knowledge needs and current situation;

10. It helps in leveraging customer knowledge;

11. To identify the relevant knowledge repositories within the organization;

12. To provide meaningful hard data input to the strategic plan for knowledge processing (Sharma and Chowdhury, 2007).

13. To give high-level view of the extent, nature, and structure of the knowledge in a specific section;

14. To provide a statement of the qualitative characteristics of the chunks of the knowledge within a particular knowledge repository;

15. To provide scientific estimates for the quantitative characteristics of the chunks of knowledge with in a particular knowledge repository.

16. To provide meaningful hard data input to the strategic plan for knowledge processing

17. To identify the relevant knowledge repositories with in the organization (Paramasivan, 2003; Debenham and Clark 1994).
2.6 PURPOSE OF KNOWLEDGE AUDIT

The main purpose of the knowledge audit is to help the audited unit to determine what it knows, who knows what, what it does not know, what it needs to know, and how it should go about improving the management of its existing knowledge. The audit therefore serves to help the audited unit to determine if it ‘knows what it knows’ and ‘knows what it doesn’t know’ about its existing knowledge state. The knowledge audit also assesses the efficiency and effectiveness of corporate, departmental and process-driven knowledge lifecycles. The enlightenment that comes as a result of the knowledge audit sets the agenda for the knowledge management initiative, programmes, and implementation, so that the organization can better leverage knowledge for business and competitive advantage (Hylton, 2009).

2.7 NEED OF KNOWLEDGE AUDIT

A knowledge Audit is a rigorous examination of an organization’s knowledge and information user. It is intended to make visible the knowledge and information assets that drive its core activities. Organizations conduct knowledge audits for a number of reasons, such as to:

1. Identify what and where key knowledge assets can be found.
2. Identify knowledge gap (what they should know but don’t)
3. Use them as evidence for developing a corporate taxonomy
4. Identify high priority documents (in terms of demand and value) for migrating into a portal
5. Use them to set knowledge management priorities and needs in a knowledge management strategy exercise.
6. Map the knowledge flow and current bottlenecks within those flows
7. Develop an information and knowledge map of the organization
8. Review the use of external knowledge resources and how it may be used more effectively
9. Review the use of internal knowledge resources, how valuable they are, and how they may be improved (DiMattia and Blumenthal, 2000).
10. identifying and quantifying knowledge needs to meet organizational
targets,
11. overall knowledge resources,
12. the knowledge and expertise resources of the organization, and
13. where the knowledge resides, who uses it, the barriers to its use, and the
gaps that need to be filled Identifying resources, services and knowledge
flow;
14. verifying the existence of appropriate services;
15. rationalizing resources;
16. controlling costs;
17. improving the marketability of services by increased visibility;
18. exploiting the resulting improvements (DiMattia and Blumenthal, 2000).

2.8 BENEFITS OF KNOWLEDGE AUDIT

The main benefit of knowledge audit is the development of a much
better understanding of this prize asset and how it can be used to stimulate
creativity and innovation. Specifically knowledge audit will be to identify how
the organization can:

1. make better use of its intellectual assets
2. make better use of external knowledge
3. avoid inefficiencies and duplication of knowledge
4. avoid knowledge overload
5. save real time and money through efficiencies (Anand and Anand,
   2007).
6. a comprehensive listing of an organizations information sources;
7. the realization of the costs associated with the creation, storage and
   retrieval of information with in the organization;
8. improvements in the services provided by the information centre; and
9. changes in the way information is handled and utilized including the
   sharing of information.
10. It helps the organization clearly identify what knowledge is needed to
    support overall organizational goals and individual and team activities.
11. It gives tangible evidence of the extent to which knowledge is being effectively managed and indicates where improvements are needed.

12. It provides an evidence-based account of the knowledge that exists in organizations, and how that knowledge moves around in, and is used by, that organization.

13. It provides a map of what knowledge exists in the organization and where it exists, revealing both gaps and duplication.

14. It reveals pockets of knowledge that are not currently being used to good advantage and therefore offer untapped potential.

15. It provides a map of knowledge and communication flows and networks, revealing both examples of good practice and blockage and barriers to good practice.

16. It provides an inventory of knowledge assets, allowing them to become more visible and therefore more measurable and accountable, and giving a clearer understanding of the contribution of knowledge to organizational performance.

17. It provides vital information for the development of effective knowledge management programmes and initiatives that are directly relevant to the organization’s specific knowledge needs and current situation (Admin, 2006).

The benefits of knowledge audit can be categorized as

1. Validity Benefits
2. Diagnostic Benefits
3. Feedback benefit
4. Information benefits
5. Training benefits

- **Validity Benefits**: one of the results of a properly performed knowledge audit is valid and accurate knowledge on the status of knowledge as a corporate resource. The quality of planning and management should therefore improve, as accurate, relevant and valid knowledge is readily available.
• **Diagnostic Benefits:** The researchers have determined that the diagnostic benefit is one that is characteristics of the majority of audits. The diagnostic element of an audit allows for strong points and weak points (or “gaps”) to be identified. This knowledge can be used to build on the strong points and weak points and to eliminate the weak ones.

• **Feedback benefit:** knowledge audit is an important element in the process of feedback. The knowledge audit is used to determine whether specific knowledge inputs deliver the expected/ desired knowledge outcomes. The knowledge audit is therefore an instrument of evaluation and provides knowledge that can be used to plan and implement corrective actions.

• **Information benefits:** a communication audit focuses attention on the process of communication in an organization and the improvement there of in the same manner, the knowledge audit can help to focus staff members’ attention on the value and benefits of the use of knowledge as a corporate resource.

• **Training benefits:** The knowledge audit provide the ideal opportunity to involve staff in the auditing process and at the same time to teach them more about the processes, philosophy and structures that support the usage of corporate knowledge resources. By the time the knowledge audit has been completed, these staff members will have a better understanding and picture of knowledge and its role in the organization. The researchers feel that the knowledge audit provides the opportunity to train staff members who will become knowledge managers, or who will be involved in corporate knowledge management processes in future (Botha, 2000; Boon 1990).
2.9 COMPONENTS OF KNOWLEDGE AUDIT

A knowledge Audit can have the following components:

1. Knowledge Needs Analysis

The first step in knowledge audits involves getting clear about precisely what knowledge the organization and the people and teams within it need in order to meet their goals and objectives. A knowledge audit provides a systematic way of finding this out to some level of detail. Common approaches taken to collating this information including questionnaire-based surveys, interviews and facilitated group discussions, or a combination of these. In asking people about knowledge needs, it important to provide a point of focus, as ‘knowledge’ can be seen as being quite conceptual and therefore difficult to articulate. To get around this, and to insure that you are concentrating on vital knowledge, invite people to think about their goals and objectives, and the core processes, activities and decisions that they perform in the course of their day-to-day work. You might ask them to also consider their main problems and challenges, and how might faster access to better knowledge help them in that regard.

Knowledge need analysis can help any organization to develop its future strategy, it can also measure the staff skills and competency enhancement needs and opportunities for training and development, corporate knowledge culture-practice such as knowledge sharing attitude, collaboration, team spirit, rewards and recognitions and staff relationship with their superiors, peers and subordinates (Sharma, and Chowdhury, 2007).

2. Knowledge Inventory Analysis

Knowledge inventory is a knowledge stock taking to identify and locate knowledge assets and resources throughout the entire organization. This process involves counting, indexing, and categorizing of corporate tacit and explicit knowledge. In the case of explicit knowledge, this will include things like:

- what knowledge we have – numbers, types and categories of documents, databases, libraries, intranet websites, links and subscriptions to external resources etc?
• where the knowledge is – locations in the organisation, and in its various systems?
• organisation and access – how are knowledge resources organised, how easy is it for people to find and access them?
• purpose, relevance and ‘quality’ – why do these resources exist, how relevant and appropriate are they for that purpose, are they of good ‘quality’ e.g. up-to-date, reliable, evidence-based etc?
• usage – are they actually being used, by whom, how often, what for?

In the case of tacit knowledge, the inventory will focus on people and look at things like:

• Who we have – numbers and categories of people
• Where they are – locations in departments, teams and buildings
• What they do – job levels and types
• What they know – academic and professional qualifications, core knowledge and experience
• What they are learning – on the job training, learning and development.

The knowledge inventory gives you a snapshot of your knowledge assets or resources. By comparing your inventory with your earlier analysis of knowledge needs, you can begin to identify gaps in your organisation’s knowledge as well as areas of unnecessary duplication. This is also explored in greater detail in the next step (Paramasivan, 2003).

3. Knowledge Flows Analysis

Knowledge flow analysis look at knowledge resources move around the organization, from where it is to where it is needed. In other words, it is to determine how people in an organization find the knowledge they need, and how do they share the knowledge they have. The knowledge flow analysis looks at people, processes and systems:

I. Analysis of people: Examine their attitude towards, habits and behaviors concerning, and skills in knowledge sharing, use and dissemination.
II. **Analysis of Process:** Examine how people go about their daily work activities and how knowledge seeking, sharing, use and dissemination form parts of those activities, existence of policies and practices concerning flow, sharing and usage of information and knowledge, for example, are there any existing policies such as on information handling, management of records, web publishing etc? Or are there other policies that exist that may directly or indirectly affect or relate to knowledge management, which may act as enablers or barriers to a good knowledge practice?

III. **Analysis of system:** examine technical infrastructure: for example, information technology system, portals, content management, accessibility and ease of use, and current level of usage. To what extend those existing systems facilitate knowledge sharing and flow, and help to connect people within the organization.

An analysis of knowledge flows will allow an organization to further identify gaps in their organization’s knowledge and areas of duplication; it will also highlight examples of good practice that can be built on, as well as blockages and barriers to knowledge flows and effective use. It will show where an organization needs to focus attention in their knowledge management initiatives in order to get knowledge moving from where it is to where it is needed (Paramasivan, 2003).

4. **Knowledge Mapping**

The knowledge map is a navigation aid to explicit (codified) information and tacit knowledge, showing the importance and the relationships between knowledge stores and dynamics. The knowledge map, an outcome of synthesis, portrays the sources, flows, constraints and sinks of knowledge within an organization. There are two main approaches to knowledge mapping:

1. Mapping knowledge assets and resources- the map shows what knowledge exists in the organization and where it can be found
(holders of the knowledge- knowledge creator, collector, connector, users and knowledge critics, data repositories)

2. Mapping knowledge flows- the map shows how knowledge moves around the organization from where it is to where it is needed (Paramasivan, 2003).

5. Other Aspects of Knowledge Audit

Be clear about your purpose. The knowledge audit is not a quick or simple process, and so the time and effort required needs to be justifies by a clear purpose and a set of actions that will be taken as a result of what the audit reveals.

The ease or difficulty that you have in gathering and collecting the information you need as part of the audit process is itself a good indicator of the status of your current knowledge management capabilities.

If you decide to commission a knowledge audit from external consultants, be aware that the quality and depth of work that comes under the general banner of ‘knowledge auditing’ varies. Many vendors use the term ‘knowledge audit’ to describe what is in fact an information audit- which will only look at explicit knowledge. Auditing tacit knowledge is probably where the greater challenge lies, and is hence the area in which expert help is likely to be most valuable (Paramasivan, 2003).

A successful knowledge audit must reflect the organization and how it works. It must review the different business processes with in the organization, exploring what knowledge is needed in the process and what knowledge the process generates. It requires a top-down as well as a bottom up approach looking at all the knowledge flows, barriers, and influences. An independent knowledge audit team is often preferable, bringing confidentiality and a fresh perspective to information management practice and use. To achieve all the objectives of the knowledge audit, to gather all the data, and develop practical protocol proposals, a mix of interviews, questionnaires, discussion groups and focus groups need to be used.
Once the knowledge map is complete and recommendations implemented the knowledge audit should not be forgotten. Organizations change and knowledge needs and flows change—the knowledge should be a regular feature of an organization helping to maintain and capitalize on this vital asset. (Anand, V. and Anand, S., 2007)

2.10 KNOWLEDGE AUDIT MODELS

In order to give flavors of the knowledge audit process, below is brief summary of the knowledge audit model developed and practiced by the author’s knowledge auditing company, Hylton Associates.

Our knowledge audit is very people-centred as basic tenet is that people are the centre of knowledge management in any enterprise, in any geographical location, large or small, private of public.

The seven-stage knowledge audit model as shown in figure number 2.1 takes gives the knowledge audit process stage-by-stage highlighting those aspects of the process that are critical to its success and the issues that may face that impact on the value of outcomes. The seven stages are:

1. Planning
2. Data collection
3. Data analysis
4. Data evaluation
5. Communicating recommendation
6. Implementing recommendation
7. The knowledge audit as a continuum

The model is not a highly structured and controlled process that operates in a tightly defined manner. Rather it is a structured framework that is flexible and can ‘bend’ to meet the varying conditions and constraints of an organization. In other words, the components can be ‘tailored’ to suit to the objectives of the organization and the resources available (Susan, 2000).
Stage One: Planning

As with any major project, the planning stage is critical as it can determine the project’s success or failure. To plan properly for information audit there are five steps to work through. These are:
1. Understand your organization and develop clear objectives
2. Determine the scope and resource allocation
3. Choose a methodology
4. Develop a communication strategy
5. Enlist management support

Figure No. 2.10.1: The Seven –Stage Model
Stage Two - Data Collection

This stage involves collecting the data you need to achieve your objectives. Data can be collected by questionnaire, personal interview or focus group interview. Whether you create a questionnaire or conduct interviews it is critical that the right people are asked the right questions. It is critical that the questions you ask result in a dataset that is usable, in terms of its volume, its content and its format. It is usual to collect three types of data:

1. data relating to information required to perform tasks and activities
2. data relating to the ‘level of criticality’ of information resources, tasks and activities
3. data relating to information transfer

This stage also involves the creation of an information resources database that is used as the tool to establish the strategic significance of resources. Records must be created for all business units/sections/departments that include their objectives, critical success factors and tasks and activities. The data collection process will gather the data relating to the information resources that enable and support the tasks and activities.

Stage Three - Data Analysis

Once the data has been collected it must be analyzed. The analysis process will identify gaps, duplications and over provisions and the use of sub-standard or inappropriate resources. It will enable a level of strategic significance to be assigned to tasks and activities that can then be used to determine where critical knowledge is being produced and stored and where it is required for re-use.

Analysis can be done in-house or by external analysts, depending on the resources available in-house, and the complexity and volume of the data collected. There are a variety of tools available to facilitate the analysis process. These range from common spreadsheet and database programs such as MS Access and MS Excel, specialist qualitative and quantitative data analysis
There are three types of analysis carried out on the data collected – (1) general analysis, (2) strategic significance analysis and (3) information flow mapping.

**General analysis**: data collected by any open questions is analyzed generally using common spreadsheet or database programs or specialist analysis tools.

**Significance analysis**: is done using the information resources database. The database can be used to develop an 'information and knowledge inventory' and to enable the matching of resources and knowledge development with business unit or organisational objectives. This allows a measure of strategic significance to be assigned to resources used and to knowledge generated. The information resources database can be used to generate reports such as:

- the tasks supported by each information resource
- the importance of each information resource to the tasks it supports
- the information resources that support each organisational objective
- the tasks for which the ‘ideal’ resources are not provided
- duplications of resources

The mapping of information flows enables the identification of gaps, duplications and flow inefficiencies. It can also form the basis for a 'knowledge transfer' model by identifying where knowledge is created, where it is needed and where it currently goes (if anywhere). Visual representation of the information flows can identify:

- bottlenecks and inefficiencies (lots going in but very little coming out)
- information gatekeepers (lots coming in through a single distribution point)
- dead ends (lots going in but nothing coming out)
- over provisions (services provided but not required)
- gaps (non-provision of critical resources)
- imbalances/biases (inequalities in information provision)

**Stage Four - Data Evaluation**

Once the data has been analyzed, problems and opportunities can be identified and then interpreted and evaluated within the context of the
organization. Not every problem will need to be addressed and some will be unable to be addressed due to organisational constraints such as insufficient resources (people, money, technical or physical resources).

Many of the problems that are identified are opportunities to improve the provision of information and extend information services and improve the quality of knowledge created. They can include:

- information hoarding
- biased distribution of resources
- use of sub-standard resources
- gaps in the provision of resources
- information overload issues
- lack of transparency and accountability
- lack of traceability

To evaluate how significant the problems are a number of questions need to be answered before a decision can be made regarding the feasibility and cost effectiveness of addressing the problems. These relate to its level of criticality, the cost of addressing it, the cost of not addressing it, and the level of formality needed to address it (local, departmental or organisational). Some examples are:

- does the problem have strategic significance? (is it affecting the achievement of organisational objectives?)
- is there a reason for the problem? Does it matter?
- what are the cost implications?
- what alternatives are possible?
- what are the implications of suggesting a change? Who will be affected? What other services will be affected? What barriers will be faced?

For each problem that is identified there may be more than one solution and it is important that the most appropriate solution is recommended. The measure of suitability of each solution must be determined to by using a weighting system to measure them against a common set of criteria. If this
process is performed correctly and objectively the solution with the highest score is the best alternative.

It is important that the recommendations that are formulated in this stage are realistic, achievable and manageable. The costs associated with the recommendation, the processes for incorporation and implementation and quantifiable goals must all be established and documented.

**Stage Five - Communicating the Recommendations**

Communication strategies are important throughout the entire information audit process, however it is critical that once the recommendations have been formulated, they are communicated to the people who are integral to them being implemented. Because many of the recommendations will represent an element of change to the resources and services available in the organization they may affect the daily work processes of some, if not many, employees. It is critical that the changes are communicated in a positive way, and in a way that guarantees management support for their implementation. Also, if you have established and maintained successful communication channels throughout the audit process, the employees will recognize the validity of the process that has been worked through to reach the final recommendations.

There are many ways in which you can communicate the information audit results and recommendations. The most common method is a written report, with the second most common being an oral presentation (or a series of presentations depending on the size and structure of the organization). Other methods include seminars and workshops, newsletters and bulletins either in hardcopy or posted on corporate intranets and web sites.

**Stage Six - Implementing the Recommendations**

Once the findings of the information audit have been developed into strategies, and the recommendations that have been formulated from the strategies have been successfully communicated to management and throughout the organization, plans must be made for the implementation of the recommendations. Nothing can be changed in isolation and each change that is
made in an organization has a roll on effect. This must be understood when formulating the recommendations, and also during the implementation process. The development of a comprehensive implementation plan and a post-implementation review strategy will facilitate the changes and minimize resistance.

The way in which the implementation program is developed will depend on what the recommendations are and to what extent they will impact on the individuals and groups that are affected. Whether they are minor or major changes, if their implementation is to be successful they must be carefully planned and executed. Even seemingly minor changes can be unsuccessful if their impact is underestimated or if they conflict with aspects of the political and cultural environments that exist within the organization.

**Stage Seven - The Continuum**

The initial information audit is the 1st generation information audit (Buchanan and Gibb, 1998). It has provided you with a rich dataset that presents a 'snapshot' of where the organization is at with regard to its information - this is your first information baseline. It has also provided you with a database that contains information relating to the information resources, and the organization’s business units and tasks and activities. Subsequent audits add to the dataset and re-assess the validity of the information baseline which is constantly changing as the organization changes. They also add to and supplement the information resources database to reflect changes in significance, tasks or organizational structure.

Once the initial information audit is complete, a decision must be made about how the datasets can be maintained and built on with subsequent information audits to regularly review the information environment. Each subsequent information audit (2nd generation and beyond) need not be conducted using the same framework. They may vary in their scope, for example be restricted to a single business unit, or a group of business units, a
geographical area, or a functional section of the organization. The methodology used could also vary according to the objectives of a specific audit. This is known as 'tailoring' the audit to suit the objectives.

The conducting of 2nd generation audits will not only ensure that resources meet needs, but will also ensure that the data gathered during the 1st generation audit are built on. 2nd generation information audits must not be conducted in isolation and must measure and account for any changes that have occurred since the previous audit. Each information audit that is conducted adds to the information resource database. As the organization changes, the changing needs can be matched with either existing or new resources use the data stored in the database.

2.11 METHODS OF KNOWLEDGE AUDIT

There are a variety of methods that can be used but as a general rule most knowledge audits involve: Identifying knowledge needs by using questionnaires, interviews and focus groups and the development of a knowledge inventory mainly focusing on the types of knowledge available (Liebowitz, 2000).

Knowledge audit usually are:

- A list of knowledge items (both explicit and tacit). This can be an overview of people’s education, a list of experiences that staff has in a certain subject. But also project reports, training material and examples of curricula where ICT is used in education.
- A knowledge network map which shows the flow of knowledge items
- A social network map that reveals the interaction among staff on knowledge sharing (Orna, 1999; Dyer, 2000; Zack, 1999a).

The basic premise is that everyone in the organization is a knowledge worker (Hylton, 2009); a knowledge worker “is primarily intellectual, creative and non-routine in nature, and which involves both the utilization and creation of knowledge” (Hislop, 2005). Although anyone in the organization can be a
knowledge worker, Abel and Oxbrow, (2002) state that you can perform the knowledge audit in a part of the organization.

There are various methods used in knowledge audit these are as follow:

1. The first method, observation, entails one or several people spending hours, days or weeks watching people do their jobs, asking questions and taking notes. Observers note the tasks of the workers, what information is necessary to accomplish these tasks and how the worker acquires this information. Observation allows for a true, detailed account of the work of individuals and groups. However, observation requires trained, skilled observers who understand how to translate what is observed into usable data for the audit. The major disadvantage is the time and number of observers that it takes to get a representative sample of the diverse tasks performed by individuals within a group.

2. The second method, focus groups, involves interviewing groups of people. The groups typically engage in unstructured discussion. As with observation, this process requires trained interviewers to ensure the validity of the data collected during the discussion. One advantage of the focus group method is the fact that the unstructured nature of conversation often brings to light issues that would probably not be uncovered during interviews with individuals.

3. A third method is to monitor information system usage. This method typically reveals who uses which systems, how often the system is accessed and the length of time the users is logged into the system. Furthermore, it can disclose systems that are unused and need to be discontinued or systems that are overused and need additional resources. Systems usage analysis must be used in conjunction with other methods to obtain a complete picture because it can’t provide the reasons why or why not the systems are used. This method also requires that the systems to be analyzed have the functionality to collect this type of data or the additional expense of adding the capability.
4. The fourth method is the questionnaire. The questionnaire can be used to collect a variety of data. It is inexpensive and can be made such that it will be easy for the respondent to fill out. The difficulty with this method is designing questions that can be easily interpreted by people with little or no explanation who have diverse information needs and systems knowledge.

5. The fifth and final method considered was the interview. The structure and format of the interview can be varied to suit a number of purposes. The interaction between the interview and the respondent may provide the opportunity to gather additional, unsolicited feedback. However, interviews can be time consuming and require either a professional interviewer or specialized training for best results (DiMattia and Blumenstein, 2000).

After reviewing the advantages and disadvantages of each of the methods of data collection, the team decided on a questionnaire to be followed up by a short interview. The questionnaire would provide the opportunity to collect the most data by using targeted questions. The interview would provide an opportunity to not only follow up on and validate questionnaire responses, but also to ask questions that couldn’t be adequately addressed in the questionnaire.

Some organizations are embarking on knowledge management programs without an understanding of why their knowledge assets are important. Rather than being in a position to make informed decisions about knowledge they need to manage, they attempt to manage everything, whether it is significant or not (Henczel, 2000).

After reviewing different knowledge audit methodologies to audit knowledge have found that they do not establish a clear strategy explaining a suitable place where the knowledge audit in an enterprise or area should initiate to give an order to complete the audit, in other words, they attempt to audit everything, significant or not to the organization. Other deficiencies found in
the great majority of the knowledge audit methodologies examined, is that they do not established measurement criteria to verify the impact related to knowledge management process. Finally, the methodologies analyzed need to be completed applied to detect problems/ opportunities and then propose some improvements to the organization in relation to knowledge management (Liebowitz et al., 2000; Henczel and Bus, 2001; Hylton, 2000; Schwikkard and du Toit, 2004; Burnet et al.2004; Jackson, 2005; Iazzolino and Pietrantonio, 2005; Cheung et al., 2005).

2.12 CONCLUSION

For the study on Knowledge Audit, understanding how the organization functions are critical to its success. Structure, culture, communication issues, political issues internal relationship, relationship with external entities must be understood before an appropriate knowledge audit methodology can be developed. Therefore the functioning of Department of Library and Information Science of Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Marathwada University (B. A. M. U.) has been explained in Chapter-3.
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