Richard Brunet-Thornton[1], Vladimir Bures[2]

WHEN KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT COLLIDES WITH NATIONAL CULTURE: EAST-EUROPEAN KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT EXPERIENCE (OR LACK THEREOF?)

Knowledge management comprises a diverse and growing body, however there is little discussion of the condition in East-European countries while a few published studies can be considered an exception. 2 research surveys are conducted to investigate the 2 hypotheses on knowledge management and knowledge sharing and transfer in the particular East-European country — the Czech Republic. The results reveal that knowledge management is a foreign, mostly unknown, concept. A shift in responsibilities and democratisation of knowledge are contrary to the ideologies and practice of doing business today. The experience of knowledge sharing and knowledge transfer reflects not only cultural values but also a cultural demographic division.

Keywords: *knowledge management, knowledge sharing and transfer, Czech Republic, technology, culture.*

Річард Брунет-Торнтон, Владімір Буреш

ЗІТКНЕННЯ НАЦІОНАЛЬНОЇ КУЛЬТУРИ ТА УПРАВЛІННЯ ЗНАННЯМИ: ДОСВІД СХІДНОЇ ЄВРОПИ (АБО ЙОГО ВІДСУТНІСТЬ?)

У статті показано, що управління знаннями набирає все більшу популярність у світі, проте мало хто обговорює його стан у країнах Східної Європи, а декілька опублікованих досліджень можна розглядати лише як виняток. Для підтвердження двох гіпотез стосовно управління знаннями та обміну і передачі знань в одній зі східноєвропейських країн — Чехії — проведено два дослідження. Результати їх показують, що управління знаннями у цьому регіоні залишається лише малознайомою концепцією. Перенесення відповідальності і демократизація знань суперечать ідеології і практиці ведення місцевого бізнесу. Досвід обміну знаннями і передачі знань відображає не лише культурні цінності, але й культурно-демографічний розрив у суспільстві.

Ключові слова: *управління знаннями, обмін і передача знань, Чехія, технологія, культура.*

Таб. 5. Літ. 31.

Ричард Брунет-Торнтон, Владимир Буреш

ПРОТИВОСТОЯНИЕ НАЦИОНАЛЬНОЙ КУЛЬТУРЫ И УПРАВЛЕНИЯ ЗНАНИЯМИ: ОПЫТ ВОСТОЧНОЙ ЕВРОПЫ (ИЛИ ЕГО ОТСУТСТВИЕ?)

В статье показано, что управление знаниями набирает все большую популярность в мире, однако мало кто обсуждает его состояние в странах Восточной Европы, а несколько опубликованных исследований можно рассматривать только как исключение. Для подтверждения двух гипотез о управлении знаниями и совместном использовании и передаче в одной из восточноевропейских стран — Чехии — проведены два исследования. Результаты их показывают, что управление знаниями в этом регионе остается лишь малознакомой концепцией. Перенос ответственности и демократизация знаний противоречат идеологии и практике ведения местного бизнеса. Опыт обмена знаниями и

[1] MBA, PhD, Lecturer and Researcher, Faculty of Business Administration, University of Economics in Prague, Czech Republic.

[2] Assoc. Prof., Ing., PhD, Associate Professor, Faculty of Informatics and Management, University or Hradec Kralove, Czech Republic; Vysoka Skola Manazmentu, City University of Seattle, Bratislava, Slovakia.

передачи знаний отражает не только культурные ценности, но и культурно-демографический разрыв в обществе.

Ключевые слова: *управление знаниями, обмен и передача знаний, Чехия, технология, культура.*

1. Introduction. Knowledge management (KM) is a controversial topic within academic circles in many countries. As with the introduction of many other "foreign" management practices, enterprises analyse the cost of introduction and if substantial benefits exist, implement — often, to the chagrin of employees. In recent history, the introduction of ISO 9000 quality standards met with substantial reticence both on the side of corporations (costs) and employees (resistance to change). Specifically to East European countries, issues are not technically related but as one director summarises, "the cooperative aspects seem too much like old socialist (communist) brigades, and it is difficult to teach workers the difference" (Clark and Soulsby, 1999:211) (the word “communist” added by the authors). As acknowledged by Brunet-Thornton and Bures (2009), successful KM implementation, despite governmental encouragement, is a rare accomplishment in East European countries in general. Therefore, the aim of this paper is, based on the qualitative research, to investigate the current state of knowledge management, knowledge sharing and knowledge transfer at the cultural national level in the Czech Republic as a special case study and, where possible, to generalise results for the whole region. The paper is organised as follows. The next section briefly describes KM foundations. The third section presents the research methodology, whereas the fourth section depicts the acquired results. The consecutive section discusses the results from several perspectives and the last section concludes the discussion.

2. Theoretical Background. KM has experienced phenomenal growth particularly in the past decade (Wilson, 2002). This coupled with overly optimistic literature (Storey and Barnett, 2000), considerable fanfare (Malhotra, 2005) and poor performance (Marr and Spender, 2004), reinforces suggestions that KM is yet another fad (Coulson-Thomas, 2004). There exists a myriad of definitions of knowledge management. Managing knowledge promotes the creation of value-added products and services once knowledge is shared (Bhatt, 2001). Malhotra (2000:3) states that KM is central to "obsoleting what you know before others obsolete it and profiting by creating the challenges and opportunities others haven't even thought about".

Alavi and Leidner (2001) identify 4 components of the knowledge process: (1) knowledge creation; (2) knowledge sharing; (3) knowledge transfer, and (4) knowledge application. Many theorists view knowledge sharing (KS) as being the instigator of KM, but there exists an overall belief that most individuals are reluctant to share knowledge for various reasons. Bollinger and Smith (2001) propose that when an organisation does not support or exhibit a sharing culture this yields an environment of inadequate knowledge transfer, devoid of trust and candidness. In turn, members are fearful of reproach. If properly instituted, a reward system may alleviate this problem. However, although the quantity of shared knowledge may increase, the quality is liable to suffer.

Nonaka's (1991) contribution to the appreciation of knowledge transfer (KT) centres on knowledge sharing on diverse planes. Knowledge creation starts with sharing of tacit knowledge that progresses ultimately to knowledge propagation. McAdam

and McCreedy (1999:93) state, "perhaps knowledge transfer in organisations is much more complicated and convoluted that this simple matrix suggests". Argote and Ingram (2000:151) argue that KT serves as a competitive edge for organisations. Furthermore, they define KT as "the process through which one unit is affected by the experience of another". While Davenport and Glaser (2002) recognise that KS often fails through the introduction of unforeseen obstacles rendering it more difficult to complete the task. Levin and Cross (2004) consider the mediating role of trust in KT. Their research reveals that competence- and benevolence-based trust among individuals influence the link between them and subsequently, the receipt of useful knowledge.

3. Research Methods. The initial literature study suggests that KM comprises a diverse and growing body. Although published studies focusing on East European environment are available, e.g. Ukraine (Nosan, 2011), Latvia (Kants, 2011); Poland (Milosz and Milosz, 2010), or Czech Republic (Maresova, 2010), the discussion of the condition in particular countries from this region is not as extensive and deep when compared to Western Europe case studies. In addition, discussions on culture and KM deal principally with organisational culture thus lacking an important correlation with national cultural values. Since this study is conducted by international team, this paper is based on the modified ethnographical approach heavily supplemented by traditional academic research and personal experience. The ethnological method as defined by Creswell (1998:12) is "a description and interpretation of a cultural or social group or system". The explication is supplemented throughout by former research and observation used to compile previously published works and documents. The research methods selected albeit a mixture of techniques permit flexibility.

Babbie (2010:422) describes qualitative research as "the non-numerical examination and interpretation of observations, for the purposes of discovering underlying meanings and patterns of relationships". This entails an open-ended observation and analysis, searching for patterns, and processes that explain the “how” and the “why”. The present research involves the use of qualitative data acquired from primary and secondary sources, informal discussions, published works and management documents, action research, and participative observation to understand and explain social phenomena.

The authors investigate 2 main KM-based hypotheses in this study:

1. Perception of KM as a foreign concept alien to the country acts as a cultural barrier to successful deployment.
2. The cultural model is the major influential factor to knowledge sharing and knowledge transfer in universities.

Basically, two research surveys are conducted to gather basic data and investigate these hypotheses. Firstly, CZ-KM-E survey consists of 31 questions in the Czech language. The unique component of this step is the nature and design of the principal instrument. The preface provides the respondent with 2 definitions: KM and intellectual capital. The participant uses the definitions as reference in replying. 30 questions use possible “Yes/No”, Likert scale and 'options' as possible answer formats. The questionnaire embeds logic wherein the answer to the first question directs the respondent to the series of questions related to their choice of answer, i.e. the ques-

tion "Based on the above definitions does your organisation have a KM programme?", if answered Yes, it directs to the series of 28 questions, if answered No, it directs to the series of 29 questions. Finally, if the answer is "Do not know", the questionnaire directs to a series of 28 questions. Finally, 93 available replies are analyzed.

Secondly, KS/KT-CZUNI survey is organised in a similar manner. The self-administered questionnaire consists of 2 sections. The first part deals with personal experience, whereas the second part deals with personal views. It is not necessary for a respondent to reply to both, although strongly suggested. Survey I consists of 15 questions, whereas survey II consists of 10 questions. 25 questions use the Likert scale. Due to the nature of the questions, gender and academic standing are the discriminating variables. The preface contains 3 definitions: KM, KS, and KT. The survey received 66 usable replies. Consequently, descriptive statistical methods are used and the received replies are processed.

Invitations were posted on a professional social network (LinkedIn) aimed directly to various interest groups. Another round of invitations was issued to former students of the authors as well as colleagues in various business and industry sectors. These contact individuals served as gatekeepers and forwarded the request to their colleagues. There exist limitations related to the procedure and technology deployed in the study. Due to time and other constraints, interviews do not constitute part of the research. Also, an assumption that is impossible to verify is that the metropolitan Prague area may be overrepresented by the C-KM-E survey — unlike the KS/KT-CZUNI survey, this questionnaire is open to all business sectors including education. The content is geared to an operational approach and background.

Table 1. **Selected statements provided by "Yes" respondents**

Selected Statement	Total, %	Male, %	Female, %
Management interest to KM:			
High	32.4	26.3	40.0
Management KM sponsorship level:			
Senior	62.5	57.9	69.2
Department(-s) contributing to KM implementation:			
Personnel	50.0	47.4	53.8
IT	50.0	52.6	46.2
Effectiveness of KM in achieving:			
Employee Development: High	31.3	42.1	38.5
Revenue Growth: Medium	28.1	26.3	30.8
Customer Service and Focus: High	31.3	31.6	30.8
Profit Growth: Medium	34.4	15.8	61.5
Best describes my organisation: "does not demonstrate a relationship between the importance of KM and the achievement of organisational goals".	50.0	52.6	46.2
"KM is a foreign concept and does not apply to the Czech Republic"			
Strongly agree	31.3	26.3	38.5
Moderate agree	31.3	31.6	30.8
"KM is just another management fad"			
Moderately agree	34.4	31.6	38.5

Source: Authors' research.

4. Results.

4.1. CZ-KM-E Survey. Respondents (n = 93), mostly aged between 21 and 50, and coming from the service, IT, education, or finance industries, comprise 52 males

(55.9%) and 41 females (44.1%). In Table 1 the selected results are described. The table depicts selected statements relevant for the purpose of this paper. These answers were provided by the respondents who replied "Yes" to the first filtration question (see section above). The total percentage of positive answers as well as differentiation between males and females is stated.

Table 2 depicts the selected statements answered by the respondents, who replied "No" to the first filtration question. The total percentage of positive answers as well as differentiation between male and female is stated.

Table 2. **Selected statements provided by "No" respondents**

Selected Statement	Total, %	Male, %	Female, %
KM would be an advantage to the organisation/ *Have not even considered KM*	51.6/*54.8*	44.4/*61.1*	61.5/*46.2*
Management interest to KM: Very Low	32.3	44.4	15.4
Department(-s) who will contribute to KM implementation: All	30.0	41.2	15.4
Current obstacles to effective KM within organisation: No time to share knowledge	71.4	56.3	91.7
What do you intend on doing: No idea	67.9	62.5	75.0
What has been completed? No idea	64.3	56.3	91.7
"KM is a foreign concept and does not apply to the Czech Republic" Strongly agree	35.7	37.5	33.3
"KM is just another management fad" Strongly agree	42.9	43.8	41.7

Source: Authors' research.

The respondents' characteristics (n = 66) are described in Table 3. Title and/or position and industry are not required given.

Table 3. **Respondent characteristics in the first / second part of the survey**

	% Male (I / II part)	Age Range	% Female (I / II part)
Gender/Age	***56.1 / 56.4***		***43.9 / 43.6***
	5.4 / 12.9	<20	10.4 / 4.2
	67.6 / 67.7	21-30	72.4 / 66.7
	18.9 / 16.2	31-40	10.4 / 20.8
	2.7 / 3.2	41-50	6.8 / 8.3
	2.7 / 0	51-60	0 / 0
	2.7 / 0	61+	0 / 0
Education	***56.1 / 56.4***	**Completed**	***43.9 / 43.6***
	18.9/ 19.4	Secondary	41.4 / 12.5
	45.9 / 58.1	Bachelors	34.5 / 37.5
	24.3 / 16.1	Masters	17.2 / 45.8
	10.8 / 6.4	Doctorate	6.9 / 4.2

Source: Authors' research.

4.2.1. Survey I Results. Table 4 summarises selected results from Survey I.

Table 4. **Summary of Survey I Results**

Q		Gender		Academic Standing			
		Male	Female	Secondary	Bachelors	Masters	Doctorate
1)	Disagree %	58,6	25,9	21,4	45,5	57,1	50
	Agree %	34,5	51,9	50	45,5	35,7	33,3
2)	Disagree = 50.0 %	62,1	48,1	28,6	50	71,4	50
3)	Agree = 42.9 %	44,8	40,7	42,9	50	42,9	66,7
4)	Agree = 33.9 %	34,5	33,3	50	22,7	21,4	66,7
5)	Disagree = 41.1 %	44,8	37	28,6	45,5	42,9	50
6)	Disagree = 33.3 %	20,7	48,1	42,9	31,8	28,6	33,3
7)	Disagree = 46.4 %	44,8	48,1	35,7	50	57,1	33,3
8)	Disagree = 48.2 %	51,7	44,4	42,9	50	57,1	33,3
9)	Agree = 51.8 %	55,2	48,1	71,4	45,5	50	33,3
10)	Agree = 35.7 %	37,9	33,3	42,9	27,3	60	16,7
11)	Agree = 37.5 %	31	44,4	42,9	27,3	42,9	50
12)	Disagree = 51.8 %	55,2	48,1	57,1	45,5	57,1	50
13)	Disagree = 48.2 %	48,3	48,1	64,3	45,5	42,9	33,3
14)	Disagree = 51.8 %	51,7	51,9	42,9	40,9	78,6	50
15)	Disagree = 42.9 %	48,3	37	35,7	36,4	57,1	50

Source: Authors' research.

Pertinent questions relative to Table 4 are:

1) The universities' existing knowledge sharing and knowledge transfer methods are an effective way to gain knowledge.

2) I am encouraged to share knowledge and information.

3) The essential practicality of knowledge is seldom transmitted or shared — we deal solely with theories.

4) The efficiency for KS can be increased by adding more technology (IT) to the existing university systems.

5) The existing technological systems used at the university are enough for effective KS and KT.

6) I would participate more in discussions and idea sharing if we had a more advanced technological system to do so.

7) I am motivated to develop and share new ideas.

8) My professor/advisor/colleagues/students provide feedback and encouragement to share knowledge during lectures or discussions.

9) If the administration of the university takes a more formal and active position towards KS, it would then be more prevalent within the university.

10) I often have face-to-face discussions with others on academic issues in an informal way.

11) Individuals with expert knowledge are willing to assist others at the university.

12) Interventions to create an environment that enables and encourages me to create, share and use knowledge (e.g., dynamic teams and seminars, reward and recognition programmes) are common at the university.

13) I feel motivated to develop new ideas.

14) New ideas are generally accepted at the university.

15) The university is equipped with necessary systems to learn from what we do, how we do it, and what we require for future.

4.2.2 Survey II Results. Table 5 summarises selected the results of Survey II.

Table 5. **Summary of Survey II Results**

Q		Gender		Academic Standing			
		Male	Female	Secondary	Bachelors	Masters	Doctorate
1)	Disagree = 41.8 %	35,5	50	44,4	37	50	33,3
2)	Disagree = 43.6 %	45,2	41,7	44,4	48,7	41,7	33,3
3)	Disagree = 47.3 %	58,1	33,3	33,3	51,9	33,3	66,7
4)	Agree = 43.6 %	45,2	41,7	33,3	51,9	41,7	66,7
5)	Agree = 49.1 %	54,8	41,7	44,4	59,3	41,7	66,7
6)	Agree = 67.3 %	61,3	75	55,6	66,7	75	100
7)	Agree = 43.6 %	38,7	50	33,3	44,4	50	66,7
	Strongly Agree = 43.6 %	51,6	33,3	44,4	48,1	33,3	33,3
8)	Agree = 63.6 %	71	54,2	44,4	70,4	54,2	100
9)	Agree = 41.8 %	35,5	50	11,1	40,7	50	66,7
10)	Agree = 41.8 %	38,7	45,8	33,3	44,4	45,8	33,3

Source: Authors' research.

Questions relative to Table 5 are:

1) I have an issue with privacy concerning the sharing of knowledge.

2) The knowledge gathering process could require reviewing your personal work documents and research to add to the knowledge repository. Do you feel this invades your privacy?

3) I feel compelled to share my ideas with others because of the KS culture at the university.

4) I distrust the accuracy and truthfulness of knowledge shared by others at the university.

5) I am afraid to share knowledge, as I believe that my ideas may be plagiarised.

6) Sharing my knowledge decreases my competitiveness with others.

7) I am more willing to share knowledge with friends or with those with whom I have a personal relationship.

8) Rewards motivate individuals to transfer and share knowledge.

9) When I use a language other than Czech (such as English) to discuss and share ideas, it decreases the effectiveness of KS.

10) KM is a foreign concept, which is not suitable for conditions in the Czech Republic.

5. Interpretation of Results. KM imports with it a sense of foreignness and "not made here". Although few exception can be found (e.g., Petrikova et al. (2010) describe experience of East European energy giant CEZ Group), the majority of the literature is in English and carries with it examples of foreign multinationals. In addi-

tion, most literature available in national language cites the same studies and cases often based on the same out-of-country models. There is a predominant notion of knowledge equating to power. After successive oppressive regimes in which knowledge is restricted to a select few, there remains a sense of ownership that knowledge, although no longer restricted toanelite, fetches money. The latter in turn converts to material goods and prestige. The lack of time to share reflects heavily on the concept of time and in general, organisational sense. Other more pressing issues or circumstances often replace current priorities. To the national mentality, KM is a formalisation of what is already being accomplished and thus, adds another formality to the workday. It hinders the sense of innovation that depends on the circumstances. KM also threatens the cultural aspect of experts and specialists. Sharing democratises knowledge and renders an equal standing to all who hold it.

Lecturers and teachers remain part of the elite. This together with what may be termed a generation gap, enforces the in/out group syndrome. In the aim to facilitate learning, many textbooks are translated from the original English language. Unless the author is fully fluent with the topic and the language, the quality of the material suffers from the lack of a culture-specific transfer.

The unique sense of bureaucracy and adaptive attitude impede the normalisation of KM as an integral part of university life. Cech and Bures (2003) describe the "traditional nature" of universities as an obstacle to KM as the process from the decision-making stage to actual implementation is quite lengthy and therefore creates additional delays to KM deployment. In addition, there is an assumption that most individuals perceive KS as "negative, unpleasant, or undesirable" that in turn produces conflict.

5.1 Hypothesis 1: Knowledge Management: Czech Experience.

The study indicates that KM programmes are prevalent in larger enterprises, often affiliates or subsidiaries of multinationals. Those not working in a KM environment believe that such a programme is an asset to their organisation. Most have not considered a programme, whereas those that have are in the process of establishing. Despite the limited size of the survey, the state of KM in the Czech lands is either in its infancy or in a state of dormancy waiting for recognition. Even from those familiar with the concept the initial impetus originates from board level suggesting that the process is imposed from headquarters. IT and HR are the 2 enterprise divisions contributing to implementation indicative that these entities have or envision the most to gain. The obstacles identified to KM implementation are classical: no time to share, information overload, and an unwillingness to share. Girard and Allison (2008) propose that information overload leads to information anxiety. Even from within the usual scope of KM benefits, the often-cited increased revenues, customer service, and reduced costs attract medium to neutral appeal. Intranet and e-mail account for the highest success rates in technology. Issues relative to those who deploy tools other than the 2 most frequent such as document management, and decision support, may be related to a lack of training and principally that the application and supporting documentation is in a language other than Czech without a suitable translation. Not surprisingly, however, most identify that they have access to Internet and e-mail only.

Lip service is paid even in the instances where KM exists. There is a lack of an overall development plan once implemented. The majority claim they have no idea of

what is to become of their programme or of KM. Ultimately, the following statement, the organisation does not demonstrate the relationship between the importance of KM and the achievement of organisational goals, captures the Czech response within an organisational framework. "It is no secret that knowledge is power. A frequent management complaint about implementing KM has been that some employees resist sharing their knowledge out of the fear the company will replace them" (Nahapiet and Ghoshal, 1998). In order to activate its commitments, government must transfer KM from academia to workers (Mladkova, 2011). Most universities offer a selection of KM courses. The question remains if this meta-knowledge is in turn transmitted publicly to others once former students become owners, managers, or leaders of industry.

There is an evident lack of even a basic appreciation within general population. From the survey, a reasonably high percentage assumes that KM is something a computer does. In order to change the model, country-based success stories and actual implementations are documented and constitute “native” artefacts. There is a need to introduce stories made here. KM can be considered as a science of complexity. If it is to become a plausible, it must be simplified to connect with daily activities often taken for granted.

5.2 Hypothesis 2: Knowledge Sharing and Knowledge Transfer in Selected Czech Universities.

Students demonstrate dissatisfaction with their universities' methods of KS and KT. This happens for a number of reasons, but primarily they claim that their academic environment does not promote or provide sufficiently a forum at which there is sharing of new ideas. There is an agreement that the course content deals with theory and lacks practicality needed in today's competitive market.

As for the technology used for KM purposes, a more dynamic platform is needed, however, this will not increase KS and/or KT participation. To summarise in the colloquial this translates to “build us the system and we will not come”. This speaks loudly as to the existence of another malaise of greater importance. Learning for this generation of students is not confined to textbooks and lectures. Their experience is multimedia driven and often hands-on through strategy-based video games. They travel and converse with friends from around the world on Facebook and Skype. Brelade and Harman (2000) suggest that KM changes the role of manager from a controller to the one of facilitator. To a large degree, KM transforms the role of educator to facilitator as well.

University members do share and transfer knowledge but only within selected groups. They anticipate a more practical position from their educators to lead by example in sharing. There lack suitable reward programmes. The necessary dynamics are lacking. Their existence is imperative before they view both the quality and nature of knowledge content as adequate. Although new ideas and methods are abundant, students remain reluctant to share. The lack of recognition reinforces this reluctance.

There is an evident benefit of a successful deployment of KM methods and tools at a university permitting KS, improving teaching, and research partnerships as well as the relationships between the administration, faculty, and students (Mikulecky, 2003). However, to reap and realise these benefits, a change in attitude and praxis is

required. This shift requires time, efforts and financial resources. Some undertakings are underway.

The move towards effective KS and KT need not be grandiose. Oliver et al. (2003) suggest simple Communities of Practice. At university, knowledge working groups based on subject matter or faculty start the process until the entire environment becomes active. Lastly, a reflection on the educators' mandate: "the cultural functions of teaching and research have been the primary functions of universities, whereas the human capital function of preparing trained persons has played a secondary role" (Kok, 2007:184).

6. Conclusions. Based on the qualitative research, 2 hypotheses are tested in this study. Both can be confirmed basing on the results acquired from the Czech environment. It is proved at the national level that perception of KM as a foreign concept alien to the country acts as a cultural barrier to its successful deployment. Moreover, the cultural model is the major influential factor to KS and KT in universities. Given that only 38% of the respondents claim to have a KM programme in place, it is not surprising that over 60% claim to have no idea as to when other KM related activities are planned. Likewise 58.8% respond in the same fashion as to what improvements, if any, are scheduled. The results indicate there is an overall lack of motivation through feedback and encouragement. There is a lack of motivation to develop new ideas. One possible remedy is for universities to adopt a proactive position (yet undefined) towards KS.

KM is a foreign concept complete with its case studies of larger enterprises such as GM, British Telecom, or IBM. KM requires interaction with colleagues and subordinates that entails additional work. A shift in responsibilities and the democratisation of knowledge are contrary to the ideologies and practice of doing business today in the Czech Republic. Lastly, the experience of KS and KT reflect not only Czech cultural values but also a cultural demographic division. Lacking national heroes and traditions, youth adopt a progressive and contemporary view on learning whereas the providers are in the process of evaluating the impact of the past 20 years. The inherent sense of bureaucratisation, research and lectures, and changing priorities dictated by the state, add already to the anxious nature of academia. Although the results can be directly applied only to the Czech settings and other countries have different cultural models (Brunet-Thornton and Bures, 2012), the authors believe that certain level of generalisation and application to other countries is possible. However, further research in particular countries needs to be conducted.

Acknowledgement. *This paper was created with the support of the GACR project SMEW, project num. 403/10/1310.*

References:

1. *Alavi, M. and Leidner, D.E.* (2001). Review: Knowledge Management and Knowledge Management Systems: Conceptual Foundations and Research Issues,MIS Quarterly, 25, 1, 107-136.

2. *Argote, L. and Ingram, P.* (2000). Knowledge transfer: A Basis for Competitive Advantage in Firms, Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 82, 1, 150-169.

3. *Babbie, E.R.* (2010). The Practice of Social Research, 12th ed., Wadsworth, Cengage Learning, Belmont.

4. *Bhatt, G.* (2001). Knowledge management in organizations: examining the interaction between technologies, techniques, and people, Journal of Knowledge Management, 5, 1, 68-75.

5. *Bollinger, A.S. and Smith, R.D.* (2001). Managing organizational knowledge as a strategic asset, Journal of Knowledge Management, 5, 1, 8-18.

6. *Brelade, S. and Harman, C.* (2000). Using Human Resources to Put Knowledge to Work, Knowledge Management Review, 3, 1, 26-29.

7. *Brunet-Thornton, R. and Bures, V.* (2009). Knowledge Management: the Czech Situation, Possible Solutions and the Necessity for Further Research, 6th International Conference on Intellectual Capital, Knowledge Management and Organisational Learning, McGill University, Montreal, Canada, 95-102.

8. *Brunet-Thornton, R. and Bures, V.* (2012). Cross-Cultural Management: Establishing the Czech Benchmark, E+M Economics and Management, 15, 3, 46-62.

9. *Cech, P. and Bures, V.* (2003). Knowledge Management and Czech Universities, Third European Knowledge Management Summer School, September 7-12, San Sebastian, Spain.

10. *Clark, E.D. and Soulsby, A.* (1999). Management and Transformation in the Czech Republic.Routledge, London.

11. *Coulson-Thomas, C.* (2004). The knowledge entrepreneurship challenge - Moving on from knowledge sharing to knowledge creation and exploitation,The Learning Organization, 11, 1, 84-93

12. *Creswell, J.W.* (1998). Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design. Sage, London.

13. *Davenport, T. H. and Glaser J.* (2002). Just-in-time delivery comes to knowledge management, Harvard Business Review, July, 107-111.

14. *Girard, J.P. and Allison, M.* (2008). Information Anxiety: Fact, Fiction, or Fallacy? Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management, 6, 2, 125-140.

15. *Kants, K.K.* (2011). Knowledge Economy and Quality of Business Education, Actual Problems of Economics, 123, 331-342.

16. *Kok, A.* (2007). Intellectual Capital Management as Part of Knowledge Management Initiatives at Institutions of Higher Learning,The Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management, 5, 2, 181 - 192.

17. *Levin, D. Z. and Cross, R.* (2004). The Strength of Weak Ties You Can Trust: The Mediating Role of Trust in Effective Knowledge Transfer Management,Science, 50, 11, 1477-1490.

18. *Malhotra, Y.* (2000). Knowledge Management and New Organization Forms: A Framework for Business Model Innovation, Information Resources Management Journal, 13, 1, 5-14.

19. *Malhotra, Y.* (2005). Integrating knowledge management technologies in organisational business processes, Journal of Knowledge Management, 9, 1, 7-28.

20. *Maresova, P.* (2010). Knowledge Management in Czech Enterprises, E+M Economics and Management, 13, 1, 131-144.

21. *Marr, B. and Spender, J.C.* (2004). Measuring knowledge, Measuring Business Excellence, 8, 1, 18-27.

22. *McAdam, R. and McCreedy, S.* (1999). A Critical Review of Knowledge Management models, The Learning Organization, 6, 3, 91-101.

23. *Milosz, M. and Milosz, E.* (2010). Critical Success Factors and Barriers to Implementation of Knowledge Management Systems at Polish SMEs, Actual Problems of Economics, 108, 309-315.

24. *Mikulecky, P.* (2003). Information and knowledge support of a student in a university environment,IEEE Region 8 EUROCON 2003, Vol. B, Computer as a Tool, Ljubljana, Slovenia, 108-111.

25. *Mladkova, L.* (2011). Knowledge Management for Knowledge Workers, 3rd European Conference on Intellectual Capital, University of Nicosia, Nicosia, Cyprus, 260-267.

26. *Nahapiet, J. and Ghoshal, S.* (1998). Social capital, intellectual capital, and the organizational advantage, Academy of Management Review, 23, 2, 242-266.

27. *Nonaka, I.* (1991). The knowledge-creating company, Harvard Business Review, 69, 96-104.

28. *Nosan, N. S.* (2011). Knowledge Economy: Essence, Prospects and Development in Ukraine, Actual Problems of Economics, 119, 12-19

29. *Oliver, G. R., Handzic, M. and Toorn, C. V. (*2003). Towards Understanding KM Practices in the Academic Environment: The Shoemaker's Paradox, Electronic Journal on Knowledge Management, 1, 2, 139-146.

30. *Petrikova, R. et al.* (2010). Modern Knowledge Management: Principles, Processes, Examples of Good Practices, Professional Publishing, Prague.

31. *Storey, J. and Barnett, E.* (2000). Knowledge Management initiatives: learning from failure, Journal of Knowledge Management, 4, 2, 145-156.

32. *Wilson, T.D.* (2002). The nonsense of knowledge management, Information Research, 8, 1, Paper Number 144.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 25.11.2012.