# Developing Framework and Indicators for Assessing Organizational Intelligence

#### Myeong-Ryoon Oh and Sang -Wook Kim\*

Department of MIS, Chungbuk National University, 28644, Korea; ryoon5@gmail.com, sierra@cbnu.ac.kr

## Abstract

Background/Objectives: This study is to develop the indicators and framework for assessing organizational knowledge levels, apply the developed indicators and framework to an administrative entity, diagnose its organizational IQ level and seek some improvement measures. Methods/Statistical Analysis: For assessing factors' weight score of organizational IQ Delphi surveys with 5-point Likert scale questionnaire and Analytical Hierarchy Process method were used. The Content Validity (CVR) was tested and a set of 39 indicators were selected for diagnosis. The AHP analysis was performed to estimate the weighted values of four categories. As a result, a total of 39 indicators across twelve divisions were identified and weighted by their significance priorities. To measure the organizational knowledge levels and to verify the applicability of the proposed indicators and framework we applied the model to a research institute affiliated with a local government. Findings: This study considers four fundamental elements of knowledge-friendly organizational culture. 39 indicators out of 52 candidates screened by the CVR reflects the opinion of expert panels. Specific indicators for each element were introduced to measure the influence factors. Four fundamental elements have a weight. In the order of weighted values are organizational flexibility (0.440), organizational rationality (0,261), organizational openness (0.216) and organizational cohesiveness (0.083) identified as the significant elements. The organizational flexibility involving formalization and transformational leadership were the most significant indicators. Also, among 39 indicators, 'Flexibility in complying with business rules or procedures' scored 0.114, which were the most significant indicator, followed by 'the easy-to-use information system', 'trust in superiors', 'empowerment through learning'. The lowest weighted value was also found in 'organizational members' involvement in decision making'. The empirical analysis revealed that the proposed organizational IO measurement contributed to identify the status of organizational knowledge management and the aspects that would require support for approaches to improve measures. Application/Improvements: The quantitative findings from this study will provide fresh insight to policy development for organizational knowledge management and the adoption of IT-based KMS, particularly to those organizations being skeptical about the return on their investments and those that have already adopted knowledge management systems only to see mediocre or unsatisfactory results

Keywords: AHP, CVR, Delphi, Indicators of Organizational IQ, Organizational Intelligence,

## 1. Introduction

The concept of knowledge or knowledge management has widely been investigated<sup>1-3</sup>. The term knowledge management was first used in 1986 by an AI (Artificial Intelligence) expert and consultant<sup>1</sup>. In Korea, knowledge management has been introduced and drawn attention since the late 1990s. Knowledge management involves enterprise-wide knowledge-based strategic management activities intended to create profits<sup>4</sup>. Central and local government offices as well as other public agencies have applied the knowledge management in practice to raise competitiveness and add value, e.g. a knowledge society designed to provide quality administrative services. As an initiative to encourage knowledge management activities, the 'Knowledge Innovation Award (formerly Knowledge Management Award)' presented by the Maeil Business Newspaper since 1999 and the 'Knowledge Administration Award' granted by the Ministry of Government Administration and Home Affairs since 2004 were incorporated into the most prestigious 'Korea Knowledge Award' as of<sup>5</sup>.

Meanwhile, the encouragement measures from the perspective of Information Technology (IT) involving the implementation of knowledge management systems have revealed an 'IT paradox', failing to meet the expectations of organizations, which were initially willing to adopt the knowledge management. <sup>6</sup>Proposed the knowledge-friendly organizational culture. In his doctorate dissertation, <sup>2</sup>remarked that the concept of knowledge-friendly organizational culture influenced the analysis of the limitations of Nonaka Ikujiro's SECI model<sup>3</sup>, the elucidation of knowledge-friendly factors and the improvement of organizational competencies.

Based on the four significant factors and relevant indicators derived by<sup>2</sup>, the present study intended to develop some indicators for rating organizational knowledge competency levels and a framework or an organizational IQ measurement model. First, the Delphi method was used to verify the content validity of the indicators. From a preliminary survey and two Delphi surveys, 4 factors and 39 indicators were derived, based on which the AHP was conducted with public servants and research experts, who were in charge of or had performed the organizational knowledge management, to elicit the weight of each indicator. A research institute affiliated with a local government was selected for the empirical analysis. Then, improvement measures were proposed based on the analysis results.

# 2. Organizational IQ and Knowledge-Friendly Culture

Previous studies defined the knowledge management activities as a series of activities intended to manage organizational knowledge and enhance its value. <sup>7</sup>Viewed the knowledge management activities as the process of Nonaka's SECI (Socialization, Externalization, Combination, Internalization) and asserted the factors impacting upon customer outcomes included socialization, externalization and combination, whilst internalization influenced financial outcomes. Yet, extensive prior studies showed differences in perspectives. Studies successful organizational on knowledge management suggested the 'organizational culture' as an essential factor for successful knowledge management<sup>8</sup>. Organizational cultural factors could hinder the growth of knowledge management, implying the organizational culture serves as a significant factor for successful knowledge management. That is, organizational culture may support the knowledge management activities successfully. Lots of studies highlighted the knowledge-friendly culture as the essential factor for creating, sharing and utilizing<sup>6,7,9</sup>. According to<sup>2</sup> concerning organizational intelligence, organizational cohesiveness<sup>10</sup>, organizational flexibility<sup>11</sup>, organizational rationality<sup>12</sup> and organizational openness<sup>5</sup> laid the foundation for organizational culture conducive to the success and sustainability of knowledge management. Table 1 is shown the fundamental factors of organizational culture and relevant concepts.

Table 1.Fundamental factors of organizational cultureand relevant concepts

Factors	Concepts
Organizational	Strong trust in and acceptance of organi-
cohesiveness	zational goals and value, intention to work
(Organizational	hard for an
commitment)	organization, and a strong desire to main-
	tain organizational membership <sup>10</sup>
Organizational	Activities to derive novel and useful ideas,
flexibility	and to combine them with existing ones,
(Creativity)	so as to
	develop some beneficial perspectives <sup>11</sup>
Organizational	An organization where its members can
rationality	expand their competencies to do what they
(Collective	desire
learning)	to do, where newly known types of think-
	ing are respected and cultivated, where
	collective
	visions are freely set, and where its mem-
	bers share learning methods and learn
	constantly
	ogether <sup>12</sup>
Organizational	Delivering one's intentions and ideas to
Openness	another so that the latter can put those into
(Communica-	action,
tion)	and the procedures of delivering some
	news, attitudes or ideas to others, as well as
	having
	people understand and cooperate with one
	another based on such procedures <sup>5</sup>

## 2.2 Organizational IQ and Knowledge Management

<sup>13</sup>Defined the organizational IQ as the coefficients quantifying the organizational activity levels and as the scale representing the levels of organizational capacities for effective decision-making and execution. Still, organizational IQ (Intelligence Quotient) has not been extensively investigated. A similar rating concept was derived in the mid-1990s by Stanford University based on empirical studies on global companies, shedding light on strong correlations between organizational activity levels and corporate achievements. That is, corporate profits and growth potential depend on organizational IQ whilst the effects of organizational IQ on corporate achievements increases in proportion to corporate growth and scale.

Suzuki Kan Ichiro's organizational IQ indicates organizational activities from two perspectives, i.e. 'information application' and 'resource application' and comprises such sub-categories as external information awareness, internal knowledge dissemination, effective decision architecture, organization focus and information age business network<sup>13</sup>. To paraphrase, organizational IQ is defined as the organizational competency levels in terms of the application of organizational information and resources. The present study suggests knowledgefriendly organizational culture serves as an important factor that successfully induces the knowledge management. Application of organizational information and resources is comparable to that of knowledge. Thus, the present study defines the organizational IQ as the levels of organizational knowledge management. Given it is necessary to constantly verify if organizational systems facilitate organizations' and their members' responsiveness to changes and to take improvement measures, organizational IQ may serve as an essential tool to measure and strengthen the organizational management competencies<sup>5</sup>.

This study adopts some fundamental elements of knowledge-friendly organizational culture. For each element, specific indicators are used to measure the influence factors. Then, following the validation of an expert group, a framework designed to measure and manage the organizational IQ is proposed here See Table 2.

 Table 2.
 Components of knowledge-friendly organizational culture<sup>2</sup>

Factors	Attributes	Measurement
Cohesion	Shared vision	Organizational vision towards future, KM as a vision and core strategy, Perception of orga-
		nizational vision/strategy, Organizational members' involvement in decision making
	Centralization	Organizational members' empowerment to make decisions, Organizational members'
		empowerment to process business, Report on matters of arbitrary decision
	Rewards	Fair measurement of performance, Objective personnel management, Creativity and job
		performance reflected in promotion, Incentive payment , Satisfaction with wages,
Flexibility	Transformational	Trust in superiors, Empowerment through learning, Superiors' logicality and prob-
	leadership	lem-solving skills, Rapport with superiors, Superior's skills to identify the essence of
		problems, Encouragement over job performance,
		Emphasis on need for organizational innovation
	Formalization	Business handbooks ready for use, Rules or policies in effect, Rules or policies for refer-
		ence, External business process, Flexibility in complying with business rules or procedures
Rationality	Quality of Contents, ,	User-friendliness of information system, Easy-to-use information system
	Documentation	Knowledge acquisition via documents and manuals, Documentation of projects/business
		meetings, Knowledge sharing, Documentation of management-related knowledge, Pro-
		cessing of useful data, Documentation of necessary knowledge
	User-orientation	Accuracy of knowledge, Sufficiency of knowledge, Easy-to-understand necessary knowl-
		edge, Convenience of knowledge in business execution,
		Knowledge supporting decision making
Openness	Participatory Leader-	Gathering organizational members' opinions in decision making, Quality improvement of
	ship between Members	organizational members, Sharing business ratings, Superiors' internal/external activities
	Participatory	Budget support for necessary knowledge management activities,
	Leadership	Personnel support for knowledge management activities
	Trust between	Trust in organizational members' speech and act, Autonomous business execution, Job-re-
	Members	lated knowledge, Sharing knowledge for business execution, Legitimate use of knowledge
		provided
	Trust in the Executive	Trust in the executive's decision, The executive's fairness in business, The executive's con-
		sistency in speech and act, Trust in the executive's expertise

# 3. A Framework for Organizational IQ Measurement

#### 3.1 Indicators: Overview

To present the areas and indicators of the organizational IQ measurement as well as to conceptualize the organizational intelligence, experts were surveyed with the Delphi method. Then, the content validity was analyzed to select the indicators. Based on these results, AHP analysis was performed to calculate the weighted values of the indicators and to propose a framework for measuring the organizational IQ.

First of all, the candidate indicators were selected from the four areas of knowledge-friendly organizational culture suggested by Lee and relevant specific indicators<sup>11</sup>. Experts were surveyed to get their opinions in the form of free comments about the derived factors and indicators. According to the experts' consensus in the preliminary survey, the 'organizational members' involvement in decision making' related to the 'shared vision' in the 'organizational cohesiveness' and the 'effects of rewards on knowledge application' were excluded. To validate the 52 candidate indicators selected from the results of the preliminary survey, the procedure in Figure 1 was performed. First, 16 local knowledge management experts were surveyed in two rounds using the Delphi method, followed by the Content Validity (CVR) analysis, to pick out 39 final diagnosis indicators. In addition, the AHP analysis was performed to estimate the weighted values of 4 categories, 12 divisions and 39 indicators. Figure 1 is shown indicator development procedure.

### 3.2 Content Validity Ratio, CVR analysis

The Delphi and the Content Validity Ratio (CVR) analysis are the methods of validating the content of indicators with expert panels. The validity of an indicator is determined based on the percentage of panels responding that the indicator is important out of the total number of panels. The validity is accepted/rejected when an indicator's CVR value measured in compliance with a formula is higher/lower than the minimum allowable value based on the number of panels. That is, in accordance with<sup>14</sup>, an indicator is regarded as meeting the content validity whose CVR value is greater than the minimum allowable value based on the number of expert panels at a significance level of 0.05. The CVR is calculated based on the following formula: CVR = (ne – n/2) / (n/2) (Here, ne: The number of panels who respond an indicator is important (4 and 5 on a 5-point scale) / n: The total number of panels).

The 52 candidate indicators were presented to the 16 experts, who rated the validity of each indicator on a 5-point Likert scale. For accuracy, two rounds of the Delphi method were conducted. Table 3 shows the mean (3.97) of all indicators with the Standard Deviation (SD) being -.72 from the first round, indicating differences in experts' opinions. The CVR analysis found 39 indicators were valid with 14 being rejected due to their scores lower than the minimum acceptable value (0.49).

In the second round of the Delphi survey where the results from the first round were presented, the mean of all indicators increased to 4.06 with the SD being 0.56, indicating the differences in experts' opinions were narrowed. In the CVR analysis, the 'organizational flexibility > transformational leadership > empowerment through learning' which were rejected in the first round scored 0.75 and was accepted. As a result, 13 indicators were rejected whereas 39 proved to be valid.

## 3.3 AHP Analysis To Estimate Weighted Value of each Indicator

AHP is a method of decision making by capturing a rater's knowledge, experience and intuition via a pair wise comparison between the elements constituting the hierarchical structure in decision making. Developed by Saaty<sup>10,15</sup> in the early 1970s, AHP simplifies the decision

1	2	3	4
Expert Delphi(1st)	Expert Delphi(2nd)	CVR analysis	Weighting
Inquiry about validity of	Re-inquiry about validity	Elimination of sub-stan-	AHP analysis to estimate
52 indicators(ACG, SD,	of 1st round results	dard indicators, 39	the weighted values of
CVR)	(ACG, SD, CVR)	indicators selected	selected indicators

Figure 1	. Indicator	development	procedure.

Fundamental	Influence factors	Measurement elements	1st AVG	1st SD	1st CVR	2nd AVG	2nd SD	2nd CVR
elements								
Organizational	Shared vision	Organizational vision towards	4.50	0.63	0.88	4.31	0.60	0.88
cohesiveness		future						
		KM as a vision and core	3.81	0.66	0.38	3.81	0.66	0.38
		strategy						
		Perception of organizational	4.25	0.68	0.75	4.50	0.52	1.00
		vision/strategy						
		Organizational members' in-	4.19	0.83	0.75	4.25	0.68	0.75
		volvement in decision making						
	Centralization	Organizational members' em-	4 00	0.73	0.50	4 00	0.52	0.75
	Gentralization	powerment to make decisions	1.00	0.70	0.00	1.00	0.02	0.75
		Organizational members' em-	4 13	0.62	0.75	3.88	0.62	0.50
		powerment to process business	4.15	0.02	0.75	5.00	0.02	0.50
		Report on matters of arbitrary	3 25	0.68	-0.50	3 38	0.62	-0.13
		decision	5.25	0.00	-0.50	5.50	0.02	-0.15
	Dewards	Eair measurement of perfor	1 60	0.48	1.00	4 75	0.45	1.00
	Rewalus	ran measurement of perior-	4.09	0.40	1.00	4.75	0.45	1.00
		Objective personnel menage	1 56	0.72	0.75	1 56	0.51	1.00
		objective personner manage-	4.30	0.75	0.75	4.30	0.31	1.00
		ment Creativity and ich porfar	1.06	0.69	0.62	4.25	0.69	0.75
		Creativity and job perior-	4.06	0.68	0.65	4.25	0.68	0.75
		mance reflected in promotion	4.12	0.62	0.75	4.25	0.06	0.50
		Incentive payment	4.13	0.62	0.75	4.25	0.86	0.50
		Satisfaction with wages	4.06	0.93	0.50	4.50	0.52	1.00
Organizational	Transformational	Trust in superiors	4.31	0.60	0.88	4.69	0.48	1.00
flexibility	leadership	Empowerment through	3.94	0.77	0.38	4.06	0.77	0.75
		learning						
		Superiors' logicality and prob-	4.19	0.54	0.88	4.25	0.68	0.75
		lem-solving skills						
		Rapport with superiors	3.81	0.75	0.25	3.56	0.81	0.00
		Superior's skills to identify the	4.33	0.49	0.88	4.38	0.62	0.88
		essence of problems						
		Encouragement over job per-	4.25	0.45	1.00	4.06	0.68	0.63
		formance						
		Emphasis on need for organi-	3.75	0.77	0.38	3.63	0.50	0.25
		zational innovation						
	Formalization	Business handbooks ready for	3.13	0.81	-0.38	3.63	0.50	0.25
		use						
		Rules or policies in effect	3.75	0.45	0.50	3.75	0.45	0.50
		Rules or policies for reference	3.38	0.62	-0.38	3.25	0.68	-0.25
		External business process	3.50	0.52	0.00	3.31	0.60	-0.25
		Flexibility in complying with	3.81	0.54	0.50	3.69	0.60	0.50
		business rules or procedures						

## Table 3.Expert Delphi and CVR

Organizational	Quality of con-	User-friendliness of informa-	3.88	0.62	0.50	3.88	0.34	0.75
rationality	tents	Easy-to-use information	4.06	0.77	0.50	4.13	0.62	0.75
	User-orientation	Accuracy of knowledge	4.06	0.77	0.75	4 00	0.52	0.75
	Oser orientation	Sufficiency of knowledge	3.88	1.02	0.75	4.00	0.34	1.00
		Easy-to-understand necessary	4.06	0.68	0.63	3.88	0.62	0.50
		knowledge	2 0 0	1.00	0.29	4 10	0.40	1.00
		business execution	5.00	1.09	0.58	4.19	0.40	1.00
		Knowledge supporting deci- sion making	3.75	0.77	0.38	3.75	0.68	0.25
	Documentation	Knowledge acquisition via documents and manuals	3.50	0.89	0.13	3.88	0.34	0.75
		Documentation of projects/ business meetings	3.81	0.75	0.25	3.63	0.50	0.25
		Knowledge sharing	4.19	0.75	0.63	4.25	0.45	1.00
		Documentation of manage-	3.31	0.70	-0.38	3.63	0.72	0.00
		ment-related knowledge						
		Processing of useful data	3.94	0.68	0.50	3.50	0.52	0.00
		Documentation of necessary	3.88	0.72	0.38	3.63	0.72	0.00
		knowledge						
Organizational	Participatory	Gathering organizational	4.00	0.73	0.50	3.94	0.57	0.63
openness	leadership be-	members' opinions in decision						
-	tween members	making						
		Quality improvement of orga-	3.88	0.81	0.50	4.13	0.34	1.00
		nizational members						
		Sharing business ratings	3.75	0.86	0.25	4.25	0.45	1.00
		Superiors' internal/external	3.19	0.83	-0.38	3.13	0.62	-0.50
		activities						
	CEO	Budget support for neces-	4.06	0.93	0.75	4.63	0.50	1.00
	Participatory leadership	sary knowledge management activities						
	1	Personnel support for knowl-	4.13	0.81	0.75	4.63	0.50	1.00
		edge management activities						
	Trust between	Trust in organizational mem-	4.25	0.77	0.63	4.50	0.52	1.00
	members	bers' speech and act						
	members	Autonomous business execu-	4.29	0.73	0.50	4.63	0.50	1.00
		tion						
		Job-related knowledge	3.94	0.77	0.63	4.13	0.62	0.75
		Sharing knowledge for busi-	4.06	0.68	0.63	4.25	0.45	1.00
		ness execution						
		Legitimate use of knowledge	3.81	0.75	0.50	3.88	0.62	0.50
		provided						
	Trust in the exec-	Trust in the executive's deci-	4.31	0.70	0.75	4.63	0.50	1.00
	utive	sion						
		The executive's fairness in	4.33	0.82	0.75	4.31	0.60	0.88
		business						
		The executive's consistency in	4.31	0.60	0.88	4.50	0.52	1.00
		speech and act						
		Trust in the executive's exper-	4.19	0.75	0.63	4.31	0.48	1.00
		tise						
	Mean	n	3.97	0.72	0.49	4.06	0.56	0.63



Figure 2. The result Assessing of Organizational IQ.

making process contributing to effective decision making on complex issues. Also, AHP structuralizes complex situations and relies on a ratio scale to derive priorities and weights, enabling integration and verification of logical consistency.

This study used the AHP to analyze the selected indicators and confirmed the reliable criteria for consistency ratios, where values of 0.1 or less were used for the analysis, assuming the respondents had performed a consistent pair wise comparison. The respondents were experts who participated in the questionnaire survey intended to analyze the validity of indicators. Given the respondents were familiar with the content and goals of the survey, AHP was used to analyze the data from 11 respondents, whose consistency ratios were 0.1 or less, based on strict criteria (See Table 4).

As the fundamental elements of knowledge-friendly organizational culture, organizational cohesiveness (0.083),

Table 4.         AHP analysis: Consistency Rational Strength Strengt Strengt Strength Strengt Strength Strength Strength Strength Str	os
--	----

Response	Consistency	adopted	Response	Consistency	adopted
No.	Ratio		No.	Ratio	
1	0.06	adopted	9	0.05	adopted
2	0.00	adopted	10	0.09	adopted
3	0.08	adopted	11	0.07	adopted
4	0.03	adopted	12	0.33	rejected
5	0.04	adopted	13	0.38	rejected
6	0.01	adopted	14	0.25	rejected
7	0.02	adopted	15	0.44	rejected
8	0.02	adopted	16	0.66	rejected

Fundamental	Influence	Measurement elements	weight	Fundamental	Influence	Measurement elements	weight
elements	factors	0 1 1 1	0.407	elements	tactors		
Cohesion	Shared	Organizational vision	0.496	Rationality	User-orien-	Accuracy of knowledge	0.532
0.083	vision	towards future	0.504	0.261	tation	Coefficience of longerule days	0 222
	0.391	KM as a vision and core	0.504		0.426	Sumclency of knowledge	0.232
	Central	Organizational members'	0 1 8 0			Fact to understand nec	0 1 1 5
	ization	empowerment to make	0.107			essary knowledge	0.115
	0.153	decisions				essary knowledge	
	0.100	Organizational members'	0.312			Convenience of knowl-	0.120
		empowerment to process				edge in business execution	
		business				0	
		Report on matters of arbi-	0.499		Documen-	Knowledge acquisition via	0.397
		trary decision			tation	documents and manuals	
	Rewards	Fair measurement of per-	0.208		0.167	Knowledge sharing	0.603
	0.456	formance					
		Objective personnel man-	0.178	Openness	Partic-	Gathering organizational	0.566
		agement		0.216	ipatory	members' opinions in	
					leadership	decision making	
		Creativity and job per-	0.098		between	Quality improvement of	0.258
		formance reflected in			members	organizational members	
		promotion			0.237		
		Incentive payment	0.241			Sharing business ratings	0.176
		Satisfaction with wages	0.275		Participato-	Budget support for neces-	0.594
					ry leader-	sary knowledge manage-	
Flovibility	Transfor	Trust in superiors	0 229		snip	Derconnel support for	0.406
0.440	mational	frust in superiors	0.238		0.217	knowledge management	0.400
0.110	leader-					activities	
	ship	Empowerment through	0 100		Trust	Trust in organizational	0 205
	0.629	learning	0.100		between	members' speech and act	0.200
		Superiors' logicality and	0.236		members	Autonomous business	0.129
		problem-solving skills			0.256	execution	
		Superior's skills to identify	0.301			Job-related knowledge	0.270
		the essence of problems					
		Encouragement over job	0.125			Sharing knowledge for	0.186
		performance				business execution	
	Formal-	Rules or policies in effect	0.303			Legitimate use of knowl-	0.211
	ization					edge provided	
	0.371	Flexibility in complying	0.697		Trust in the	Trust in the executive's	0.186
		with business rules or			executive	decision	
	0 10 0	procedures			0.289		
Rationality	Quality of	User-friendliness of infor-	0.384			The executive's fairness in	0.357
	contents	mation system	0.616			Dusiness	0.260
	0.408	Easy-to-use information	0.016			me executives consisten-	0.269
		57516111				Trust in the executive's	0 1 9 9
						expertise	0.100
						enperioe	

Table 5.AHP analysis results

organizational flexibility (0.440), organizational rationality (0.261) and organizational openness (0.216) were weighted. In the order of weighted values, organizational flexibility, organizational rationality, organizational openness and organizational cohesiveness proved significant. Notably, the organizational flexibility involving formalization and transformational leadership proved to be the most significant. Also, among 39 indicators, the organizational flexibility  $(0.440) \rightarrow$  Formalization  $(0.371) \rightarrow$  Flexibility in complying with business rules or procedures (0.697) scored 0.114, which proved to be the most significant, followed by the organizational rationality  $\rightarrow$  quality of contents  $\rightarrow$  easyto-use information system, the organizational flexibility  $\rightarrow$  transformational leadership  $\rightarrow$  trust in superiors and the organizational flexibility  $\rightarrow$  transformational leadership  $\rightarrow$ empowerment through learning in the order named, which suggested the indicators relevant to the transformational leadership proved relatively more significant. Also, the lowest weighted value was found in the organizational cohesiveness  $\rightarrow$  centralization  $\rightarrow$  organizational members' involvement in decision making. Likewise, the rewards-related indicators showed relatively low weighted values (See Table 5).

# 4. Empirical Analysis

#### 4.1 Overview

To measure the organizational knowledge levels, to verify the applicability of the proposed indicators and framework, to measure the organizational IQ of a real agency and to seek for improvement measures, the developed model was applied to a research institute affiliated with a local government for measurement and analysis. The target institute empirically analyzed here was a research and administrative organization founded and operated to contribute to local development by systematically studying and analyzing every aspect and presenting efficient alternatives for problems and issues raised in the region. From December 1015, 2015, the organizational members were interviewed face to face and over the phone to inform the objective and method of this study prior to diagnosis. Each question item was rated on a 5-point Likert scale.

#### 4.2 Results

Each question item was rated on a 5-point Likert scale. 32 valid response sheets were analyzed. The analysis of weighted items highlighted the institute's status relevant to the organizational knowledge-friendly indicators, i.e. flexibility (3.447), openness (3.167), rationality (3.113) and coherence (2.964) in the order named. Figure 2 shows the empirical results using the organizational IQ assessing indicators.

Concerning the cohesiveness, the reward was found relatively less significant: Shared vision (3.360), centralization (2.840), rewards (2.667). The indicators associated with the 'rewards' came 25th, 27th, 30th, 31st and 39th among the 39 indicators, being low in rank overall. In particular, the 'creativity and job performance reflected in promotion' came 39th, being lowest in rank, which suggested policy measures would be required. Concerning the flexibility, flexibility and standardization including guidelines and leadership in business execution scored highest, i.e. transformational leadership (3.572) and formalization (3.235). Concerning the rationality, using information systems and user-oriented knowledge systems outweighed document-based sharing or acquisition of knowledge: quality of contents (3.024), user-orientation (3.311) and documentation (2.808). This finding suggested that IT-based knowledge application was in place. Finally, concerning the openness, the 'personnel and budget supports for knowledge management activities' should be considered given the result: Participatory leadership between members (3.182), participatory leadership (2.972), trust between members (3.404) and trust in the executive (3.101).

The foregoing empirical analysis proved the proposed organizational IQ measurement contributed to identifying the status of organizational knowledge management and the aspects that would require supports for systematic approaches to improvement measures.

# 5. Conclusions

The present study approached the knowledge management from the perspective of knowledge-friendly organizational culture beyond the perspective of technology with a view to helping organizations to make efforts for and invest in knowledge management, to identify current conditions based on the quantified evidence and to develop systematic improvement measures.

This paper proposed a framework for measuring and managing the organizational IQ from the perspective of knowledge-friendly organizational culture. To develop the proposed framework, four influence factors for organizational IQ measurement were derived and the measurement elements' content validity was secured based on the consensus of an expert group surveyed. Also, AHP was used to calculate the weighted value of each factor and thus to propose the framework capable of measuring and managing the organizational IQ.

This paper proposed some areas and indicators for evaluating organizational intelligence and defined the concepts of knowledge application competencies in relation to organizational knowledge management. Also, each indicator was weighted to determine its importance, which served as the starting points in identifying, measuring and analyzing the essential conditions for the improvement of organizational knowledge management levels. The proposed indicators and relevant findings are conducive to organizational knowledge management by helping organizations to identify their cultural status in view of the implementation of organizational knowledge management and serve as the specific reference data for policy measures that need be developed for future viability of organizations. 'If you can't measure it, you can't manage it' said Peter Drucker, implying that the first step of management is measurement. The present quantitative findings will give fresh insight into policy development for organizational knowledge management and the adoption of IT-based knowledge management information systems, particularly to those organizations being skeptical about the return on their investments and those that have already adopted knowledge management systems only to see mediocre or unsatisfactory results.

# 6. Acknowledgment

This work was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea Grant funded by the Korean Government (NRF-2013S1A5B5A07049420).

# 7. References

- Wigg KM, Spek R. Supporting knowledge management: A selection of methods and techniques. Expert Systems with Applications. 1997; 13(1):1–15.
- 2. JeongGue L. An exploration on the leverage factors of organizational knowledge growth dynamics (A Comparison of the private and the public Enterprises). Chungbuk National University; 2011.
- 3. Nonaka I, Takeuchi H. The knowledge creating company. Oxford University Press;1995. p. 167–9.
- 4. Drucker FP. Post-capitalist society. Oxford Butterworth Heinemann; 1993. p. 1–287.
- 5. Myers PS. Knowledge management and organizational design. Butterworth-Heinemann; 1996.
- 6. Davenport T, Prusack L. Working knowledge, how organization manage what they know. Boston, Massachusetts: Harvard Business School Press; 2000.
- Min JH, Lee YC. Knowledge management capabilities, activities and empirical research. Korea Journal of Customer Satisfaction Research. 2004; 6(1):123–55.
- Sang-hyeun P, Seoung-joon Y, Sang-wook K. Building a system dynamics model for strategic knowledge management in IT Company. Korean System Dynamics Society. 2002; 3(1):105–29.
- 9. Davenport T, Prusack L. Working knowledge. Boston, Massachusetts: Harvard Business School Press; 1998.
- 10. Saaty TL. The analytic hierarchy process. Mc-Graw Hill International; 1980.
- 11. Lovelace RF. Stimulating creativity through managerial intervention. R&D Management. 1986; 16(1):161–74.
- Senge PM. The Fifth Discipline: The art and pratice of the learning Organization. New York: Currency Doubleday; 1990.
- Ichiro SK. ( ). Organizational IQ (Intelligence Quotient - The realization of speed management. 2001.
- 14. Lawshe CH. A quantitative approach to content validity. Personnel Psychology. 1975; 28(1):563–75.
- 15. Satty TL. Multicriteria decision making: The analytic hierarchy process. RWS Publications. 1990; 16(3):175–91.