

IMPACT OF KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT IN PRIVATE COLLEGES- AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS

1. Dr.S.SAM SANTHOSE

Assistant professor, Department of Management studies, Nesamony Memorial Christian College, Marthandam, *Affiliated to Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Abishekapatti, Tirunelveli-627012, Tamil Nadu, India.*

2. Dr.L NOBLE LAWRENCE

Assistant professor, Department of Management studies, Nesamony Memorial Christian College, Marthandam, *Affiliated to Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Abishekapatti, Tirunelveli-627012, Tamil Nadu, India.*

ABSTRACT

This paper focus on the educational system in private colleges in Kanyakumari District, Tamil Nadu. The concepts of knowledge management are explored and correlated into their dimensions. Empirical analysis is performed to examine the relation between knowledge management prevailing among the educators of private colleges in Kanyakumari District. This study identifies the Knowledge Creation, Knowledge Capture, Knowledge Organization, Knowledge Storage, and Knowledge Dissemination.

Key words: Educators, Knowledge management, Knowledge sharing.

INTRODUCTION

Knowledge management sources can be used to improve the strategic status and competitive edge of the educational institutions. Organizational culture is the internal and external factors related to the organization. The process of knowledge generation includes brainstorming and interviewing (Zsóka 2007). Required infrastructure and effective research section depicts a knowledgeable environment. The transfer and application of knowledge makes the

organizational outcome effective and productive. Educational institutions are decentralized in the past decade. HEIs are expressed as a service business to attract the international students (Oplatka 2004; Goldsmith 2004).

Knowledge management is considered as the critical resource in the global economy (Chivu&Popescu, 2008; Saxena&Tiwari, 2013; Allameh, 2011). In the near future, competitive edge will be the generation of knowledge Lara et.al., (2012). To foster innovation, organizations need to develop knowledge management (Argote& Ingram, 2000; Waddel& Stewart, 2008). Knowledge management practices, quality improvement and performance are associated Choi et al., 2020).

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- ❖ To analyse the various determinants of Knowledge Management
- ❖ To examine the relationship between the demographic factors and Knowledge Management
- ❖ To provide valuable suggestions in improving Knowledge Management among the educators of private colleges.

HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY

Hypotheses were tested for the study and they were as follows:

HYPOTHESIS I: There is no significant difference between Gender with respect to Knowledge Management

HYPOTHESIS II: There is no significant difference between Educational Qualification towards Knowledge Management

HYPOTHESIS III: There is no significant relationship among Determinants of Knowledge Management

PROBLEM STATEMENT

Understanding the expectations of the educators is very difficult for the education institution management. It is very essential to the organization to understand about the determinants of knowledge management by the educators. The recent Covid-19 pandemic brought about in the unexpected necessity for the service from the educators all over the world. Though there is more requirement for educators, the Covid situation has created a boom to this industry. Minimum studies have been conducted on this regard in Kanyakumari district, Tamil Nadu. The knowledge management of the educators in private colleges needs to be analysed as they must be more attentive as their service is very much sensitive and care worthy.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study focuses on Kanyakumari district, Tamil Nadu in India. Data was collected from 179 educators belonging to private colleges from Kanyakumari district with the help of a questionnaire for the study. The study is empirical. Secondary data is sourced from various credible sources like books, newspapers, journals, and through access to various websites. Primary data is collected through simple random sampling technique. The data collection was done from January 2023 to February 2023.

Sampling technique

The technique followed is Simple random sampling to select the sample. Educators from various private colleges were selected and the questionnaire was distributed. A total of 200 structured questionnaires were circulated out of which 179 (89.5 %) complete questionnaires were used for further research and analysis 13 (6.5 %) questionnaires were incomplete and 8 (4.0 %) questionnaires were not returned. Henceforth, the sample size of this study was 179 respondents.

Research design

Descriptive research design is employed for this study. The data collected were coded, tabulated, and analysed using software packages such as SPSS. Statistical tools like Descriptive Analysis, T-Test, ANOVA, and Correlation Analysis, are employed for the study.

Table:1. Demographic background of Employees

Demographic Characteristics		n (Total=179)	% of n
GENDER	Male	35	19.6
	Female	144	80.4
AGE	Less than 25 years	24	13.4
	25 years - 35 years	119	66.5
	35 years -45 years	26	14.5
	45 years & above	10	5.6
EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION	PG with M.Phil.	26	14.5
	PG with NET/SLET	44	24.6
	PG with PhD	109	60.9
WORK EXPERIENCE	Less than 5 years	34	19.0
	5 years-10 years	36	20.1
	10 years-15 years	73	40.8
	15 years & above	36	20.1

Source: Primary data

n- Number of respondents

It is evident from the table:1 that a higher number of the educators are female (80.4 %) compared to the male educators (19.6 %) in the study. Regarding age, educators belonging to 25 years - 35 years (66.5 %) are higher in representation followed by 35 years -45 years (14.5 %), Less than 25 years (13.4 %) and 45 years & above (5.6 %). The educators having PG with PhD (60.9 %) as qualification are higher in representation followed by PG with NET/SLET (24.6 %) and PG with M.Phil. (14.5 %). The educators having work experience as 10 years-15 years (40.8 %) are more in number in the study. 20.1 % of the educators have work

experience of between 5 years to 10 years and 15 years & above (20.1 %). Educators having less than 5 years of experience are 19.0 %.

HYPOTHESIS I

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference between Gender with respect to Knowledge Management

Table:2. Student t test for significant difference between Gender with respect to Knowledge Management

Knowledge Management	Gender				t Value	P Value
	Male		Female			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Knowledge Creation	8.54	2.318	11.88	1.968	8.702	0.000**
Knowledge Capture	7.51	2.429	11.15	1.242	12.513	0.000**
Knowledge Organization	6.57	1.539	8.61	1.591	6.868	0.000**
Knowledge Storage	10.05	1.830	11.01	1.532	3.184	0.000**
Knowledge Dissemination	10.17	2.905	11.27	2.509	2.252	0.000**

Source: Statistically analyzed data

Note: **Denotes significance at 1% level

The above table:2 indicates that based on Mean score of Knowledge Creation, Knowledge Capture, Knowledge Organization, Knowledge Storage, and Knowledge Dissemination Female educators have more focus on the on the determinants of Knowledge Management than the male educators in private colleges. P value is less than 0.01. Therefore at 1 per cent level of significance, the null hypothesis is rejected. Hence there is significant difference between male and female educators with respect to the Knowledge Management.

HYPOTHESIS II

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference between Educational Qualification towards Knowledge Management

Table:3. One-way Analysis for Educational Qualification towards Knowledge Management

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Knowledge Creation	Between Groups	465.482	2	232.741	69.823	0.000**
	Within Groups	586.664	176	3.333		
	Total	1052.145	178			
Knowledge Capture	Between Groups	352.707	2	176.354	70.313	0.000**
	Within Groups	441.427	176	2.508		
	Total	794.134	178			
Knowledge Organization	Between Groups	151.793	2	75.897	32.683	0.000**
	Within Groups	408.710	176	2.322		
	Total	560.503	178			
Knowledge Storage	Between Groups	29.256	2	14.628	5.768	0.004**
	Within Groups	446.375	176	2.536		
	Total	475.631	178			
Knowledge Dissemination	Between Groups	23.216	2	11.608	1.705	0.005**
	Within Groups	1198.225	176	6.808		
	Total	1221.441	178			

Source: Statistically analyzed data

Note: ** Denotes significance at 1 % level

The table:3 depicts that there is a significant difference between Educational Qualification of the educators in private colleges with the Knowledge Creation (Innovative development, Enhanced R&D, Contracting with experts), Knowledge Capture (Future oriented, Benchmarking of new practices, Virtual reality system), Knowledge Organization (Effective communication, Current and relevant Knowledge is updated, Adapting strategic plan), Knowledge Storage (Easy access of Knowledge, Database management is maintained, Knowledge assets), and Knowledge Dissemination (Knowledge is distributed & transferred

to all academics, Knowledge tools are articulated in common language, Knowledge Sharing).

The significance is at 0.001 level.

HYPOTHESIS III

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant relationship among Determinants of Knowledge Management

Table:4. Inter Correlation Matrix on the Determinants of Knowledge Management

Source: Statistically analyzed data

		Knowledge Creation	Knowledge Capture	Knowledge Organization	Knowledge Storage	Knowledge Dissemination
Knowledge Creation	Pearson Correlation	1	0.902**	0.977**	0.818**	0.915**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Knowledge Capture	Pearson Correlation		1	0.924**	0.845**	0.844**
	Sig. (2-tailed)			0.000	0.000	0.000
Knowledge Organization	Pearson Correlation			1	0.943**	0.840**
	Sig. (2-tailed)				0.000	0.000
Knowledge Storage	Pearson Correlation				1	0.912**
	Sig. (2-tailed)					0.000
Knowledge Dissemination	Pearson Correlation					1
	Sig. (2-tailed)					

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table:4 illustrates that the correlation coefficient between **Knowledge Creation** and Knowledge Capture is 0.902 which in turn indicates 90 per cent high positive relation Knowledge Creation and Knowledge Capture and is significant at 1% level. The correlation coefficient between Knowledge Creation and Knowledge Organization is 0.977 which in turn indicates 98 per cent high positive relation Knowledge Creation and Knowledge Organization and is significant at 1% level. The correlation coefficient between Knowledge Creation and Knowledge Storage is 0.818 which in turn indicates 82 per cent high positive relation Knowledge Creation and Knowledge Storage and is significant at 1% level. The correlation coefficient between Knowledge Creation and Knowledge Dissemination is 0.915 which in turn indicates 92 per cent high positive relation Knowledge Creation and Knowledge Dissemination and is significant at 1% level.

The correlation coefficient between **Knowledge Capture** and Knowledge Organization is 0.924 which in turn indicates 92 per cent high positive relation Knowledge Capture and Knowledge Organization and is significant at 1% level. The correlation coefficient between Knowledge Capture and Knowledge Storage is 0.845 which in turn indicates 85 per cent high positive relation Knowledge Capture and Knowledge Storage and is significant at 1% level. The correlation coefficient between Knowledge Capture and Knowledge Dissemination is 0.844 which in turn indicates 84 per cent high positive relation Knowledge Capture and Knowledge Dissemination and is significant at 1% level.

The correlation coefficient between **Knowledge Organization** and Knowledge Storage is 0.943 which in turn indicates 94 per cent high positive relation Knowledge Organization and Knowledge Storage and is significant at 1% level. The correlation coefficient between Knowledge Organization and Knowledge Dissemination is 0.840 which in turn indicates 84

per cent high positive relation Knowledge Organization and Knowledge Dissemination and is significant at 1% level.

The correlation coefficient between **Knowledge Storage** and Knowledge Dissemination is 0.912 which in turn indicates 91 per cent high positive relation Knowledge Storage and Knowledge Dissemination and is significant at 1% level.

CONCLUSION

Effective training needs to be promoted to the faculty members such that they strengthen the education scenario through research skills. The empirical analysis of the study shows that there is an effective relation among the determinants of the knowledge management among the educators of private colleges in Kanyakumari district. Faculty exchange programs as well as student exchange programs also can be enhanced so that all the stakeholders get the benefits of knowledge sharing. Knowledge management programs is as important as the psychological and strategic significance. With the introduction of knowledge management system tools and techniques many of the private colleges have created a path for effective and efficient knowledge management.

REFERENCES

Bates, T. (1997, June): Restructuring the university for technological change. Paper presented at The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, What Kind of University, London, GB.

Beckmann, A. and Cooper, C. (2004): Globalization', the new managerialism and education: Rethinking the purpose of education in Britain, The Journal for Critical Educational Policy Studies, 2(2) <http://www.jceps.com/?pageID=article&articleID=31>.

Goldsmith, R.E. (2004): Current and future trends in marketing and their implications for the discipline, Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice 12, 4, 10-16.

Levine, A.E. (2000): The future of colleges: 9 inevitable changes. *Chronicle of Higher Education*.

Meyer, H.D. (2002): The new managerialism in education management: Corporatization or organisational learning? *Journal of Educational Administration*, 40, 6, 534-551.

Middlehurst, R./Woodfield, S. (2006): Quality review in distance learning: Policy and practice in five countries. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 12, 4, 37-58.

Oplatka, I. (2004): The characteristics of the school organisation and the constraints on market ideology in education: an institutional view, *Journal of Education Policy* 19, 2, 143-161.

Salmi, J. (2002): *Constructing knowledge societies: New challenges for tertiary education*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Schein, E.H. (1992): *Organisational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: The Jossey-Bass Inc.

Teichler, U.I. (2004): The changing debate on internationalization of higher education, *Higher Education*, 48,1, 5-26.

Tylor, E.B. (1871): *Primitive culture: Researches into the development of mythology, philosophy, religion, art and custom*, vol. 1. London: John Murray.

Wilkins, U./Menzel, D./Pawlowsky, P. (2004): Inside the black-box: Analysing the generation of core competencies and dynamic capabilities by exploring collective minds. An organisational learning perspective. *Management Revue*, 15, 1, 8-26.

Zsóka, A.N. (2007): The role of organisational culture in the environmental awareness of companies. *Journal for East European Management Studies*; 12, 2, 109-131.