

The current issue and full text archive of this journal is available on Emerald Insight at:
<https://www.emerald.com/insight/2397-7604.htm>

JRIT
13,2

Knowledge management practices

An exploratory study at the Malaysian higher education institutions

174

Balakrishnan V. Nair and Chandramalar Munusami

Department of Management & Marketing, Nilai University, Nilai, Malaysia

Received 23 January 2019
 Revised 25 March 2019
 Accepted 22 April 2019

Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to investigate KM practices that may be in place in the higher education institutions (HEIs) and whether the KM practices are made known to the employees for improving the teaching and learning environment provided at the Malaysian higher education institutions.

Design/methodology/approach – Data were collected using a personal administrated method made available to private higher education institutions academic members in five states with 30 or more employees. A total of 1,100 survey questionnaires were handed out, out of which 273 were collected and were usable (24.8 per cent response rate). The sample was checked for response and non-response bias. Results were tested using SPSS application and questionnaire tools.

© Balakrishnan V. Nair and Chandramalar Munusami. Published in *Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching & Learning*. Published by Emerald Publishing Limited. This article is published under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) licence. Anyone may reproduce, distribute, translate and create derivative works of this article (for both commercial and non-commercial purposes), subject to full attribution to the original publication and authors. The full terms of this licence may be seen at <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode>

Retraction Notice: The publishers of the *Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching & Learning* wish to retract the article V. Nair, B. and Munusami, C. (2019), “Knowledge management practices: An exploratory study at the Malaysian higher education institutions”, published in the *Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching & Learning*, Vol. 13 No. 2, pp. 174-190.

It has come to our attention that a large proportion of this article is copied, without attribution, from several earlier articles. These were:

- Veer Ramjeawon, P. and Rowley, J. (2017), “Knowledge management in higher education institutions: enablers and barriers in Mauritius”, *The Learning Organization*, Vol. 24 No. 5, pp. 366-377. <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/TLO-03-2017-0030/full/html>.

- Mayodza, J. & Ngulube, P., (2012), “Knowledge management practices at an institution of higher learning”, *SA Journal of Information Management*, 14(1), <https://sajim.co.za/index.php/SAJIM/article/view/496/584>.

- Devi Ramachandran, S., Choy Chong, S. and Ismail, H. (2009), “The practice of knowledge management processes: A comparative study of public and private higher education institutions in Malaysia”, *VINE*, Vol. 39 No. 3, pp. 203-222. <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/03055720911003978/full/html>.

- Jon A. Krosnick, Allyson L. Holbrook, Matthew K. Berent, Richard T. Carson, W. Michael Hanemann, Raymond J. Kopp, Robert Cameron Mitchell, Stanley Presser, Paul A. Ruud, V. Kerry Smith, Wendy R. Moody, Melanie C. Green, Michael Conaway, (2002), “The Impact of ‘No Opinion’ Response Options on Data Quality: Non-Attitude Reduction or an Invitation to Satisfice?”, *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Volume 66, Issue 3, pp. 371–403, <https://doi.org/10.1086/341394>.

- Dumay J, (2017) Editorial for EJKM Volume 15 Issue 2, *The Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management*, Volume 15 Issue 2, (pp59-60), https://issuu.com/academic-conferences.org/docs/ejkm-volume15-issue2-article812?mode=a_p.

The *Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching & Learning* submission guidelines make it clear that articles must be original and must not infringe any existing copyright. The authors wish to offer their honest regrets for not giving attribution to the original authors of the above mentioned works, and sincerely apologise for the error and the inconvenience caused. The publishers of the journal sincerely apologise to the readers and the original authors of the above mentioned works.



Findings – It was essential to establish the knowledge management (KM) capacity in key areas such as the ability to recognise experts within the institution, leadership's innovation, knowledge sharing and knowledge acquiring work culture, and technology usage. KM tools and techniques would help the institutions to meet their competitive goals; therefore, it is vital for HEIs to create KM awareness among the employees.

Research limitations/implications – Similar to most studies, it is anticipated that the participants' awareness of KM practices at their HEIs is very high. The samples were collected to evaluate the general view of KM awareness and how participants perceived KM practices. The total samples received for this study were expected; however, they were sufficient to study the impact.

Practical implications – This paper provides support for the importance of KM practices and employees awareness at HEIs to enhance innovation and performance teaching and learning environment.

Originality/value – This paper is one of the first papers to find empirical support for the role of KM practices at HEIs. Further, the positioning of KM practices as a competitive tool can be considered as an influential factor to competitive advantage.

Keywords Knowledge management, Knowledge sharing, Tacit knowledge management

Paper type General review

Introduction

Knowledge management (KM) plays a dynamic role in the higher education institutions (HEIs) success, particularly through effective planning, organising, monitoring and coordinating the KM assets related to intellectual capital. Thus, KM could enrich knowledge sharing and overall performance (Hossain *et al.*, 2013). HEIs are considered to be knowledge-intensive organisations (Howell and Annansingh, 2013; Ramachandran *et al.*, 2013) and knowledge-creating institutions, and they are also considered to be in the knowledge business (Rowley, 2000). They create new knowledge through research, disseminate knowledge through teaching and learning, research and development, communication, dissemination of science, and create jobs through spin-offs (Alexandropoulou *et al.*, 2009; Fullwood *et al.*, 2013). In a knowledge economy, KM has been recognised as one of the determining factors for innovation and competitive advantage (Darroch, 2005; Dasgupta and Gupta, 2009).

There is evidence that KM could be important in supporting HEIs in teaching and research activities; however, there is also evidence that the approaches adopted by HEIs are passive and inconsistent (Donate and Canales, 2012). Cranfield and Taylor (2008) suggested that HEIs need to develop a common understanding of KM before they can begin to see the benefits on an institutional-wide level. However, research into KM in universities is limited (Alexandropoulou *et al.*, 2009; Fullwood *et al.*, 2013), and such research, as has been conducted, focuses either on specific aspects of the knowledge process, such as the individualistic nature of research and loyalty to discipline (Tippins, 2003), or on the specific elements of KM, such as knowledge sharing amongst academics (Cheng *et al.*, 2009; Fullwood *et al.*, 2013). Some studies have examined obstacles to KM in HEIs in the areas of knowledge creation (Fullwood *et al.*, 2013; Ramachandran *et al.*, 2013). However, most of this research has been conducted in countries with mature higher education systems; furthermore, the development of HEIs is viewed as key to the economic, social and cultural development.

Kidwell *et al.* (2000) supported the notion that HEIs are suitable places to apply KM practices to support HEIs functional and operational processes. It is therefore not surprising to insist there is a need for KM in the education sector (Sallis and Jones, 2002). This is because HEIs are posited to profit greatly from the development and application of certain KM mechanisms that assist in identifying not only what is known, but also what must be known, similar to business organisations (Tippins, 2003). Hence, KM practices in the HEIs need to be effective as society moves from the industrial to the knowledge age to improve teaching and learning, and as well to provide a strong knowledge base for research practices and strategies.

However, a knowledge gap exists in relation to the aspiring KM practices: lack of understanding between information and knowledge, KM storage location, KM challenges experienced, and knowledge sharing acquiring experiences. Nevertheless, limited research conducted in Malaysia's perspective. This study aims to discuss KM practices and their

relevance to teaching and learning environment in private HEIs. More specifically, to generate insights into KM traits that can promote and encourage knowledge sharing and knowledge acquiring culture in the private HEIs in the future.

Literature review

Looking back at the work of Davenport and Prusak (1998), knowledge is defined as coming from one's experiences, values, contextual information and expert insight, which then provides the basis for evaluating and incorporating new experiences and information. KM can be seen as the way that people create, transfer and adopt knowledge resources at different levels of interrelationships or networks. The work by Phelps *et al.* (2012) identified those network levels to be interpersonal, intra-organisational and intra-organisational. Within a construction organisation, KM is a set of tools and practices developed and implemented to gather, store, share, protect and make project-related experience and training available for use.

KM has many meanings within a variety of areas. Girard and Girard (2015) found that KM has been defined differently by various authors in different disciplines. This also highlights the fact that within each context, people perceive and use the term differently, and it is appropriate to define KM within the context of HEIs. One of the definitions captured by Levinson (2007) is that KM is the process through which organisations generate value from their intellectual and knowledge-based asset. Concerning knowledge as an asset, Frost (2010) defined KM as the systematic management of an organisation's knowledge assets for the purpose of creating value to meet organisational objectives at the operational, tactical and strategic levels.

The definition of KM in the literature review is challenging due to numerous conceptual origins of this study field. For instance, organisational knowledge includes personnel known as subject matter experts and information stored in devices (Richey *et al.*, 2010). A broader concept of knowledge was developed, which includes both explicit aspects, such as language and documentation, and tacit aspects, such as experience and skills (Nonaka, 1991). However, the obvious definition of knowledge is that organisational knowledge creation theory defined knowledge as three complementary elements. First, knowledge is reasonable true belief. Literature justifies the truthfulness of their beliefs based on their communication with the world. Second, knowledge is the experience that was obtained from performance and knowledge, allowing individuals to describe, arrange, shape and learn to solve a task or problem. Third, knowledge is situated on a continuum from explicit to tacit knowledge (Nonaka and Von Krogh, 2009). There are also challenges in the definition of KM due to the various conceptual understanding of knowledge and how organisations describe their management. KM can be a systematic way of administering a valuable resource through the promotion of an incorporated approach used in the identification, capturing, organising, structuring, sharing, retrieving, as well as evaluating the knowledge assets of a given enterprise (Kim and Ju, 2008).

In addition, KM involves the acquisition, storage, diffusion as well as the implementation of tacit knowledge in addition to tacit knowledge, both within and out of the boundaries of the organisation in a way that is aimed at making the organisation attain corporate objectives with highly efficient means (Magnier-Watanabe and Senoo, 2008). Thus, the KM can be defined as the process of effectively managing both the tacit knowledge and the explicit knowledge, within the organisation so as to enhance organisational competitive advantages. Furthermore, it could form an environment within the organisation that enables to create, transfer and share knowledge, which leads to managing knowledge effectively (Bratianu, 2011).

However, one obvious definition of KM is that an organisation has the ability to establish a set of activities or procedures that may constantly create an environment within an organisation that assists in the creation, transfer and sharing of knowledge (Alex *et al.*, 2017; Akhavan *et al.*, 2013; Bratianu, 2011). KM is essential to improve organisations dynamics. According to Sharimilah Devi *et al.* (2008), for organisations to remain competitive resilient, they must effectively and efficiently create, capture, organise, share and apply organisational

knowledge and expertise. Therefore, it is essential for organisations to apply KM to achieve competitive benefits (Choi and Lee, 2003). However, many organisations failed in applying KM because effective implementation requires eliminating KM obstacles (Huang and Lai, 2014).

Knowledge management in higher education institutions

HEIs have always been involved in KM practices. The three missions of universities, research, education and service to society are closely linked with knowledge creation, knowledge dissemination and knowledge transfer, respectively (Rowley, 2000; Alexandropoulou *et al.*, 2009; Fullwood *et al.*, 2013; Ramachandran *et al.*, 2013). However, to remain competitive in the knowledge economy, HEIs need to manage their knowledge processes within the context of a deliberate KM strategy. A key prerequisite to successful KM is an awareness of the factors that promote knowledge creation, sharing and transfer in HEIs. Enablers to KM have a positive effect and the prospect of its being beneficial. Thus, there are various reasons as to why KM practices are significant to HEIs and as well the way the institutions approach KM practices that can have huge improvements in the sharing of explicit as well as tacit knowledge. Research works of KM in the HEIs aided in the comprehension of the various benefits that are brought by the application of KM in the processes of educational institutions like research, curriculum development, alumni, student affairs and services, administrative services and strategic planning (Kidwell *et al.*, 2000). Thus, the creation of a KM system within the institutions is vital to capture, identify, transform, evaluate, disseminate and consolidate the institutional knowledge (Sharimilah Devi *et al.*, 2008).

The present global economy has posed a huge challenge to private HEIs in Malaysia for educating the knowledgeable as well as the skilful learners who meet their expectation and societal needs (Hazlina, 2019). Hence, HEIs need an effective system to deal with KM practices in order to provide quality education services. According to Sharimilah Devi *et al.* (2008), it is essential for HEIs to improve knowledge creation, dissemination and learning. A wide array of literature points that various educational institutions are not prepared to effectively embrace KM. They are also not fully aware of the highly crucial significance of tacit knowledge and the greater initiatives to transform and rebrand by improving the existing knowledge system and inventing new ways of thinking and doing (Toro and Joshi, 2012). Knowledge has to be built on its own, frequently supporting, encouraging, funding and interacting with academic members of the HEIs will inspire knowledge creation rather acquiring knowledge from outside and hiring specialist or consultants.

Therefore, it is essential to cope with the current dynamic changes in the private education sector. The development of industrial revolution 4.0 (IR) challenges HEIs to keep abreast with the sector's developments. HEIs are in the midst of a significant transformation regarding the way they produce graduates owing to the digitalisation and revolutionisation. This transition is so compelling that it is representing a dynamic change that has occurred in industries and pushing HEIs to incorporate smart systems fuelled by research methodologies, data and technology learning methods. Thus, KM implementation has to capture the spirit of the industrial revolution and digitalisation to evolve in the future.

Hence, HEIs and academicians need to play an active role in KM innovation and create new knowledge. There are three obvious reasons why KM is imperative to private HEIs. First and foremost, HEIs by nature are knowledge-intensive organisations where they are recognised to be in the knowledge business (Cronin and Davenport, 2000), since knowledge production, distribution and application are ingrained in the institution (Ho *et al.*, 2008). Knowledge, in this case, is both an HEI's main production factor as well as its final product (Goddard, 1998). Second, the unprecedented growth of private HEIs, in which the numbers have doubled and compelled with the increasing enrolments, has driven stiff competition. Third, the issues of quality of courses offered by various private HEIs have been a great concern to the nation. This is evident from the drop in ranking of some top private HEIs in

Malaysia (Hazlina, 2019). As such, by considering KM views, it is indispensable for HEIs to effectively manage KM and act as a strategic tool for HEIs to remain and/or gain competitive advantage.

In this perspective, KM practices in the HEIs (as units representing the academics in general) not only quickly filter to find critical information but also enable the institutions to use, and re-use information in creative ways so that novel insights and new knowledge would surface. Table I shows the KM processes and their definitions in the HEIs setting, as identified from the literature (e.g. Albers and Brewer, 2003; Lawson, 2003; Earl and Scott, 1999; Morse, 2000).

Joseph (2001) opined that KM is a process wherein institutions formulate ways in an attempt to recognise and archive assets from within, which are derived from the employees and/or academics of various departments or faculties, and in some cases, even from other institutions and/or organisations sharing similar areas of interest. Hence, HEIs do not solely provide knowledge to students but are also engaged in managing and collaborating the existing knowledge for future reference (Goud *et al.*, 2006). An institutional-wide approach to KM has been identified to lead to considerable improvements in sharing explicit and tacit knowledge, thus improving the performance of the HEIs (Tippins, 2003).

The primary issue that makes KM implementation a challenge to HEIs is that rather than considering knowledge as an asset that increases in value when shared, many faculty members consider knowledge as proprietary and something that is not shared freely (Ho *et al.*, 2008; Wind and Main, 1999). Given the nature of academia and the emphasis placed on conducting primary research, it is not surprising that some faculty members view knowledge as a possible source of differentiation and thus defer sharing certain aspects of their knowledge. When knowledge is viewed as a source of power, it acts as a “separator” between the haves and the have-nots and in some cases, knowledge loss occurs (Wiig, 1993).

Further, HEIs are often organised in functional areas (e.g. academic, research and development, marketing, student affairs and so on) that operate independently (Tippins,

KM processes	Definition
1. Knowledge creation	Knowledge is created through discovery, that is, academics develop new ways of doing things or it is brought in through external sources. Research and development activity is one such knowledge creation
2. Knowledge capture	Knowledge capture happens when new knowledge is identified as relevant and valuable to current and future needs. The methods of knowledge capture that come from external sources include the following: benchmarking best practices from other HEIs; attending conferences; hiring consultants; monitoring economics, social, and technological trends; collecting data from staff, students, competitors, and resources; hiring new staff; collaborating with other HEIs; building alliances; forming joint ventures; and establishing knowledge links with collaborators
3. Knowledge organisation	Knowledge organisation happens when new knowledge is refined and then organised. This is done through filtering to identify and cross-list the useful dimensions of the knowledge for different products and services of the HEIs. The knowledge is placed in context, so that it is actionable and it can be reviewed and kept current and relevant
4. Knowledge storage	Knowledge storage is a process wherein knowledge is codified and stored in a reasonable format so that others in the HEIs can access it. Database management and data warehousing technologies can help in this process. Besides, databases, directories of expertise, procedural handbooks, and e-mail messages are examples of codifying knowledge
5. Knowledge dissemination	Knowledge dissemination involves personalising knowledge and distributing it in a useful format to meet the specific needs of the academics. The knowledge is articulated in a common language using tools that are understood by all users. Publications, presentations, websites, white papers, teaching and learning activities, policies, and reports are examples of mechanisms used by HEIs to disseminate and/or transfer knowledge
6. Knowledge application	Knowledge application happens when knowledge is applied to new situations in which academics can learn and generate new knowledge. In the learning process, there should be analysis and critical evaluation to generate new patterns for future use. Decision making at the organisational level, innovation, and customer/student relationship management are examples of direct knowledge application. The application of knowledge may generate new knowledge or update current knowledge that has to be stored in the databases of the HEIs

Table I.
Definitions of KM processes in the HEI setting

2003). Thus, as in the business environment, functional areas within many private HEIs often fail to share knowledge that can lead to the establishment of a higher standard of education. Hence, teachers who develop systematic and effective ways to identify and develop their students thinking show that with profound knowledge they can enhance students' learning substantially, leading to content mastery (Zhonghe and Shuhua, 2016).

Research problem

This study observed that support and motivation in private HEIs of Malaysia are scarce in order to capture employees' tacit knowledge and preserve it to give access to build new knowledge. In developed countries such as the USA, the UK and Australia, the education institution applies various strategies and practices to capture tacit knowledge of the staff members and experts. The argument is that KM practices may help the HEIs to improve the quality of education services and performance; however, it is not clear whether HEIs employees are well informed and provided sufficient support, training and financial grant. The KM goals, objectives and motivation are the respective HEIs' responsibility. Thus, it benefits the HEIs, as the tacit knowledge capturing activities are recorded and no doubt will be used for submitting reports to various funding and grading agencies, universities, industries, foreign collaborations, etc. It also strengthens the KM practices and it is used as a competitive advantage over the competitors. This study underscores the fact that the public has become more digital knowledge based and HEIs that are able to identify, value, create and evolve their knowledge assets are likely to be more successful than those that do not. KM is about enhancing the use of organisational knowledge through sound practices of KM and organisational learning. KM practices encompass the capture and/or acquisition of knowledge, its retention and organisation, its dissemination and re-use and lastly responsiveness to the new knowledge. Therefore, the following research questions were designed to fit the study aims:

- RQ1. What KM practices mean to academicians?
- RQ2. What technologies are being used to enhance KM practices?
- RQ3. What are the methods used for knowledge sharing and knowledge acquisition?
- RQ4. What are the suggestions on KM practices to enhance value of the education services?
- RQ5. What are the processes of evaluating KM practices that are in place?

Methodology

A search on the website of the Malaysian Ministry of Higher Education (www.mohe.gov.my) reveals that there are about 37 private universities, university colleges, foreign university branch campuses and about 544 private colleges currently in operation. There are also private HEIs from overseas institutions and/or affiliated with overseas institutions, for example, the UK, Australia, India and China. A semi-structured questionnaire that seeks to generate in-depth insights was deemed to be appropriate (Pearlson *et al.*, 2016). The questionnaire was divided into two sections. Section A comprised of participant's qualification and important factors to tacit knowledge progression, and Section B questions were related to KM practices. An interview schedule was designed and piloted through meetings with three senior academicians who were experts in KM research field. The experts provided information and guidance to facilitate the study during the interview. Then, the second round of questionnaire was created and 1,100 questionnaires were distributed to polytechnics, community colleges, private universities, university colleges, foreign university branch campuses, private colleges and private HEIs affiliated with overseas institutions using personal administered method assisted

by volunteers. The authors collected a total of 80 questionnaires from Kuala Lumpur (7.2 per cent response rate), 91 from Selangor (8.3 per cent response rate), 27 from Penang (2.5 per cent response rate), 38 from Malacca (3.5 per cent response rate) and 36 Johor (3.3 per cent response rate). The result was a sample of 273 individuals, that is, 24.8 per cent of the entire survey respondents. These five states were selected on the basis of the private HEIs' ranking, location and survey sample for this research. The participants were informed about the survey's objective, confidentiality, and at any time, they could decline to answer any question or withdraw from the survey. A survey type sample size calculation was utilised, meaning that a sample error formula, rather than the power analysis formulae that are usually utilised in experimental research, was used. The decision in selecting the random sample was to have a confidence level of 95% and a 10 per cent (0.10) sampling error. On the contrary, purposive sampling was used for qualitative data collection. All usable questionnaire responses were analysed using SPSS analysis software and questionnaire tool. Qualitative data analysis was achieved by identifying patterns and themes in the collected study data. The sample was checked for response and non-response bias.

Results

The summary of the major findings was organised according to the subject matter raised by the research questions of the study. The results reflect the survey questionnaire and observation. Table II illustrates the respondents' qualification: 10 (3.7 per cent) respondents have a PhD/Doctorate degree, 145 (53.1 per cent) respondents have a Master degree, 106 (38.8 per cent) respondents have a Bachelor degree, 5 (1.8 per cent) respondents have a Diploma, 2 (7 per cent) respondents have a professional certificate and 2 (4 per cent) respondents have other qualification. The data show that the respondents were aware of the KM practices that fit the purpose of this study.

In Table III, results were based on the perception reflected by the respondents' agreement on the level of understanding between information and knowledge. The results indicate that there is a huge degree of understanding between information and knowledge. This was reflected by the fact that in the questionnaire when asked if information and knowledge have the same meaning, 23 per cent of the respondents strongly agreed, 60.4 per cent agreed with the notion that they meant the same thing, 10.3 per cent did not give an opinion, 5.1 per cent disagreed, whereas 1 per cent strongly disagreed. The question whether knowledge depends on information, 19.4 per cent respondents strongly agreed, 70.0 per cent agreed with the notion, 10.6 per cent did not give an opinion and remaining were unsure of it. Concerning whether the KM is the same as information management, 4.0 per cent respondents strongly agreed, 36.6 per cent agreed with the notion, 36.6 per cent did not give an opinion, 19.0 per cent disagreed, whereas 3.7 per cent strongly disagreed. The question whether KM includes information management, 15.8 per cent respondents strongly agreed, 43.6 per cent agreed with the notion, 25.3 per cent did not give an opinion, 4.3 per cent disagreed, whereas 1.1 per cent strongly disagreed.

Educational qualification	No. of respondents	Percentage
PhD	10	3.7
Master's degree	145	53.1
Bachelor's degree	106	38.8
Diploma	5	1.8
Professional certificate	2	0.7
Others	2	0.4
Total	270	98.9
Missing	3	1.1
Total	273	100.0

Table II.
Respondents'
qualification

Source: Adopted for the study

In relation to the “No opinion” responses, a number of prominent survey researchers have recommended the routine use of “don’t know” options in questionnaires, presumably in order to minimise non-attitude reporting (e.g. Berdie and Anderson, 1974; Bogart, 1972; Converse and Presser, 1986; Oppenheim, 1992; Payne, 1950). This perspective is based on a set of underlying assumptions. First, it presumes that some people have opinions on any given issue and are aware of possessing those opinions, whereas other people do not have opinions and are aware that they do not. But the behaviour of people without opinions is presumed to be contingent on question format. These individuals are presumed to report the fact that they have no opinion accurately when a no opinion option is offered, but when no such option is offered, some or all of these people may fabricate reports of “non-attitudes” due to pressure to appear opinionated. Such non-attitude responses might be the result of the respondent choosing purely randomly among offered response alternatives or making a choice driven by the structure of the question (Converse, 2006). This perspective suggests that no opinion responses should not always be viewed as accurate, that is, we should not presume that every time a person chooses a no opinion response option, he or she cannot report a meaningful response. The authors of this study presume that the respondents may cope by randomly selecting responses from among the choices offered according to the KM practices and processes at their respective HEIs in order to appear opinionated.

The respondents were able to respond with an understanding of what KM refers to whilst whether they are sure or unsure of KM practices at their institutions. The results show that employees are involved in activities that could be classified as KM practices. The data suggest that being aware of KM or knowing what it means does not necessarily mean practising knowledge sharing and acquiring. The implication of these results is that, in practice, this study was exploratory as the use of KM appeared to be a concept of fulfilling job responsibility; it lacks the knowledge sharing and acquiring perceptions.

This study also intends to identify the knowledge needed to support the HEIs knowledge storage and highlight the gaps. In Table IV, results indicate paper-based documents, computers in departments, personal computers and a central information system as sources and locations of knowledge. The results for the question whether knowledge was found in paper-based documents are as follows: 7.3 per cent questionnaire respondents strongly agreed, whereas 42.5 per cent agreed with the notion, 27.1 per cent gave no opinion, 19.8 per cent disagreed and 3.3 per cent strongly disagreed. Thus, 5.1 per cent strongly agreed with the notion that knowledge was in the heads of departmental members, whereas 36.6 per cent agreed, 26.7 per cent chose not to give an opinion about that perception, 26.4 per cent disagreed and 5.1 per cent strongly disagreed with it. Although a significant number of 5.8 per cent did not give an opinion about knowledge being kept in a central storage space, 7.3 per cent strongly agreed and another 38.5 per cent agreed, 30 per cent did not give an opinion, and 21.2 per cent disagreed with that perception. At the same time, 4.8 per cent respondents were of the perception that the knowledge they needed to perform their job functions was on their personal computers or workstations, whereas 43.6 per cent agreed, 29.3 per cent gave a non-

	<i>n</i> ^a	Strongly disagree %	Disagree %	Neutral %	Agree %	Strongly agree %
1. Information and knowledge mean the same thing	273	1	5.1	10.3	60.4	23.8
2. Knowledge depends on information	273	0	0	10.6	70.0	19.4
3. Knowledge management is the same as information management	273	3.7	19.0	36.6	36.6	4.0
4. Knowledge management includes information management	273	1.1	14.3	25.3	43.6	15.8

Note: ^aNumber of respondents
Source: Adopted for the study

Table III.
Level of understanding between information and knowledge

committal response, 18.7 per cent disagreed and 3.7 per cent strongly disagreed. Regarding the question whether computers in the department were the source of knowledge, 12.1 per cent respondents strongly agreed, 41.0 per cent agreed, 22.7 per cent did not give an opinion, 15.0 per cent disagreed and 5.9 per cent strongly disagreed with it.

This study has suggested the desirability of creating knowledge repositories for the improvement of capturing knowledge assets that include student projects, institutional records (archival and otherwise) and conference and symposium papers. Although the suggested repositories suggest a gap in knowledge storage, they bring out the desire of study participants to determine what constitutes valuable information and knowledge worth retaining as the HEIs institutional memory. Establishing their knowledge needs will affect HEIs strategic planning. According to Stankosky (2005) and Mavodza and Ngulube (2011), it has an impact on an organisation’s ability to meet its goals and objectives and its projection on how best to use its services and knowledge products for the future, because these processes involve experts in the organisation and can be barriers to their successful implementation. Some of these barriers are as follows: KM may not necessarily be a way of doing daily business and that a policy that can guide it, therefore, does not exist, fear of adopting new or different ways of doing things with its resulting resistance from the community, lack of appropriate organisational infrastructure to handle KM practices, and KM is deemed unsuitable for some HEIs organisational settings.

HEIs are used to internet services, cloud computing and free apps also fall into the category of KM tools. Table V illustrates that 7 per cent of the respondents strongly agreed that there were no proper organisational guidelines on sharing information, 4 per cent agreed, 21.2 per cent gave no opinion, 57.9 per cent disagreed and 12.1 per cent strongly disagreed with that. Regarding the view that the bureaucratic procedures involved in sharing were complicated, 14.7 per cent respondents strongly agreed with the statement, 50.4 per cent agreed, 23.1 per cent gave a non-committal response, whereas 4.8 per cent disagreed and 1.5 per cent strongly disagreed with that perception. Concerning the notion of a lack of a proper IT platform to share information, 0.7 per cent questionnaire respondents strongly agreed, 4.0 per cent agreed, 21.2 per cent gave a non-committal response, but 57.7 per cent disagreed with that notion and 12.1 per cent strongly disagreed. Some respondents perceived organisational policy and/or directives as barriers that prevented them from storing information effectively; 10.3 per cent of the respondents strongly agreed and 49.5 per cent agreed with the notion, 24.5 gave a non-committal response, 9.2 per cent disagreed and 1.5 per cent strongly disagreed. It is interesting to note that lack of open-minded information sharing yielded following responses: 16.1 per cent respondents strongly agreed, 54.2 per cent agreed, whereas 15.44 per cent did not give an opinion, 10.3 per cent disagreed. A non-committal response also seemed concerning on the information sharing.

This implied that the importance of leadership at HEIs needs to be sensible to KM advantages and its essentials should be incorporated into the organisation’s strategic plan and strategic goals (Stankosky, 2005). This kind of leadership support results in KM policy that Jain (2007) referred to as the road map to answer questions about the “what, why, how, and who” of

Table IV.
Knowledge
management storage
location

	<i>n</i> ^a	Strongly disagree %	Disagree %	Neutral %	Agree %	Strongly agree %
1. Paper-based documents filing system	273	3.3	19.8	27.1	42.5	7.3
2. Heads of department members	273	5.1	26.4	26.7	36.6	5.1
3. Central information system	273	5.8	21.2	30.0	38.5	7.3
4. Personal computer	273	3.7	18.7	29.3	43.6	4.8
5. All computers in the department	264	5.9	15.0	22.7	41.0	12.1

Note: ^aNumber of respondents
Source: Adopted for the study

KM, because this approach can result in systemic changes, not merely isolated changes in the operations of any single department. This view partly concurs with the suggestion made by Singh and Kant (2008) that KM barriers include the lack of top management commitment, lack of technological infrastructure, lack of clearly defined methods or processes for KM practice, lack of an organisational structure that supports a KM strategy, lack of organisational culture, lack of motivation and rewards, employees retirement, lack of ownership of problems and employees turnover. This reinforces the point made by Kok (2003) who wrote that KM practice is benchmarked by the use of enablers that include leadership, technology, culture and measurement. Despite these barriers, the modern information environment that includes a wide variety of information, information providers and platforms for doing so has made it necessary for organisations, including education institutions, to consider using KM tools and techniques to identify what tacit and explicit knowledge exists in the organisation and what knowledge they might require in the future to enhance work processes.

The importance of capturing knowledge or institutional know-how could be a priority if the need for its retention was realised. The implication of this statement is that besides the requirement to have guidelines or procedures on what knowledge to capture, it needs to be systematically organised. This is important because not all information is knowledge and not all knowledge is valuable (Aswath and Gupta, 2009). Acquired knowledge is of limited value if it is not organised and stored for easy retrieval and archive, which needs proper organisation, as retrieval depends more on the memory of individuals than on finding assistance. Broadbent (1998) suggested the “purposeful management processes which capture often personal and contextual information that can be used for the organisation’s benefit”. Valuable knowledge needs to be drawn out and retained so that there is continuity even when the creator leaves the organisation, and the retrieval of knowledge is not solely dependent on individuals’ memory. Eventually, a knowledge bank (Branin, 2003), repository (Bailey, 2005) or portal may exist. The data captured from the study are suggestive of the fact that KM practices need clear policies in knowledge creation, knowledge capture, knowledge organisation, knowledge storage, knowledge dissemination and knowledge application.

It is essential to establish the HEIs’ KM capacity in key areas such as the ability to recognise experts within the institution, leadership, institutional work culture and technology. It is also important to find out whether using KM tools and techniques would help the institution to meet its goals. Therefore, this study’s ultimate aim is to analyse whether HEIs were using tacit knowledge assets effectively. It was revealed that HEIs have experts in various academic disciplines, besides those in administrative and non-administrative positions. However, KM was not part of the institutions work culture, a fact which was reflected and demonstrated in the questionnaire results. Therefore, it is essential to identify and describe the knowledge needs of the institutions and enumerate the variables involved in the process of recognising experts.

KM literature suggested that information flow is the way knowledge could travel and grow within an organisation. Koenig (2003) credited the flow of formal and informal

	<i>n</i> ^a	Strongly disagree %	Disagree %	Neutral %	Agree %	Strongly agree %
1. No proper organisational guidelines on sharing	262	2.9	8.4	17.9	50.9	15.8
2. Bureaucratic procedures involved in sharing are complicated	258	1.5	4.8	23.1	50.5	14.7
3. Lack of IT platform to share information	262	12.1	57.9	21.2	4.0	0.7
4. Organisational policy and/or directives	259	1.5	9.2	24.5	49.5	10.3
5. Lack of open-minded information sharing	262	0	10.3	15.4	54.2	16.1

Note: ^aNumber of respondents

Source: Adopted for the study

Table V.
Knowledge management challenges experienced

information up, down and across the enterprise as the source for improvements in operational productivity. Similarly, knowledge flow also requires a working environment that nurtures and accelerates the sharing of knowledge. Table VI illustrates the effect of knowledge sharing on individuals; respondents felt that it enabled their quick accomplishment of tasks, as evidenced by the results: 9.2 per cent respondents strongly agreed, whereas 36.6 per cent agreed with responsibility, 40.3 per cent gave no opinion, 6.6 per cent disagreed and 1.8 per cent strongly disagreed. They also felt that it improved their job performance, as highlighted by the results: 2.9 per cent respondents strongly agreed, 25.3 per cent agreed with the perception, whereas 42.5 per cent were non-committal, 20.1 per cent disagreed and 4.4 per cent strongly disagreed. Amongst the respondents, 2.6 per cent agreed that knowledge sharing was generally useful in their jobs, whereas 20.1 per cent agreed with the perception, 58.6 per cent seemed ambivalent, 9.5 per cent disagreed with that perception and 5.5 per cent strongly disagreed. The respondents indicated that knowledge sharing enabled individuals to react more quickly to change, and the results were as follows: 2.6 per cent respondents strongly agreed, 13.2 per cent agreed with the perception, 49.5 per cent gave no opinion, 24.5 per cent disagreed and 7.3 per cent strongly disagreed with the perception.

The respondents shared the view that information and knowledge sharing had the potential to turn individual knowledge into organisational knowledge for their respective institutions. Thus, a curriculum-related symposium or conference could be significant as a KM technique, since it was intended to create an information transfer and sharing platform for HEIs. These data suggest that knowledge sharing is viewed as important in job performance, and imply that the potential to benefit from using KM tools and techniques that enabled retaining knowledge for subsequent re-use did exist. The capability of individuals to operate in ways that enable KM practice is expressed by responses to the question of whether knowledge sharing in the departmental environment was seen as facilitating knowledge storage. The importance of knowledge sharing was corroborated by respondents. A non-committal response by a majority of respondents led to an ambivalent interpretation, but all the respondents were clear about the knowledge sharing and knowledge acquiring culture in their respective institutions.

Table VII illustrates the respondents' opinions on tacit knowledge progression, 105 (38.5 per cent) respondents referred to job performance. KM applications differ depending on factors such as the size of the institute, its capital structure and the educational market in

Table VI.
Knowledge sharing
acquiring experiences
(adopted for the study)

	<i>n</i>	Strongly disagree %	Disagree %	Neutral %	Agree %	Strongly agree %
1. Enables me to accomplish tasks quickly	258	1.8	6.6	40.3	36.6	9.2
2. Improves my job performance	260	4.4	20.1	42.5	25.3	2.9
3. Useful in the overall performance of my job	263	5.5	9.5	58.6	20.1	2.6
4. Enables me to react more quickly to change	265	7.3	24.5	49.5	13.2	2.6

Note: *Number of respondents
Source: Adopted for the study

Table VII.
Respondents' opinions
on tacit knowledge
progression

Important factors to tacit knowledge progression	No. of respondents	Percentage
1. Job experience	105	38.5
2. Educational development	23	8.4
3. Job performance and competence	143	52.4
4. Knowledge management policy	1	0.4
5. Missing	1	0.4
Total	273	100.0

Source: Adopted for the study

which the institute operates. However, most organisations integrate KM into the organisation without paying much attention to the role and function of KM, and especially as related to the job performance level of the employees (Almajali *et al.*, 2016; Masa'deh *et al.*, 2015; Obeidat *et al.*, 2014). Regarding the opinion on tacit knowledge progression, 23 (8.4 per cent) respondents referred to educational development. The discourse on sustainable learning (Burns, 2013) and “effective teaching” implies that educators can effectively address well-known sociocultural and ecological problems in ways that transform and enhance learners’ awareness of the need to stabilise the relationship between the society and the living world. Hopkinson and James (2010) recognised the importance of these sustainability skills and competencies but also observed that progress within individual lectures is unlikely to achieve the level or rate of embedding education for sustainable development that is frequently discussed but rarely achieved. However, 143 (52.4 per cent) respondents referred to job performance and competence. Prahalad and Hamel (1990) coined the term “core competence”; human expertise has been seen as an important ingredient in the mix of a company’s systems, technologies, physical location and infrastructure that make up this competence.

Therefore, managing individual competencies (knowledge and skills) is one important element in the management of strategic competitive advantage, if individual competencies are in line with organisational core competence. This has been acknowledged by some KM advocates by putting an emphasis on implicit knowledge and the techniques necessary to deal with it from an organisational point of view (Michellone and Zollo, 2000). However, only 1 (4 per cent) respondent thought that the institution’s KM policy had a very little impact on tacit knowledge progression. Sharing tacit knowledge requires a culture conducive to this type of sharing. Furthermore, knowledge must be used to locate and translate knowledge elements, thus facilitating their integration into other communities. This endeavour is very much about people and managing organisational culture change. Often, it is much more reasonable to simply externalise the sources of tacit knowledge rather than the knowledge itself (Davenport and Prusak, 2000). This means that often it is better for experts to externalise what they know rather than how they know it. The main role of KM is then to ensure that experts can be found so that tacit knowledge can be passed on through practice, mentoring and networking that supports and encourages the networking that is necessary for these functions to occur.

Conclusion

A key aspect to create awareness of KM practices is the identification of what KM means to employees at the HEIs, a review of their knowledge assets and the design of a strategy that can facilitate the creation, sharing and transfer of knowledge, to their institutions’ competitive advantage. Furthermore, the HEIs in Malaysia require visionary leadership, which can introduce these policies and create the right climate for knowledge creation, sharing and transfer as a basis for enhanced research and innovation in the country. As part of this initiative, consideration should be given to investment in a dedicated KM office, interactive web portals and knowledge repositories, collaborative and multi-disciplinary and inter-institutional research projects, rewards and incentives, access to data and databases and increased collaboration with private sector. More widely, this study suggests that HEIs need to create broader KM practices, strategies and cultures. Further research on KM processes and policies in HEIs can contribute to a more robust and insightful knowledge base in this area. Additionally, KM practices need to be tapped from institutional skills and the already existing intellectual capital. A supportive institutional climate can, therefore, bring systemic transformation to the entire institution.

A large number of respondents gave no opinion or a neutral response to most of the questions, and this can have an impact on the morale of those in the teaching area of the institutions. It also makes it complicated to implement a system of regular measurement and

accountability, and as a result, teaching and research performance becomes difficult to measure. Nevertheless, the benefits to be attained; there are two primary issues that make KM implementation a challenge across all HEIs. Rather than considering knowledge as an asset that increases in value when shared, many faculty members consider knowledge as proprietary and something that is not shared freely (Ho *et al.*, 2008; Wind and Main, 1999). Given the nature of academia and the emphasis placed on conducting primary research, it is not surprising that some faculty members view knowledge as a possible source of differentiation, and thus defer sharing certain aspects of their knowledge. When knowledge is viewed as a source of power, it acts as a “separator” between the haves and the have-nots (Wiig, 1993), and in some cases, knowledge loss occurs. Further, HEIs are often organised in functional areas (e.g. academic, research and development, marketing, student affairs and so on) that operate independently (Tippins, 2003). Thus, as in the business environment, functional areas within many HEIs often fail to share knowledge that can lead to the establishment of a higher standard of education. Hence, KM of the educational system must reflect and comprise information at all levels, starting from the management level to the faculty level and to the student level in order to improve the management of KM and to achieve academic quality.

For this reason, the HEIs may encourage an open institutional culture with incentives to promote the integration of individual skills and experiences into institutional knowledge and recognise the many strengths of knowledge utilisation formally and informally, and understand that it is not only technology that supports KM activities. Social relations, networking and interaction are some of the main elements that arise from KM practices. There is a need to establish new knowledge to enhance the HEIs teaching and learning environment, and it is essential to encourage employees to communicate regularly to share their ideas. In order to create KM awareness, assessment of the current KM practices is needed to be carried out by highlighting existing KM activities and experience, outlining the benefits, explaining how KM can be built upon, and exposing barriers to progress. This will show how current KM practice awareness affects the ability of the employees in the HEIs to meet intended goals and demonstrate the connection between faculties, employees and students. People who need knowledge acquisition should be identified. It is very important to focus on mission-critical rather than just fashionable knowledge practices. A policy to institutionalise KM practices should be developed in order to facilitate knowledge growth through knowledge sharing and acquiring culture. Incentives can help to reinforce best practices and at the same time can create a shift in behaviour. Incentives can be based on an annual performance review on the basis of employee's contribution to the institution's knowledge.

HEIs are the best places for advancing KM initiatives. The academic members need to be aware of the benefits that are possible from a sound teaching and learning environment. Thus, job experience may encourage academic members to positively promote their respective institutions, enhancing student enrolment and retention in the process. Effective KM practices can create creativity, particularly as it is likely that different types of knowledge assets have different influences on knowledge creation. Job performance and competence through the use of technology that is already in place can expedite the dissemination and sharing of knowledge, and networking activities can propagate a healthy relationship with the public and job placement with industries for its graduates. It is essential to map the knowledge storage and identify expert who can enable the KM sharing of best practices. This can be done by examining the performance results of the employees. If best practices and styles are already in place, it is better to use them to enhance performance rather than attempting to invent new ways. Jain (2007) suggested a mapping knowledge or knowledge gap exercise: “Knowledge mapping can identify organisational knowledge assets as well as knowledge gaps”. This exercise helps in the eventual measuring of the effectiveness and success of KM practices and principles. It is important for institutional members to have an easy access to knowledge. The institutions' KM policy may need to organise the KM

databases to help in making knowledge visible, so that it can be shared and transferred around easily, enabling employees to use such knowledge for an enriched teaching and learning environment.

References

- Akhavan, P., Ramezan, M. and Yazdi Moghaddam, J. (2013), "Examining the role of ethics in knowledge management process: case study: an industrial organisation", *Journal of Knowledge-Based Innovation in China*, Vol. 5 No. 2, pp. 129-145.
- Albers, J.A. and Brewer, S. (2003), "Knowledge management and innovation process, the eco-innovation model", *Journal of Knowledge Management Practice*, Vol. 9 No. 2.
- Alex, K., Joanna, P. and Jerzy, G. (2017), "The impact of leadership on trust, knowledge management, and organisational performance: a research model", *Industrial Management & Data Systems*", Vol. 117 No. 3, pp. 521-537.
- Alexandropoulou, D.A., Angelis, V.A. and Mavri, M. (2009), "Knowledge management and higher education: present state and future trends", *International Journal of Knowledge and Learning*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 96-106.
- Almajali, D.A., Masa'deh, R. and Tarhini, A. (2016), "Antecedents of ERP systems implementation success: a study on Jordanian healthcare sector", *Journal of Enterprise Information Management*, Vol. 29 No. 4, pp. 16-29.
- Aswath, L. and Gupta, S. (2009), "Knowledge management tools and academic library services", *International Conference on Academic Libraries, Vision and Roles of the Future Academic Libraries*, Delhi, October 5-8, pp. 187-192.
- Bailey, C.W. (2005), "The role of reference librarians in institutional repositories", *Reference Services Review*, Vol. 33 No. 3, pp. 259-267.
- Berdie, D.R. and Anderson, J.F. (1974), *Questionnaires: Design and Use*, Scarecrow, Metuchen, NJ.
- Bogart, L. (1972), *Silent Politics: Polls and the Awareness of Public Opinion*, Wiley-Interscience, New York, NY.
- Branin, J.J. (2003), "Knowledge management in academic libraries: building the knowledge bank at the Ohio State University", *Journal of Library Administration*, Vol. 39 No. 4, pp. 41-56.
- Bratianu, C. (2011), "Changing paradigm for knowledge metaphors from dynamics to thermodynamics", *Systems Research and Behavioural Science*.
- Broadbent, M. (1998), "The phenomenon of knowledge management: what does it mean to the information profession? Knowledge management: an emerging concern", available at: www.sla.org/pubs/serial/10/1998/may98/broadben.html (accessed 12 January 2018).
- Burns, H. (2013), "Meaningful sustainability learning: a study of sustainability pedagogy in two university courses", *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, Vol. 5 No. 2, pp. 166-175.
- Cheng, M.Y., Ho, J.S.Y. and Lau, P.M. (2009), "Knowledge sharing in academic institutions: a study of multimedia university malaysia", *Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 7 No. 3, pp. 313-324.
- Choi, B. and Lee, B. (2003), "An empirical investigation of KM styles and their effect on corporate performance", *Journal of Information and Management*, Vol. 40 No. 5, pp. 403-417.
- Converse, J.M. and Presser, S. (1986), *Survey Questions: Handcrafting the Standardised Questionnaire*, Sage, Beverly Hills, CA.
- Converse, P.E. (2006), "The nature of belief systems in mass publics (1964)", *Critical Review*, Vol. 18 Nos 1-3, pp. 1-74, available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/08913810608443650>.
- Cranfield, D.J. and Taylor, J. (2008), "Knowledge management and higher education: a UK case study", *The Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 6 No. 2, pp. 85-100.

- Cronin, B. and Davenport, E. (2000), "Knowledge management in higher education", in Bernbom, G. (Ed.), *EDUCAUSE Leadership Strategies*, Vol. 3, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA, pp. 25-42.
- Darroch, J. (2005), "Knowledge management, innovation and firm performance", *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 9 No. 3, pp. 101-115.
- Dasgupta, M. and Gupta, R. (2009), "Innovation in organisations. a review of the role of organisational learning and knowledge management", *Global Business Review*, Vol. 10 No. 2, pp. 203-224.
- Davenport, T.H. and Prusak, L. (1998), *Working Knowledge: How Organisations Manage What They Know*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA.
- Davenport, T.H. and Prusak, L. (2000), *Working Knowledge: How Organisations Manage What They Know*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA.
- Donate, J. and Canales, I. (2012), "A new approach to the concept of knowledge strategy", *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 22-44.
- Earl, M.J. and Scott, I.A. (1999), "Opinion: what is a chief knowledge officer?", *Sloan Management Review*, Vol. 40 No. 2, pp. 29-38.
- Frost, A. (2010), "Knowledge management definition", available at: www.knowledge-managementtools.net/knowledge-management-definition.html (accessed 9 September 2018).
- Fullwood, R., Rowley, J. and Delbridge, R. (2013), "Knowledge sharing amongst academics in UK universities", *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 123-136.
- Girard, J. and Girard, J. (2015), "Defining knowledge management: toward an applied compendium", *Online Journal of Applied Knowledge Management*, Vol. 3 No. 1, pp. 1-20.
- Goddard, A. (1998), "Facing up to market forces", *Times Higher Education*, Vol. 13 No. S1, pp. 6-7.
- Goud, N.V., Venugopal, N.M. and Anitha, S.Y. (2006), "Impact of knowledge management in higher education", *Proceedings of the International Conference on Knowledge Management in Institutes of Higher Learning, Multimedia University, Malaysia and Suan Dusit Rajabhat University, Bangkok*.
- Hazlina, A. (2019), "Malaysian varsities see drops in latest QS rankings by subject", available at: www.nst.com.my/education/2019/02/464111/malaysian-varsities-see-drops-latest-qs-rankings-subject (accessed 12 March 2019).
- Ho, J.S.Y., Cheng, M.Y. and Lau, P.M. (2008), "Knowledge sharing in knowledge-based institutions", *Proceedings of the 10th International Business Information Management Association Conference*, Kuala Lumpur.
- Hopkinson, P. and James, P. (2010), "Practical pedagogy for embedding ESD in science, technology, engineering and mathematics curricula", Special issue: competencies for sustainable development and sustainability: significance and challenges for ESD, *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, Vol. 11 No. 4, pp. 365-379.
- Hossain, L., Atkinson, S., D'eredita, M. and Wigand, R. (2013), "Towards a mech-organic perspective for knowledge sharing networks in organisations", *UK Academy for Information Systems*, Worcester College University of Oxford, 8-20 March.
- Howell, K.E. and Annansingh, F. (2013), "Knowledge generation and sharing in UK universities: a tale of two cultures?", *International Journal of Information Management*, Vol. 33 No. 1, pp. 32-39.
- Huang, L.S. and Lai, C.P. (2014), "Knowledge management adoption and diffusion using structural equation modelling", *Global Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 8 No. 1, pp. 39-56.
- Jain, P. (2007), "An empirical study of knowledge management in academic libraries in East and Southern Africa", *Library Review*, Vol. 56 No. 5, pp. 377-392.
- Joseph, M.F. (2001), "Key issues in knowledge management", *Knowledge and Innovation, Journal of the Knowledge Management Consortium International*, Vol. 1 No. 3, pp. 8-38.
- Kidwell, J.J., Vander Linde, K.M. and Johnson, S.L. (2000), "Applying corporate knowledge management practices in higher education", *EDUCAUSE Quarterly*, Vol. 23 No. 4, pp. 28-33.

- Kim, S. and Ju, B. (2008), "An analysis of faculty perceptions: attitudes toward knowledge sharing and collaboration in an academic institution", *Library & Information Science Research*, Vol. 30 No. 4, pp. 282-290.
- Koenig, M. (2003), "Knowledge management, user education and librarianship", *Library Review*, Vol. 52 No. 1, pp. 10-17.
- Kok, J.A. (2003), "Role of leadership in the management of corporate knowledge", *South African Journal of Information Management*, Vol. 5 No. 3, p1.
- Lawson, S. (2003), "Examining the relationship between organisational culture and knowledge management", unpublished academic dissertation, Nova Southern University, Fort Lauderdale, FL.
- Levinson, M. (2007), "Knowledge management definition and solutions", available at: www.cio.com/article/2439279/knowledge-management-definition-and-solutions.html (accessed 26 August 2018).
- Magnier-Watanabe, R. and Senoo, D. (2008), "Organisational characteristics as prescriptive factors of knowledge management initiatives", *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 12 No. 1, pp. 21-36.
- Masa'deh, R., Obeidat, B., Zyod, D. and Gharaibeh, A. (2015), "The associations among transformational leadership, transactional leadership, knowledge sharing, job performance, and firm performance: a theoretical model", *Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 4 No. 2, pp. 848-866.
- Mavodza, J. and Ngulube, P. (2011), "The use of knowledge management tools and techniques in library practices in an academic environment", *Mousaion*, Vol. 29 No. 2, pp. 94-115.
- Michellone, G. and Zollo, G. (2000), "Competencies management in knowledge-based firms", *International Journal of Technology Management*, Vol. 20 Nos 1/2, pp. 134-155.
- Morse, R. (2000), "Knowledge management systems: using technology to enhance organisational learning", *Paper Presented at Challenges of Information Technology Management in the 21st Century*, Anchorage, AK, May, pp. 21-24.
- Nonaka, I. (1991), "The knowledge-creating company", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 69 No. 6, pp. 96-104.
- Nonaka, I. and Von Krogh, G. (2009), "Perspective tacit knowledge and knowledge conversion: controversy and advancement in organisational knowledge creation theory", *Organisation Science*, Vol. 20 No. 3, pp. 635-652.
- Obeidat, B., Masa'deh, R. and Abdallah, A. (2014), "The relationships among human resource management practices, organisational commitment, and knowledge management processes: a structural equation modelling approach", *International Journal of Business and Management*, Vol. 9 No. 3, pp. 9-26.
- Oppenheim, A.N. (1992), *Questionnaire Design, Interviewing, and Attitude Measurement*, Pinter, London.
- Payne, S.L. (1950), "Thoughts about meaningless questions", *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Vol. 14 No. 4, pp. 687-696.
- Pearlson, K.E., Saunders, C.S. and Galletta, D.F. (2016), *Managing and Using Information Systems, Binder Ready Version: A Strategic Approach*, John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, NJ.
- Phelps, C., Heidi, R. and Wadhwa, A. (2012), "Knowledge, networks, and knowledge networks: a review and research agenda", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 38 No. 4, pp. 1115-1166.
- Prahalad, C. and Hamel, G. (1990), "The core competence of the corporation", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 68 No. 3, pp. 79-91.
- Ramachandran, S., Choy, C.S. and Yew, W.K. (2013), "Knowledge management practices and enablers in public universities: a gap analysis", *Campus-Wide Information Systems*, Campus-Wide Information Systems, Vol. 30 No. 2, pp. 76-94.
- Richey, R.C., Klein, J.D. and Tracey, M.W. (2010), *The Instructional Design Knowledge Base: Theory, Research, and Practice*, Routledge, New York, NY.
- Rowley, J. (2000), "Is higher education ready for knowledge management?", *International Journal of Educational Management*, Vol. 14 No. 7, pp. 325-333.

- Sallis, E. and Jones, G. (2002), *Knowledge Management in Education Enhancing Learning and Education*, Kogan Page, London.
- Sharimilah Devi, R., Chong, S.C. and Lin, B. (2008), "Perceived importance and effectiveness of KM performance outcomes: perspectives of institutions of higher learning", *International Journal of Innovation and Learning* Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 18-37.
- Singh, M.D. and Kant, R. (2008), "Knowledge management barriers: an interpretive structural modelling approach", *International Journal of Management Science & Engineering Management*, Vol. 3 No. 2, pp. 141-150.
- Stankosky, M.A. (2005), "Advances in knowledge management: University research toward an academic discipline", in Stankosky, M. (Ed.), *Creating the Discipline of Knowledge Management: The Latest in University Research*, Butterworth Heinemann, Burlington, MA, pp. 1-14.
- Tippins, M.J. (2003), "Implementing knowledge management in academia: teaching the teachers", *The International Journal of Educational Management*, Vol. 17 No. 7, pp. 339-345.
- Toro, U. and Joshi, M. (2012), "ICT in higher education: review of literature from the period 2004-2011", *International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology*, Vol. 3 No. 1, pp. 20-23.
- Wiig, K.M. (1993), *Knowledge Management Foundations: Thinking about Thinking: How People and Organisations Create, Represent, and Use Knowledge*, Schema Press, Arlington, TX.
- Wind, J. and Main, J. (1999), *Driving Change*, The Free Press, New York, NY.
- Zhonghe, W. and Shuhua, A. (2016), "Addressing challenges in urban teaching, learning and math using model-strategy application with reasoning approach in linguistically and culturally diverse classrooms", *Journal of Urban Learning Teaching and Research*, Vol. 12, pp. 47-60.

Further reading

- Al Husseini, S. and Elbeltagi, I. (2012), "Knowledge sharing and innovation: an empirical study in Iraqi private higher education institutions".
- Bratianu, C. (2016), "Knowledge dynamics", *Management Dynamics in the Knowledge Economy*, Vol. 4 No. 3, pp. 323-337.
- Chan, I. and Chao, C.K. (2008), "Knowledge management in small and medium-sized enterprises", *Communications of the ACM*, Vol. 51 No. 4, pp. 83-88.
- Lee, M.N. (2004), "Global trends, national policies and institutional responses: restructuring higher education in Malaysia", *Educational Research for Policy and Practice*, Vol. 3 No. 1, pp. 31-46.
- Magnier-Watanabe, R. and Senoo, D. (2010), "Shaping knowledge management: organisation and national culture", *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 14 No. 2, pp. 214-227.

About the authors

Dr Balakrishnan V. Nair is Lecturer of Marketing at the School of Management & Marketing, Faculty of Business, Nilai University Malaysia. His research focuses on marketing strategy and product innovation, in particular the influences of competitive advantages. He is also involved in business sustainability, in particular the change management, distribution channel, and social networking. Dr Balakrishnan V. Nair is the corresponding author and can be contacted at: balakrishnan@nilai.edu.my

Dr Chandramalar Munusami is Lecturer in Economics at the School of Management & Marketing, Faculty of Business, Nilai University Malaysia. Her research focuses on economic growth and consumer demand, in particular the consumer markets. She is also involved in business sustainability, in particular the efficiency, supply and demand, and market changes.

For instructions on how to order reprints of this article, please visit our website:

www.emeraldgrouppublishing.com/licensing/reprints.htm

Or contact us for further details: permissions@emeraldinsight.com