

**KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT IN EDUCATION SECTOR:  
AN EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION**

Dr. Sandeep Kapoor\*

Dr. Vaishali Goel\*

---

**ABSTRACT**

*With the liberalization, privatization and globalization of Indian economy, there have been innumerable career opportunities in various business sectors. This has resulted in increasing demand for updated, active and committed management people in different sectors in India. These people play a vital role in shaping the economy of a country. They gain knowledge either from intellectual resources (capital) or from technical resources and manage it by keeping themselves updated which is intended to incorporate in global and competitive environment. The intellectual capital (faculties) manages the knowledge through books, internet, FDPs. The study is an attempt to conduct a comparative analysis of general mental ability of intellectual capital of private institutions and government institutions, with a view to find out the gap and to improve upon the overall working of the educational institutions in western U.P. region. 100 faculty members in western U.P. region participated in the study and the data was collected by using test comprised of the questions on the pattern of UGC-NET. On the basis of the analysis of data, this research also specifies there is a difference in management of knowledge among intellectual capital of private business schools and government colleges. The study concludes that private institutions are hiring only one or two faculty members of high caliber and rest of the faculty members are either freshers or of very low caliber.*

**Keywords:** *Intellectual capital, Intellectual resources, Technical resources, Competitive advantage, & Caliber.*

---

\*Assistant Professor, Department of Business & Management Studies, Meerut Institute of Engineering and Technology, Meerut

---

**INTRODUCTION:**

During the last few decades the amount of information in form of knowledge in science and technology and other fields has shown an exponential growth. Besides the amount of information the opportunities for accessing the information has dramatically increased with the onset of Internet revolution. It is done by everyone as part of the day-to-day job, embedded in the workflow. People are easily able to obtain the data, information, and knowledge they need to do their jobs.

Faculties play a vital role in shaping the economy of a country by producing management people both from private and Government College with managed knowledge. In a growing economy, institutes need faculties who apart from being qualified are committed. They interact effectively with their colleagues--anywhere, anytime, and by any means. They are supported by competitive corporate world and technical applications that contain integrated decision support and data-mining.

**KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT**

Knowledge management refers to the production, sharing, application, and transformation of knowledge. The field of knowledge management is of great importance in the commercial world because technological economies are increasingly knowledge based. But the success of the organization depends on knowledge of management people which in turn depends on intellectual capital. Knowledge management comprises a range of strategies and practices used in an organization to identify, create, represent, distribute, and enable adoption of insights and experiences which are embodied in individuals. The value of Knowledge Management relates directly to the effectiveness with which the managed knowledge enables the students to deal with today's situations and effectively envision and create their future. It improves performance, provides competitive advantage, innovation, methods to share the lessons learned, integration and continuous improvement of the organization. Knowledge is of two types, i.e., explicit knowledge and tacit knowledge. Explicit knowledge is formalized, is explained with texts, and is easy to be spread. Tacit knowledge exists in people's mind, is implicit, which is hard to be coded and difficult to transfer. But tacit knowledge plays dominant role in the formation of students' knowledge system, world value and value concepts.

**REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

Business schools whether private or Government aided around the world develops and implement information technology of various kinds to enhance the knowledge management mechanism within the organization. These schools develop their knowledge through the process of teaching and learning. At business schools where knowledge management is efficient, teachers do not just teach what they already know but continue to thirst for more knowledge. By learning new things, teachers can enhance their mental ability which further develops new teaching techniques and improve the curriculum for their students. With active teachers having good mental ability, students are also more likely to become eager learners. These updated intellectuals are keen to update their knowledge rigourously. They want to know what colleagues are currently thinking, what methods and approaches are currently being used and they want the opportunity to discuss ideas with colleagues across the schools and universities (McAndrew et al 2004). They attend workshops, seminars, FDPs to gain current insights. With the revolution of internet there is a boom of websites and online resources which these intellectuals can share, evaluate, make comments and evaluate other's comments. The factors motivating knowledge sharing include knowledge self-efficacy, enjoyment in helping others, collective cognitive responsibility, individual outcome expectations (Kankanhalli et al, 2005, Hsu, et al 2007; Bandura 1997). But these intellectuals can manage the knowledge only when they are having good mental ability.

There are many business schools where individuals may not willingly share information with their departmental peers, or with other departments, because they believe that what they know provides them with an inherent advantage in bargaining and negotiation. Despite the availability of most sophisticated 'knowledge sharing' technologies, such human concerns may often result in sharing of partial, inaccurate, or ambiguous information.

Business students go to school to seek knowledge, it depends on educational institutions how they plan their knowledge management. Knowledge management helps in developing an atmosphere conducive to the sharing and exchange of knowledge. But the process starts from the top management of the organization and their members with knowledge share who further transfers that information. In private colleges they interact with their intellectuals to share their experiences, talk about their problems and explore solutions together. They provide channels and time for them to interact and share their opinions. On the other side if these intellectuals get the right atmosphere, they are ready to lead the discussion. They make sure

their students that regardless of their classes, have opportunities to interact and exchange their knowledge, learning together in the process.

### **ROLE OF INSTITUTION IN IMPARTING KNOWLEDGE**

A great amount of expert knowledge is possessed by library staff and users, both in and outside the libraries. In university and research communities such expertise is abundant and should be inventoried, indexed, and updated regularly and be made searchable and accessible through electronic databases created and maintained by libraries. The knowledge and accumulated experiences of library staff members form the intellectual assets of any library and should be valued and shared. An organizational culture for sharing of knowledge and expertise should be established with appropriate rewards and incentives. Those intellectuals who share their tacit knowledge and experiences through writing, publishing, lecturing, tutoring, or mentoring should be appropriately recognized and rewarded. An organizational culture which emphasizes cooperation, sharing, and innovation can only be established by strong leadership and commitment from the top management and a shared vision by the library staff. As a learning organization, libraries should allocate annual funding to provide continuing education and staff training to all staff members. Knowledge must be renewed and expanded to prevent it from becoming stagnant.

A mentoring system should be in place to help newcomers to learn from experienced intellectuals. Informal seminars and brownbag sessions where they can interact and exchange “**lessons learned**”, “**best practices**” and other specific experience and knowledge should be scheduled at regular intervals and at convenient times. Special interest groups and chat rooms can be created through intranet. Since many valuable experiences have been accumulated over time, top management should pay attention to favorable working conditions and environment, which will contribute to better staff retention.

### **Objectives of the Study**

The objective of the study is to conduct a comparative analysis of general mental ability of intellectual capital of private institutions and government institutions, with a view to find out the gaps and to improve upon the overall working of the educational institutions.

### **Hypothesis**

Faculty of both type of i.e. government & private institutions have same caliber.

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

The study was carried out in different institutes imparting post graduate management

---

education and ranked by All India Management Association, (AIMA) New Delhi. The effort has been applied to investigate the mental ability of faculty members in government and private institutions in western U.P. region. By applying a systematic random sampling technique 50 colleges each of government and private sector were selected and then one faculty from each college selected. The respondents ranged from Professors to Lecturers of these institutions.

The researcher used a simple mental ability test. The test comprises of 30 questions (of 1 marks each) to be completed in 30 minutes time. This test paper is based on the pattern of paper of UGC- NET (objective type paper); which includes the items of Series test, analogy test, Logical reasoning, teaching aptitude, research aptitude, English comprehension, communication, Data interpretation, Information and communication technology, People & environment and Higher education system; governance, polity and administration.

The un-attempted questions were treated as wrong answers. Then after getting the final scores the values of Q3 and Q1 were calculated of the total scores of 100 subjects which worked out to be as under:

Value of the Quartile Three (Q3) = 23

Value of the Quartile One (Q1) = 09

Thus all those cases which fell above the value of Q3 i.e. 23 were classified as high caliber group and those who fell below the value of Quartile were considered as low caliber and those falling between the two limits of Q1 and Q3 were taken as moderately intelligent. In order to test the null hypothesis the mean, variance and z-test were applied; on total sample collected, on high caliber group and on low caliber group.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### **I. Comparison of Faculty Member on the basis of their Caliber**

First of all the scores obtained by both type of faculty members are compared to identify the difference in their capabilities. Table 1 presents a comparative picture of faculty of government colleges and private institutions on the basis of test conducted by the researcher.

**Table 1**

#### **Comparison of Government & Private Faculty members on Caliber**

Government	Private
------------	---------

<b>Mean</b>	20.56	10.96
<b>Variance</b>	40.95	39.75
<b>Observations</b>	50.00	50
<b>Z</b>	7.56	
<b>z Critical one-tail</b>	1.64	
<b>z Critical two-tail</b>	1.96	

It is clear from the above table that there is a significant difference between the faculty members of government institutions and private institutions. It may be noted that the average scores obtained by the faculty members at government institution is 20.56 however it is only 10.96 at private institutions. This is sufficient to indicate that the faculty members at private institutes are of low caliber. Further if Z-test is applied, then too the null hypothesis i.e. faculty of both type of institutions have same caliber, gets rejected as  $Z=7.56$  which is under rejection area at 5% confidence level for both cases whether one tail or two tail. Thus faculties at government institutions are better than that of private institutions.

The major reason of this may be that most of faculty members at private institution at the time of their appointment have not been subjected to intelligence testing. Mostly their appointment is on the basis of references or salary negotiations. Thus overall there is a significant difference between the capabilities of both types of faculty members.

## **II. Comparison of faculty member of high caliber group**

The comparison of the faculty members on the basis of their caliber is not the real test for null hypothesis. Therefore, now only High caliber faculty members of government institutions and private institutions are compared. Table 2 presents the situation of the faculty member of high caliber group.

**Table 2**  
**Comparison of Government & Private faculty member of high caliber group**

	<b>Government</b>	<b>Private</b>
<b>Mean</b>	26.72	28.5
<b>Variance</b>	2.68	0.5
<b>Observations</b>	18.00	2
<b>Z</b>	-2.81	

<b>z Critical one-tail</b>	1.64
<b>z Critical two-tail</b>	1.96

The most important point in the above table that the average scores obtained by the faculty members at private institutions (28.5) is higher than that of government institution i.e. 26.72. But the number of faculty member in this group is 18 from government institutions and only 2 from private institutions. This proves that there are very high caliber faculty members in private institutions but they are very less in numbers. Further if Z-test is applied, then too the null hypothesis i.e. faculty of both type of institutions have same caliber, gets rejected as  $Z = -2.81$  which is under rejection area at 5% confidence level for both cases whether one tail or two tail.

Thus faculties at private institutions are better than that of government institutions as far as high caliber group is concerned. The reason may be that since a number of private business schools are mushrooming up in the market and they have to stay long by providing best knowledge goes to the business organizations.

### III. Comparison of faculty member of low caliber group

The comparison of the faculty members of low caliber group is also as important as it was in case of high caliber group. Table 3 presents the situation of the faculty member of low caliber group.

**Table 3**

#### **Comparison of Government & Private faculty member of low caliber group**

	<i>Government</i>	<i>Private</i>
<b>Mean</b>	8.50	6.29
<b>Known Variance</b>	0.50	5.69
<b>Observations</b>	2.00	24
<b>Z</b>	3.16	
<b>z Critical one-tail</b>	1.64	
<b>z Critical two-tail</b>	1.96	

It may be noted that the scores obtained by the faculty members at government institutions (8.50) is higher than that of private institutions i.e. 6.29. But the number of faculty member in this group is 24 from Private institutions and only 2 from Government institutions.

This proves that a big number of faculty members at private institution are of low caliber and they are much below than the low caliber group of government institutions. Further if Z-test is applied, then-too the null hypothesis i.e. faculty of both type of institutions have same caliber, gets rejected as  $Z = -3.16$  which is under rejection area at 5% confidence level for both cases whether one tail or two tail. Thus faculties at private institutions are of quite low caliber as compared to the government institutions as far as low caliber group is concerned.

### **FINDINGS & CONCLUSION**

On the basis of above analysis it can be concluded that the faculty members at government institution are better than that of private institutions; Private institutions have some faculty members who have a very high caliber, but their number is very small i.e. only two. On the other hand if we look at the low caliber group then again private institutions hit the boundary, around 50% faculty members at private institutions are of low caliber. Thus it can be concluded that private institutions are hiring only one or two faculty members of high caliber and rest of the faculty members are either freshers or of very low caliber; therefore they are hitting both of the extremes.

### **SUGGESTIONS:**

As it has been found that faculty members of government institutions are more effective and caliber than that of private institutions. It is recommended that in case of faculty members at private institutions a proper selection procedure should be adopted at the time of recruitment and references or salary negotiation should not be considered. In this way they can get people who are moderately intelligent rather than having one key man and small soldiers around him.

### **REFERENCES:**

1. Awad, Elias M and Ghaziri, Hassan M., Knowledge Management, Delhi: Person Education, 2006, pp. 47-49.
2. Bandura, A., (1986). *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
3. Bandura, A., (1997). *Self-efficacy: The Exercise of Control*. Freeman, New York, NY.

4. Broadbent, M., The Emerging Phenomenon of Knowledge Management, The Australian Library Journal, Feb-6-24, 1977.
5. Brown, J.S. and Duguid, P., Structure & Spontaneity, Knowledge Organization (Managing Industry Knowledge- Creation, transfer and Utilization, edited by Nonaka and Teece David, Sage Publisher, 2001.
6. Carroll, J.M, Choo, C. W., Dunlap, D. R., Isenhour, P. L.; et al. (2003) Knowledge management support for teachers. Educational Technology, Research and Development, 4,51, 42-64.
7. Dhawan, Radhika, the Knowledge Corporation, Business Today, may 1999.
8. Drucker, Peter, The Post Capitalist Society, Butter worth-Heinemann, 1993.
9. Goyal Kumar Swarup, Knowledge Management, Adhyan Publishers, 2010.
10. Hsu, M. H. et al (2007). Knowledge sharing behavior in virtual communities: The relationship between trust,self-efficacy, and outcome expectations. International Journal of Human-Computer Studies, 65, 153-169.
11. <http://www.gartner.com>
12. Kamalvijayan D, Information & Knowledge Management, Macmillan, 2005.
13. Kankanhalli, A, Tan, B, Kwok-Kee, W. (2005). Contributing Knowledge to Electronic Knowledge Repositories: An Empirical Investigation. MIS Quarterly, 29, 1, 113-143.
14. McAndrew, P., Clow, D. Taylor, J. & Aczel, J. (2004). The evolutionary design of a Knowledge Network to support knowledge management and sharing for lifelong learning. British Journal of Educational Technology, 35(6), 739-746.
15. Millan, Willam, Building the Ultimate Resource, Management Review, vol.88, Jan.1999
16. Myres, Paul S., Knowledge management and Organizational Design, Butterworth Heinemann USA.(1993)
17. Natrajan Ganesh and Shekhar, sandhya, Knowledge management Enabling Business Groiwth, Tata McGraw Hill, 2005.
18. Nonka I. and Takeuchi M., The Knowledge Creating Company, Oxford University Press, 1995.
19. Pattnayak, B., Human Resource management, Prentice-Hall of India Pvt. Ltd., 2005.
20. Quinn, James Brown, The Intelligent enterprise, The Free Press, 1992.
21. Raman, A. T., Knowledge management A Resource Book, Excel Books, 2003.
22. Sharma Pankaj, Knowledge Management, Aph publishing corporation, 2004.

23. Shein, Esther, Knowledge is Power, Sales and marketing Management, Vol.150, March, 1998.
24. Srikantaih T K, Koeing Michael E D, Knowledge Management Lessons Learned (What Works And What Doesn't), Ess Ess Publication2008.
25. Taylor, J. & Aczel, J. (2004). The evolutionary design of a knowledge network to support knowledge management
26. Tiwana Amrit, The knowledge management toolkit: Practical techniques of building a knowledge management system, Pearson, 2003.
27. Warriar. Sudhir, Knowledge Management, Vikas Publishing House, 2003.