



THE IMPACT OF KNOWLEDGE SHARING BEHAVIOUR ON ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF TEACHING FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCE COLLEGES

S. Sam Santhose¹ and Dr. P. Ravi²

¹Research Scholar, (Reg. No:9428), Department of Management Studies, Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Abishekapatti, Tirunelveli, Tamil Nadu, India.

²Professor, Department of Management Studies, Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Abishekapatti, Tirunelveli, Tamil Nadu, India.



ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study is to provide an understanding of knowledge sharing behaviour among academics in higher educational institutions and its impact on academic performance. Besides, the study aims to know the impact of KM Environment on relation between knowledge sharing behaviour and their academic performance. The sample, consisting of 136 Assistant Professors from various Arts and Science Colleges in Marthandam, selected using convenient technique from non-probability sampling. The data were collected by means of questionnaires and the collected data put into analyses through structural equation modelling through AMOS software. The major findings of the present paper are – there is a positive relationship between individual knowledge sharing behaviour and academic performance. The performance is further enhanced when the knowledge management environment influences the knowledge sharing behaviour. Therefore, when the knowledge management environment is given priority by the college, the performance of the teaching faculty could be improved.

KEYWORDS: Individual Knowledge Sharing Behaviour, Knowledge Management Environment and Academic Performance.

INTRODUCTION

In an organization, knowledge management holds an important place and role. The ability to organize knowledge management comprises gathering, organizing, sharing and analysing individuals' and groups' knowledge. This takes place throughout the institution which, in turn, gives an impact on the performance. Education institutions are the most benefitting ones from knowledge management. Teachers, educational institutions such as schools, colleges and universities pop up in one's mind in the discussion over knowledge and knowledge management. In the course of their mundane activities, higher educational institutions take part in various routines in academic processes, which, in turn, pave the way for knowledge enrichment. In knowledge management, it is the people rule the roost, as against the systems that prevail. Higher educational institutions should lend a helping hand to its faculty by means of introducing various innovative and beneficial policies and practices in managing and sharing knowledge. In order to transfer knowledge in a better way, educational institutions look into various other possibilities. By doing so, they could successfully see to it that knowledge is transformed into an actual decision making.

By maintaining knowledge management in a better way, educational institutions get into the good books of others, which, in turn, have a positive impression upon it and the academic routines. In sharing knowledge, one could get umpteen of benefits at the organizational and individual levels. At the

organizational level, sharing knowledge chips in and paves the way for an on-stop and stable growth (Ling et al., 2009), in meeting the general objectives and goals of the organization, paying attention to problem solving in the organization (McDermott & O'Dell, 2001; Riege, 2005), uplifting the performance in educational field, upholding attractiveness and productivity (Kearns & Lederer, 2003 in Huang & Davison, 2008; Riege, 2005), understanding the needs of customers and solving them in a better way possible (Skyme, 2000).

At individual level, sharing knowledge paves the way for the promotion of learning and innovation (Riege, 2005; Ling et al., 2009), augmenting their act (Srivastava, Bartol & Locke, 2006), services and capabilities (Ketvirtis, 2011), and reassigning information among personalities in the similar unit or from one unit to another (Argote & Ingram, 2000). One of the advantages of sharing knowledge is that grows or develops the individuals in terms of various other educational oriented processes (Syed-Ikhsan and Rowland, 2004). In order to acquire knowledge, education, on-job-training, mentoring, seminars, conferences and workshops help a lot. Meanwhile, Universities are considered the bastion of knowledge.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE:

The evolution of institutions of higher education has given room to higher competition and it encourages individuals to better perform. Such evolution has paved the way for the higher educational institutions to distinguish the lead for knowledge management (KM) advantages that are its predominant strength (Bhurry. M. Raja J, 2011). Knowledge distribution is one of the foremost procedures of knowledge management (Nonaka B & Takeuchi, 1995). Kim and Ju (2008) recognized and studied the key issues of knowledge distribution among faculty in a higher educational institution found that insight is the most recognized feature for knowledge sharing and also calculated the inspiration of faith and directness in communication.

Anju Thapa states sharing and managing knowledge practices are treated as predominant features of any knowledge based organization. As against the business organizations, the idea behind knowledge sharing has been gaining momentum in the education sector.

Nomini Muhammad acknowledged the presence of association among knowledge management practices and academic performance. In order to attain higher academic performance, institutions have to confirm that knowledge management practices are admirable and stable. Gold et al. (2001) and Lee and Choi (2003) scrutinize the characteristics of organizational ethos, arrangement, and machinery that are straightaway associated towards knowledge management. They did not examine the overall social, leadership, and technological characteristics of the whole organization. The constraint to only knowledge relevant background issues discloses the supposition that knowledge management is a set of comparatively autonomous administrative practices rather than a central mechanism through which organizational factors are activated in order to accomplish organizational objectives. This supposition may have undervalued the authentic effect of knowledge management.

Zheng et al. (2009) explored the facilitating on sequence of knowledge management on the association between the organizational settings, organizational culture, structure, approach and organizational efficiency. They catch that knowledge management can incompletely play the role of arbitrating instrument among the variables. They also inspire pending research to discover that other variables are adept to make noteworthy device with this formula. Remarkably, the outcome from literature indicates that knowledge management practices have significant influence over organizational effectiveness (Zahidul et al; 2011).

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- To know the relation between staff's knowledge sharing behaviour and their Academic performance.
- To know the impact of Knowledge Management Environment on relation between staff's knowledge sharing behaviour and their Academic performance.

METHODOLOGY

The total number of samples collected was 150. Among them 14 samples were not properly filled and had errors. Therefore, the total number of samples selected was 136. The sample consisted of Assistant Professors from various Arts and Science colleges in Marthandam, Tamil Nadu selected using convenient technique from non-probability sampling. The data collection method followed was questionnaire method and the data was analysed through structural equation modelling through AMOS software.

DATA ANALYSIS

Role of mediator (Knowledge Management Environment) between Individual knowledge sharing behaviour (X) and their Academic performance (Y)

```

*****
Model = 4
  Y = AP   (Academic Performance)
  X = IKSB (Individual knowledge sharing behaviour)
  M = KME  (Knowledge Management Environment)

Sample size
  136

*****
Outcome: KME

Model Summary
      R      R-sq      MSE      F      df1      df2      p
      .86      .74      .26    372.09     1.00    134.00     .00

Model
coeff      se      t      p      LLCI      ULCI
constant   .62     .16     3.93     .00     .31     .93
IKSB       .81     .04    19.29     .00     .73     .89

*****
Outcome: AP

Model Summary
      R      R-sq      MSE      F      df1      df2      p
      .91      .83      .10    331.19     2.00    133.00     .00

Model
coeff      se      t      p      LLCI      ULCI
constant   1.82     .10    17.44     .00     1.62     2.03
KME        .38     .05     7.05     .00     .28     .49
IKSB       .34     .05     6.69     .00     .24     .45

*****
    
```

In linear regression, Individual Knowledge sharing behaviour (X) has a positive relationship with Knowledge Management Environment (M) and that Individual Knowledge sharing behaviour increases in 1 unit leads to an increase in Knowledge management environment by 0.81 unit. In multiple regression, Individual Knowledge sharing behaviour (X) has a positive relationship with Academic performance (Y) and that increase in 1 unit leads to increase in Academic performance by 0.90 unit and On the other hand,

Knowledge Management Environment (M) has a positive relationship with Academic performance (Y) and that increase in 1 unit leads to an increase in Academic performance by 0.34.

***** TOTAL EFFECT MODEL *****

Outcome: AP

Model Summary

	R	R-sq	MSE	F	df1	df2	p
	.88	.77	.14	449.21	1.00	134.00	.00

Model

coeff	se	t	p	LLCI	ULCI	
constant	2.06	.12	17.82	.00	1.83	2.29
IKSB .66	.03	21.19	.00	.59	.72	

In linear regression, Individual Knowledge sharing behaviour (X) has a positive relationship with employee a Knowledge Management Environment (M) and that increase in 1 unit leads to increase in Academic performance by 0.66 unit.

***** TOTAL, DIRECT, AND INDIRECT EFFECTS *****

Total effect of X on Y

Effect	SE	t	p	LLCI	ULCI
.66	.03	21.19	.00	.59	.72

Direct effect of X on Y

Effect	SE	t	p	LLCI	ULCI
.31	.05	6.69	.00	.24	.45

Indirect effect of X on Y

Effect	Boot SE	BootLLCI	BootULCI	
KME	.34	.07	.21	.52

Ratio of indirect to total effect of X on Y

Effect	Boot SE	BootLLCI	BootULCI	
KME	.53	.11	.32	.77

Ratio of indirect to direct effect of X on Y

Effect	Boot SE	BootLLCI	BootULCI	
KME	1.10	4.81	.47	3.40

R-squared mediation effect size (R-sq_med)

Effect	Boot SE	BootLLCI	BootULCI	
KME	.71	.04	.62	.79

***** ANALYSIS NOTES AND WARNINGS *****

Note:

Number of bootstrap samples for bias corrected bootstrap confidence intervals: 5000

Level of confidence for all confidence intervals in output: 95.00

The result shows the total effect Individual Knowledge sharing behaviour (X) has a positive relationship with Academic performance (Y) and that increase in 1 unit leads to increase in Academic performance by 0.66 units. (LLCI = - 0.59, ULCI = - 0.72).

Modifications in the influence on Academic performance while Knowledge management environment as a mediator. The result shows the indirect effect Individual Knowledge sharing behaviour has a positive effect on Academic performance i.e. effect Individual Knowledge sharing behaviour is increased by 1 standard deviation, academic performance increases by 0.34 (LLCI = - 0.21, ULCI = - 0.52). Modification on effects changes from 0.31 to 0.4 (Mp > 50 %). The mediator could account more than the total effect value. Hence, role of the mediator is effective. Knowledge management environment plays an important role to increase Academic performance.

SUGGESTIONS

- As an individual, it is the responsibility of the teachers to keep updating their knowledge periodically. This can be achieved easily through sharing their knowledge with their colleagues.
- As an institution, the management needs to promote knowledge sharing behaviour among the teaching faculties. This can be achieved through various mean. For example, by providing IT enables environment, proper leadership that promotes knowledge sharing, good infrastructure, etc.
- Providing monetary rewards for good knowledge sharing behaviour can highly increase the performance of the teaching faculties. Therefore, the management can consider providing monetary rewards for such activities.
- Non-monetary rewards such as appreciation on the stage, in the magazine, etc. can also help in promoting the knowledge sharing behaviour of the individual. Therefore, management can also consider this as an option.

CONCLUSION:

The present paper tried to highlight the importance of knowledge sharing behaviour and the relationship between knowledge management environment and academic performance. Unlike other things, when knowledge is shared, instead of getting dwindled, it becomes doubled. Particularly in the field of academia, knowledge sharing is the only act around which all other acts are involved. It's the duty of a teacher working in a college to share the knowledge that he has gained to the students. But that will be a one way process. Good teaching will occur only when it goes beyond a one way process. It must involve a three way process, the teacher must share whatever he has learned to the students, if there is any valuable suggestion or input that comes from the students, the teacher must be ready to receive it and finally the teacher should share his/her knowledge to other teachers and colleagues so that together as a community they can grow and increase their knowledge. Moreover, in the case of an academic institution like a college or a university, knowledge management becomes very important. Only when knowledge management systems are incorporated in the institution, it can grow exponentially. The present paper tried to shed some light on this aspect of knowledge sharing activity.

REFERENCES:

1. Nonaka I and Takeuchi H (1995) "The knowledge creating Company How Japanese companies create the Dynamics of Innovation."
2. Kim. S and Ju. B (2008) "An analysis of faculty perceptions: Attitude towards knowledge sharing and collaboration in an academic institution". *Library & Information science research*, No.30, PP 282 – 290.
3. Thapa. A., "K.M. Practices and knowledge sharing : a study of University of Jammu" *Abhinav*, Vol. No.1, Issue No.9, PP 144 – 149.

4. MamtaBhusry; and JayantiRanjan (2011) "Implementing knowledge management in Higher Educational Institutions in India: A Conceptual Frame – work", *International Journal of Computer Applications* (0975 – 8871) Vol. 29 No.1, PP 34 – 46.
5. NorriniMuhammed, et.al (2011) "Knowledge Management Practices and Academic performance in university TeknologiMara Terengganu, Malaysia" *world applicablesciences journal* 12: 21 – 26, ISSN 1818 – 4912.
6. Ling C. W., Sandhu M. S. and Kamal K. J. (2009). "Knowledge sharing in an American multinational company based in Malaysia", *Journal of Workplace Learning*, Vol. 21, No. 2, pp. 125-142.
7. McDermott R. and O'Dell C. (2001). "Overcoming cultural barriers to sharing knowledge", *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 5, No. 1, PP. 76-85.
8. Kearns G. S. and Lederer A. L. (2003). "A resource based view of strategic IT alignment: How knowledge sharing createscompetitive advantage", *Decision Sciences*, Vol. 34, No. 2, pp. 1-29.
9. Skyme D. J. (2000). *Developing A Knowledge Strategy: From Management to Leadership*, The MIT Press, pp. 61-84.
10. Riege A. (2005). "Three-dozen knowledge-sharing barriers managers should consider", *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 9, No. 3, pp. 18-35.
11. Srivastava A., Bartol K. M. and Locke E. A. (2006). "Empowering leadership in management teams: Effects on knowledge sharing, efficacy, and performance", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 49, No. 6, pp. 1239-1251.
12. Ketvirtis S. (2011). "Knowledge sharing: Leveraging trust and leadership to increase team performance", available online at:lens/stories/2012/knowledge-sharing-leveraging-trust-and-leadership-to-increase-team-performance.html.
13. Argote L. and Ingram P. (2000). "Knowledge transfer: A basis for competitive advantage in firms", *Organizational Behavior andHuman Decision Processes*, Vol. 82, No. 1, pp. 150-169.
14. Gold AH, Malhotra A, Segars AH (2001). Knowledge management: an organizational capabilitiesperspective. *J Manage InfSyst* 2001; 18(1):185–214.
15. Lee H, Choi (2003) Knowledge management enablers, process, and organizationalperformance: an integrative view and empirical examination. *J Manage InfSyst*; 20(1):179–228.
16. Zahidul; Patrick andIkramul (2011), Knowledge Management Practices and Organizational Effectiveness: Empirical Evidence from Banks of an Underdeveloped Country *Global Education Journal*, Vol, No. 3, pp. 1-28, 2011. Available at SSRN:<http://ssrn.com/abstract=1974095>
17. Zheng W, et al, (2009). Linking organizational culture, structure, strategy, and organizational effectiveness: Mediating roleof knowledge management, *J Bus Res* (2009), doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.06.005
18. Syed-Ikhsan, Syed Omar Sharifuddin and Rowland, Fytton (2004)"Knowledge Management In A Public Organization: A Study of theRelationship between Organizational Elements and the Performance of Knowledge Transfer" *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Volume 8 No2Pp95-111.



S. Sam Santhosé

Research Scholar, (Reg. No:9428), Department of Management Studies, Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Abishekapatti, Tirunelveli , Tamil Nadu , India.



Dr. P. Ravi

Professor, Department of Management Studies, Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Abishekapatti, Tirunelveli , Tamil Nadu , India.