Knowledge Management Orientation of B-School Processes: A Case Research

Sanghamitra Brahma
Heritage Business School, Kolkata (WB)
brhmdtt@yahoo.com

Sumita Mishra
School of Management, KIIT University, Bhubaneswar
sumita.mishra@ksom.ac.in

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research article is to understand the awareness and relevance of Knowledge Management (KM) initiatives in the management institutes/ B-Schools affiliated to a state university. The methodology involves semi-structured interviews of 30 senior professors who have worked in different management institutions affiliated to such a state university in West Bengal. The interview transcripts have been analyzed for key phrases/words, categorized, examined for their frequencies. The findings from the study suggest implications for future development in the management education though integration of their key processes with that of Knowledge Management.

The integration of Knowledge Management Process with the key academic administration processes in tune with the favourable strategic enablers may lead to benchmarking of the B-School processes that offer degrees affiliated to the state universities.

Key Words: *Knowledge Management Implementation, Knowledge Management in B-Schools, Key Strategic Enablers for Knowledge Management*

Introduction:

Management education in India is in crisis. They fail to compete on vital international parameters like research, rankings and accreditation. The mid-tier B-Schools are fighting for their survival with fewer takers for MBA programmes, especially in tier-3 and tier-4 B-Schools, owing to a variety of reasons, like, students' increasing awareness on the quality of education being provided, lack of infrastructure and faculty in the lower-rung B-Schools, decreasing return on investment (fees), absence of industry tie-ups and collaborations etc.

Drop in interest among students has forced most lower-rung institutes to struggle with low occupancy rates, or in some cases even cease operations. Virtually any graduate can get admission to a B-School. The mid-tier and bottom

tier of management programs which majorly include 3000+ low-cost MBAs offered by public universities and their affiliated colleges, have little direction and relevance. As per CRISIL Research estimates, tier-3 and tier- 4 B-Schools together account for about 85 per cent of intake capacity of B-Schools in India. However, students clearly are not biting the bullet, as indicated by the slowdown in growth in the last 3-4 years. (Please refer to the Annexure below for understanding the approach to categorizing B-Schools in India.)

Categorization of B-Schools in India *(Source: CRISIL Research)*

CRISIL Research has categorized B-Schools in 4 buckets namely Tier-1, Tier-2, Tier-3 Tier-4 based on four parameters.

Type	Occupancy Rate (in Percent)	Average salary offered (in Lakhs)	No. of students placed (in Percent)	Average Fees (in Lakhs)
Tier-1	95-100	9+	98-100	12-15
Tier-2	80-95	5-9	80-98	8-12
Tier-3	70-80	3-5	60-80	5-8
Tier-4	0-70	0-3	0-60	0-5

Note: B-Schools have to fulfill the requisite criteria for all four parameters considered in order to fall into a particular bucket. For instance, a business school with a capacity utilization rate of 98%, with 100% of students placed but with an annual average salary package of Rs. 7 lakhs would classify as a tier-2 college and not a tier-1 college.

In this situation, MBA program admissions are badly affected in the state of West Bengal. A number of colleges have been compelled to shut down their operations in the last five years.

The challenges faced by the B-Schools is further amplified by the evolving role of academics lately in all streams of professional education and training with the rapidly changing dynamics in the national, international and global scenario. Path breaking developments in information and communication technology allows the management/ professional students to avail immense number of scholarly articles within seconds through internet. A large volume of the content is increasingly 'Grey Literature'. There are doubts regarding the quality of this supply chain of knowledge amidst a 'Tsunami of Intellectual Content'.

Institutional entities, whether for profit or non-profit, like Universities, university-level Autonomous Institutes, publishers for academic content (both physical and virtual) operate the distribution function in academics.

Though a variety of mechanisms are there to control the quality of education, but their adoption in B-Schools is very limited. Apart from those graded in the premium segment in our country, B-Schools are not competent in adopting and implementing the suitable methods and techniques for current quality control in management education and training.

Success of the universities/ academic institutions is contingent on the assumption that they possess relevant expertise, knowledge and skills that the students must learn to emerge as befitting for the real/ business world. The faculty of management education supply chain is tasked with the role of constantly integrating the currently accepted and relevant business doctrines and practices in their curricula. Also, distinguishing 'what is relevant' from 'what is fad' is equally important. Periodic retooling of the various segments of academic programs must be a regular ordeal.

Knowledge Management Process and Practices (KMPP) can assist a B-School/ management institute to continuously assess and upgrade its quality by identifying 'what is known and what must be known'. It is fortunate that KM concepts, its mechanisms and their applications which are used to manage organization knowledge and memory are being taught in the classrooms.

But it is unfortunate that the institutions are themselves very slow in adopting these concepts and techniques. For instance, a central premise of KM is knowledge sharing. However, in most academic institutions physical and psychological barriers often hinder effective sharing and transfer of knowledge. As a result there is tremendous lack of cross-disciplinary brain storming and consequent knowledge generation.

KM process implementation in business institutions must begin with initial assessment of the current intellectual capital related to teaching, research and services at distinct levels like individual, departmental and organization as a whole to set the knowledge boundaries. *Effective implementation of KMPPs is ensured by certain strategic enablers (KSE) like supportive Leadership & Governance, conducive Work Culture, IT Infrastructure & System and Integrated Performance Evaluation; and certain individual-level factors like Attitude & Perception.*

Previous academic researchers have looked at implementation of KM and their strategic enablers in higher education institutions (Ramchandran, Chong and Wong, 2013). However, specific research in private, self-funded institutions, affiliated to the state universities which are struggling to survive the crisis of redundancy and how integrated KM may serve as a revival strategy is not evidenced.

Literature Review:

KM and KM Process in Organizations: Knowledge is not independent of its knower; it is the result of cognitive processing triggered by the inflow of new stimuli (Fahey and Prusak; 1998). Knowledge is not a radically different concept from information. Rather, information is gradually converted to knowledge when it is processed in the mind of the individuals and knowledge becomes information when it is articulated

and presented in the form of text, graphics, words and other symbolic forms (Schubert et al 1998).

The concept of Knowledge Management has originated in the early 1990s. It was initiated from the difficulty of dealing with complexities, ever increasing competition spurred by technology and the growing sophistication of customers' demands. Polanyi's (1966) discussion on distinction between explicit and tacit knowledge was one of the germinal tasks which led researchers to develop management definitions, concepts, process, stages, circulations and procedures. Drawing on the work of Polanyi (1962-1967), Nonaka (1994) identified two dimensions of knowledge in organizations: tacit and explicit. Tacit knowledge is rooted in action, experience, mental maps, beliefs, paradigms, viewpoints, concrete know-how, crafts and skills etc. that apply to a specific context. The explicit dimension of knowledge is articulated, codified and communicated in symbolic form and/or natural language.

Knowledge Management is a risk with a huge payoff and the risk return balance is the prime condition under consideration. Organization is a Knowledge Field, which is a dynamic synthesis of inherently limited and fragmented bodies of knowledge that comprise its K-inventory. Also, the K-Field is structured and contoured by the emotions and feelings of those who inhabit it (Spender; 2003). Knowledge based organizations host knowledge management episodes which are triggered by a knowledge need/ opportunity and culminate with the satisfaction of that need (Holsapple & joshi; 2003). Teece and Pisano (2003) argued that competitive advantage of firms stem from dynamic capabilities rooted in high performance routines operating inside the firms. The collective body of knowledge offered by employees of the organizations has emerged as a key point of differentiation, providing a foundation upon which the quality of products and services can be improved (Balthazard and Cooke, 2004; Jashapara, 2004; Andrade et al., 2003).

Organizational Learning and KM: Organization learning is a way to create new knowledge, apply it for a purpose and thereby learn from the process and its outcome. Brown and Duguid (1991) described organization learning as 'the bridge between working and innovating'. The implications of organization learning on KM involve creation of an ideal learning environment, awareness about how and why something has been learned and usefulness of the new learning to the organization.

Peter Senge (1990) argues that often failure provides richest learning experience to the organizations. He criticizes the way we reward success and look upon failure can be detrimental to the long term health of the organization. Levitt and March (1996) discusses superstitious learning

where positive or negative results are associated with the wrong results. Real organization learning results from examination of the information generated from their actions rather than the relatively arbitrary success or failure criteria. There are two approaches to organization learning, namely, cognitive perspective that examines the entire firm's learning as a whole and community based perspective where firm's practitioners create knowledge in their own networks called Communities of Practice (Lave & Wenger; 1991). These two views are complimentary and not contradictory.

KM Systems (KMS):

Systems designed to support knowledge in organizations may not appear radically different from the standard information systems, but they enable users to assimilate information into knowledge. KM is becoming a research priority for the academic community (Salmador and Bueno, 2007) and companies are allocating a greater share of spending for its implementation (Beijerse, 1999; Call, 2005). A KMS is distinct from transaction processing systems (TPS), decision support systems (DSS) or executive information systems (EIS) because of its main mission is to transform experiences into explicit knowledge within the organization. Experience is important and critical part of a KMS (Nonaka, 1994) because when individuals receive new information, the information is processed in light of one's past experience to develop and create new knowledge (Prahalad and Hammel, 1990); in better words it connects the past to the present (Davenport and Prusak, 2000).

Influence of KMPP on the KSE in the Academic Setting:

The academic institutions *work culture* is often resistant to learning. Researchers have found that even in firms that embrace innovation and recognize the importance of managing knowledge may take years at times to share and adopt certain 'best practices' (Szulanski, 1996). Instead of considering knowledge as an asset whose value increases only when shared, most faculty members consider knowledge as proprietary and is not to be shared freely (Wind and Main, 1999). Lack of intra-organizational relationships like hall talks and social networks to support formal and informal mechanisms needed for knowledge sharing becomes a barrier (Szulanski, 1996). *Leadership* is the cardinal thread that runs through the whole gamut of KM initiatives in an organization. In every organization leaders have a direct impact on how companies should approach and deal KM processes and practices. KM programs can be effective only when they permeate to all levels in the organization, beginning at the top (De Tienne et al., 2004). Davenport et al. (1998) and Storey and Barnett (2000) had concluded that support of the upper level management should be ongoing and delivered in a practical manner.

Technology is an essential mediating factor in effective implementation of KM process and practices in an organization. The intervention of information technology (IT) is inevitably important as a tool for successful KM implementation (Bhatt, 2001; Kim, Suh and Hwang, 2003). The role of ICT in knowledge sharing is fully understood only if it is related to motivation for knowledge sharing (Hendricks, 1999). Brazelton and Gorry (2003) had inferred that technology alone may not effectively encourage knowledge sharing activities. Kim and Javenpaa (2008) concluded that the existing relationship between communicating parties play a vital role in shaping technology-enabled-knowledge-activities.

Most of the activities are individualistic and limited to internal peer group, if shared; Interactions with external experts are limited to personal acquaintance (Basu and Sengupta, 2007). Wah, Menkhoff, Loh and Evers, (2007) conducted a study in the tertiary education institution in Singapore to reveal that *rewards and incentives*, open-mindedness of the knowledge sharer, and cost-benefit concerns of knowledge hoarding are the strongest predictors of knowledge sharing in comparison to pro-social motives or organizational care. Abdullah, et al. (2008) studied seven major public universities in Malaysia to infer that appropriate incentives and rewards should be awarded for sharing, searching and the usage of KM Systems as a mode of motivation. Cheng et al. (2009) has emphasized the importance of providing the right incentive system and understanding the individual's expectation towards knowledge sharing in order to facilitate knowledge sharing behavior.

Objective and Methodology of the Study: The objective of the study is to empirically examine the KM Orientation of the mid-tier private management institutes affiliated to the state technical university in West Bengal in lieu of the Key Strategic and Individual-level Enablers. It explores the awareness about Knowledge Management Process, relevant Practices and their Key Enablers in academics at individual-level and organizational-level. Also, through thematic content analysis, the study seeks to establish that the favorableness of certain strategic-level and personal-level enabling factors may encourage the KM process based implementations in management academics.

Methodology of the Study:

This study is a thematic case research with holistic as well as embedded units' analyses. It has investigated the knowledge orientation in the mid-tier, privately administered B-Schools, MBA Institutes and Departments with courses affiliated to MAKAUT – Maulana Abul Kalam Azad University of Technology, West Bengal. There are approximately 40 such institutes. The embedded units of analysis are 30 senior academicians with at least 10 years of experience in management education in such institutes.

The theoretical construct for the study has been decided through analysis of the certain public reports related to the problem like CRISIL review, etc. and review of extant literature. The construct considers:

- Effective implementation of the KM Process & Practices (KMPP)
- Key Strategic Enablers (KSE) at Organization-Level i.e. Supportive Leadership & Governance, Conducive Work Culture, IT Infrastructure & System and Integrated Performance Evaluation
- Individual-Level Enablers i.e. faculty members' Attitude and Perception
- Context - B-Schools and MBA departments affiliated to the MAKAUT

The two rival theories that are being advocated are:

(i) Organizational/Institutional enablers when favorable encourage participation and involvement at individual-level by inducing positivity in their Attitude and Perception and thereby facilitate the effective implementation of KM initiatives/ KMPP.

(ii) Lack of autonomy in institutional operations and administration impedes the favorableness of the KSE and in due course Individual-level enablers for effective implementation of KMPP.

The findings of the study are based on both primary and secondary data that has been gathered from multiple sources of evidence. Primary data has been gathered through in-depth, open-ended but focused interviews, direct observation and participant observation. Secondary data has been gathered from online web portal documents and archives. The data has been corroborated through data triangulation to converge the line of inquiry. 30 senior academicians and some administrative staff and management representatives from the contextual case have been interviewed. The draft summaries have been reviewed by a selected number of senior respondents and then finalized.

The interview transcripts have been analyzed for key phrases and words, categorized into arrays and examined for their frequency. The thematic analysis is guided by the theoretical propositions consisting of two rival theories mentioned above. The technique of explanation building has also been appropriately used.

The Case Context Profile: The B-Schools/ Institutes affiliated to MAKAUT exercise little autonomy in running its MBA program. They rigidly follow the prescribed syllabus and curriculum prescribed by the University. In fact, all institutes affiliated to the same state university in a state district follow the same curriculum. Examination and evaluation system is fully coordinated and controlled by the University. They are bound normatively to the bureaucratic

structure prescribed by the affiliating body and blindly follow the schedules set by it.

The University came into operation formally in the year 2001. Almost all the 40 (approx) institutes offering its affiliated MBA degree came into existence after 2001. The privately run self funded programs are also approved by the All India Council for Technical Education (AICTE). The MBA programme is modeled on semester system with specialization in Marketing Management, Financial Management, Human Resource Management and Systems Management and a few others which have not been very popular. The selection of the students for admission into the course is through state-level WBJEMAT (West Bengal Joint Entrance - Management Aptitude Test).

Findings & Discussions:

The data gathered from observations and interviews conducted with senior faculty members and administrative staffs have yielded the following findings, which echo the research findings of Sharimllah Devi et al. (2007) and Chong et al. (2009). MBA institutes affiliated to the state technical university of West Bengal - MAKAUT are nonchalant about the KM initiatives and rather complacent towards benefits of aligning their institutional processes to that of KM process.

- **Knowledge Based Initiatives:** There is tremendous lack of mindset for strategic partnerships and collaborations with the Industry. They do not have any structured policy, objectives towards national and international strategic partnerships and collaborations (Davenport et al., 1998; Storey and Barnett, 2000). They do not venture beyond routine delivery of the university courses, conducting examinations, admissions and placement. There is no fund flow from the industry or an outlook to even craft such channels. There is little or no concern about the opportunities that lie in institute level and individual level creativity and talent, which may enable future innovations to be taken to the market in collaboration with the industry to deliver long term (5-10 years) benefits to the society.

  Senior faculty members are seldom engaged in mapping out the key questions and challenges through brainstorming that have opportunity to add to the knowledge capital/ intellectual property (IP) of the institute. Multidisciplinary approach to research and learning to breakdown the traditional academic silos and drive a new multidisciplinary culture and curricula to attract industry projects is seldom exercised.

- **Leadership & Governance:** The policymakers and governors of the Institute are inefficient and sloppy to ensure a predictable and stable strategic plan to co-op up with the current volatile environment. They fail to realize the priority of Knowledge Management and the criticality of investing in such projects. Such a

policy even if present in a rudimentary and unstructured manner is not communicated through the entire academic community in the institute.

There is a requirement to redefine investment in KM as a source of competence and problem-solving for the society as advocated by De Tienne et al., 2004. Their thought focus must shift from regular *admissions-grooming-placement cycle* to incremental value addition to the continuing batches and to the society through industrious contributions in intellectual capital. Visionary collaborations between industry and universities may accelerate innovation and help to deliver solutions to social challenges. But to harness the tandem, the mission and objectives of the university needs to be redefined in tune with the KM process.

- **Organization Work Culture:** It is found that often the institute's own board and faculty have little freedom to decide and implement on strategic issues. As a result, there is a lack of motive and potential to practice autonomy in actual sense to improve efficiency and effectiveness of the academic processes and outcomes. The faculty and knowledge resource persons mostly have a tendency to resist any innovative initiative as these require more involvement but not incentivized.

Too much emphasis on routine responsibilities leaves the faculty drained out of time. The lecture hours range from 12-20 hours in a week. The faculty dedicates most of preparation time in updating and customizing his study material and handouts so as to make it readily accepted to the students. Faculty assessment focuses mainly on his regular course coverage and student assistance. Little credence is given to contributions in other parameters like R&D and consultancy projects. Therefore, academics is driven more by drawing of a stable monthly salary through routine tasks rather than contributory incentives.

A few accomplished senior professors, who have joined post-retirement on ad hoc but high pay structure supplement the marketability and brand image of the institute to boost admissions. The institute lacks the intention to tap such resources to actually contribute to institute's intellectual goals and achievements. A much larger number of the faculty members are young and bear the regular course coverage load. Besides, there are a large number of visiting/guest faculty from both industry and academia, who commit to the institute only for the allotted time slot. The manpower is also deficient in positive cross-cultural understanding as the B-Schools/ management institutes employ local residents of the respective states mostly.

There is no directive to develop opportunities for academic and industry researchers to dialogue on a knowledge sharing platform. An informal exchange through lectures and seminars that may spark conversations leading to new relationships is very limited.

- **IT Infrastructure & System:** The institutes are usually found to have a sound infrastructure to administer the routine activity schedules. But the concept of Institutional KM and Memory is to be instilled yet. This would require faculty to engage and contribute as subject matter experts (SMEs) with the assistance of the knowledge engineers and skilled technicians. Scheduled training for all the human resource on the KMS is required. Top Management is not aware or not convinced about the returns from such investment in KM System Infrastructure and is therefore reluctant.

  Strong two-way communication between B-School administrators, academics and senior corporate officers; regular follow up to keep the dialogue flowing; and impromptu feedback from either side may help to develop a substrate of academics who understand the benefits of KMS. Information system is integrated effectively to implement the routine day-to-day operations but its effective and efficient implementation fails due to lack of skilled in-house technical staff (Kim and Javenpaa, 2008).

  Organization Knowledge must be organized into three specialized categories (Knowledge Marts), namely - *Strategic Knowledge* to set the path and direction to accelerate the organizations' future research, developmental and intellectual contributions; *Operational Knowledge*- to scale up the quality of the pedagogical procedures and protocol for current operations; and *Domain Knowledge* in the various core and special fields of management.

- **Integrated Performance Evaluation and Reward System:** A well-structured incentive/reward system for research/developmental outcomes and contributions is absent. Industry Institute Cell tackles only the student placement related issues. There is no effort to club the basic and applied research with industry for mutual benefit of the institute and the society. Ample funding may be tapped from the Industry through such collaborations to meet the industry gap/ requirement with academic assistance. Leading position must be given to those who bring in more than their academic and research pedigree. Multidisciplinary individuals who may mentor in bridging the knowledge gap i.e. what we have and what is required must be encouraged in creative endeavours.

The Institute should not hang up on counting chickens before they hatch i.e. measuring the results of a strategic alliance in the short run. Most fruitful projects take time to fruit (Szulanski, 1996). Setting artificial metrics to measure them can often undercut the alliance and fail to capture the unanticipated benefits that accrue when a well-structured strategic relationship is built on trust and is managed by people who understand both worlds. Focus should be on quality instead of quantity. Selective projects with focus on excellent strategic benefits through peer review shall attract industry investment and ensure better results.

- **Individual Perception and Attitude:** The faculties as resource persons are found to be quite reluctant to discuss and share their research ideas in intra-organizational forums or engage in intrapreneurial initiatives beyond routine responsibilities (Wind and Main, 1999). This is because there is no regular incentive system to acknowledge and reward such contributions. Besides, some are quite complacent in their attitude and do not venture to any further to routine work.

There is a tremendous lack of 'Learning by Doing' attitude in the academicians as very few are with an experience in industry or the proclivity to network outside their area of expertise. A subtle insinuation of job insecurity adversely affects cultivation of personal ties that can lead to most creative and promising KM collaborations. Most faculty members consider knowledge as proprietary which should be protected. As a result, the personal knowledge and intellectual capital remains isolated in silos instead of getting integrated with the Institutional knowledge.

The individual-level attitude towards their job and career is to keep things easy-going and comfortable. They are reluctant to take challenges to chase their individual goals based on career planning, and restrict their mobility. They are family oriented and therefore prefer job security to growth and dynamism.

Autonomy may allow the institute to develop structured policy for knowledge based initiatives which may encourage a positive attitude and perception among their employees. The academics focus their efforts towards personalized goals and rarely engage in institutional gains beyond routine (Basu and Sengupta, 2007). There is tremendous lack of organizational belongingness and team spirit among the academics in the context of innovative undertakings.

Conclusions

Following are the suggestions for effective orientation of the management institutes/ B-Schools to Knowledge Management and the successful implementation of the KMPP in its operations.

1. *Implementation of the KM based Initiatives or knowledge orientation*

to support organizational learning and innovatively contribute to the society must address the concern of multiple stakeholders at the institution's strategic level as well as operational level. KM based institutional processes must support a broad user base and incorporate a cost effective approach to knowledge validation. Such initiatives must meet the two basic objectives: (1) Integration of the KM initiatives with the key processes of the organization (2) KM must enable sharing of the valuable knowledge gained from the previous knowledge capture task. The combination of the two objectives may help to improve the connection of the KM process to the entire academic and administration process in the institute, including the concern of all the stakeholders.

2. *New knowledge generated through integration of the multidisciplinary knowledge* (Bush, 2008; Oplatka, 2010a; Ribbins, 2006) *may be relevant to meet the industrial requirement* and therefore channel in funds from the corporate projects. *Collaborations with the Industry* on one hand may enable employment of the newly created knowledge in solving the real-world problems and on the other hand allow inclusions of the latest happenings in the classroom deliberations (Gunter, 2012).

3. Barriers due to Institutional *bureaucratic mindsets between those tasked with operating the bureaucracy and those who are working within it, i.e. two different thought worlds, must be mitigated to maximize participation* and get the best results from such KM initiatives. While the bureaucratic administration is more focused on the quality of admissions, placement etc., ample focus must be given to collaborations with the industry. The KM initiative can benefit only though involvement, commitment and transparency of the senior administrators and their endorsement to the KM strategies (Useemmay, 2014).

4. *Autonomy at both strategic and operations level is a key requirement* for effective KM in the management Institutes.

5. Organization may begin with implementation of one program and gradually in encroach into other tools and processes. KM implementation consisting of scheduled initiatives and programs must be based on a realistic plan and expectations. Firstly, *the organizations vision, mission, objectives and its behavioural intentions must be aligned with that of the KM processes*. Top management must be counseled and convinced regarding the impact of KM outcome on the institutional effectiveness. It must reasonably set the goals, perceptions and beliefs.

6. *Institutions' vision, mission and objectives must be corroborated to that of the individual employees* to continuously motivate them to commit towards knowledge –centric behavior for long-term competitiveness. Strong and consistent power and at times coercive power requires to be exercised to promote KM. *Visionary leadership* must be cultivated with investment of money, time and resources. Persistent idea generation and knowledge creation from all levels of staff comes through receptive perception and attitude.

7. *Feasibility assessment of the organizational infrastructure* (i.e. physical, technological and financial), *the organizational work culture, performance evaluation system, employees' attitude and perception towards KM must be conducted to set the KM goals.* Reasonably feasible goals may inspire the employees to assess their personal knowledge and enhance through knowledge transfer to meet new challenges.

8. *Cultivate and nurture a conducive work culture* in contrary to a push/ coercive strategy. KM initiative requires a collective and coercive effort to use all the available resources into effective utilization.

9. *Stories from the colleagues, peers and senior leaders are rich, credible and effective tools in transferring and sustaining learning* both for the storyteller and for the listener. Any KM intervention should be less than an hour for reasons: the delegates are more likely to clear time to attend; the facilitator is more likely to retain the attention span of all the attendees. *External delivery partners* (Federman, 2014), their styles, method of delivery, connection with the delegates, conference calls after the programme, even humor and personal teaching stories of the facilitators can affect the effectiveness of the KM interventions.

10. *KM oriented behavior can be encouraged through integration of monetary and non-monetary benefits/ incentives to such contributions.* KM Process phases like knowledge sharing, creation/ capture, transfer, dissemination/use must be complemented with balanced performance evaluation/rewarding system. In the beginning, employees should be encouraged through personal benefits in the form of direct, monetary, explicit returns with improvement in the course content, innovative teaching pedagogy, publications – both research articles and reference books etc. Also additional increments in the salary and promotions may be awarded. Over time rewards may be made implicit like publicizing the names of the employees along with their ideas/ contributions made to the institute, its processes or provide skill enhancement programs,

extended job-scope. Gradually, the reward system may be geared towards team achievement to encourage creativity, team-work and harmony among the people.

11. *Operational staff greatly affects the successful implementation of the KM programs with their attitude, behavior and participation.* Any kind of negative perception or negative attitude at individual level must be alleviated. Also, fears and misconceptions about KM as that it may lead to downsize organizations or lead to heavy workload or may require too rigid IT expertise.

The study reiterates the impact of enabling factors like organizational work culture as stressed by Tippins (2003) and individual perception and attitude. It also establishes the criticality of Supportive Leadership & Governance, favourable Work Culture, Integrated Performance Evaluation & Incentive System and well-integrated IT infrastructure in creating a learning environment in the education sector.

The findings strongly support both the theoretical propositions. Further, the theories are mutually complementary and not contradictory.

(I) Organizational/Institutional enablers when favorable encourage participation and involvement at individual-level by inducing positivity in their Attitude and Perception and thereby facilitate the effective implementation of KM initiatives/ KMPP.

(II) Lack of autonomy in institutional operations and administration impedes the favorableness of the KSE and in due course Individual-level enablers for effective implementation of KMPP.

Affiliation to the State University binds the Institute to operate within the mandate set by the university and impart the syllabi 'as is' to the students. Internalization of the KMPP at all the levels of operations, implementation of fully integrated IT and KM System, regularized policy for rewarding/ incentivizing KM/IC contributions, clear perception and positive attitude at individual level through engagement and acknowledgement are drivers of the KM implementation.

An improved management of Knowledge and Intellectual Capital shall unfailingly add rigour to the B-Schools/ management institutes. This shall help the management academics in the mid-tier in particular, to recover from the lull.

Future research in the context may be extended with quantitative techniques and tools. The construct may be researched in other geographical territories and zones to strengthen the arguments presented in the paper. Quantitative research with the construct may consider more enabling factors like training, empowerment, benchmarking, organization structure etc. A longitudinal study may serve to reinforce the suggestions of the study.

References

Abdullah, R., Selamat, M.H., Jaafar, A., Abdullah, S. and Sura, S. (2008), An Empirical Study of Knowledge Management System Implementation in Public Higher Learning Institution, *International Journal of Computer Science and Network Security*, 8(1), 281-290

Andrade, J., Ares, J., Garcia, R., Rodriguez, S., Silva, A. & Suarez, S. (2003), Knowledge management systems development: A roadmap, *Journal of Lecture Notes in Computer Science,* Vol. 2773, pp. 1008–1015

Balthazard, P.A. & Cooke, R.A. (2004), Organizational culture and knowledge management success: Assessing the behavior – performance continuum, *Proceedings of the 37th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences,* USA

Basu, B. and Sengupta, K. (2007), Accessing Success Factors of Knowledge Management Initiatives of Academic Institutions – A Case of an Indian Business School, *The Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management,* 5(3), 273-282

Beijerse, R.P. (1999), Questions in KM: Defining and conceptualizing a phenomenon, *Journal of Knowledge Management,* Vol. 3, pp. 94–109

Bhatt, G.D. (2001), Knowledge Management in Organizations: Examining the Interaction between Technologies, Techniques and People, *Journal of Knowledge Management,* 5(1), 68-75

Brazelton, J. and Gorry, A. (2003), Creating a Knowledge-Sharing Community: If You Build It, Will They Come? *Communications of the ACM,* 46(2), 23-25

Brown, J.S. & Duguid, P. (1991), Organizational Learning and Communities of Practice, Toward a Unified View of Working, *Organization Science,* Vol.2, no.1

Bush, T. (2008), From management to leadership: semantic or meaningful change? *Educational Management, Administration & Leadership,* Vol.36, No.2, pp.271-288

Call, D. (2005), KM-not rocket science, *Journal of Management,* Vol. 9, pp. 19–30

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, Issue 3, pp.313-324

Chong, C.W., Chong, S.C. and Wong, K.Y. (2009), Is the Malaysian Telecommunications Industry ready for KM Implementation? *Journal of Knowledge Management,* Vol.13, No.1, pp.69-87

CRISIL Opinion – 'MBA Dream' withering away, (May-2014), published by CRISIL Research, Retrieved – 10 Feb., 2016 from www.crisil.com

Davenport, T.H. & Prusak, L. (2000), Working knowledge: How organizations manage what they know. Harvard Business School Press

Davenport, T.H., DeLong, D.W. and Beers, M.C. (1998), Successful knowledge management projects, *Sloan Management Review,* Vol. 39, No. 2, pp.43-57

DeTienne, K.B., Dyer, G., Hoopes, C. and Harris, S. (2004), Toward a model of effective knowledge management and directions for future research: culture, leadership and CKOs, *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, Vol.10, No.4, pp.26-43

Fahey, L. and Prusak, L., (1998), The Eleven Deadliest Sins of Knowledge Management, *California Management Review,* Vol. 40, No.3, pp.265-276

Federman, D. (2014), Inside Higher Education, available at: http://tinyurl.com/17sskdt (accessed 17 June, 2014)

Gunter, H.M. (2012), The field of educational administration in England, *British Journal of Educational Studies,* Vol.60, No.4, pp. 337-356

Hendricks, P. (1999), Why Share Knowledge? The influence of ICT on the Motivation of Knowledge Sharing, *Knowledge and Process Management,* 6(2), 91-100

Holsapple, Clyde W., and Joshi, K.D., (2003), A Knowledge Management Ontology, *Handbook on Knowledge Management, Vol.1-Knowledge Matters,* Edited by C.W. Holsapple, Publisher-Springer, pp.89-124

Jashapara, J. (2004), Knowledge management: An integrated approach FT (Financial Times). Prentice Hall

Kim, S., Suh, E. and Hwang, H. (2003), Building the Knowledge Map: An Industrial Case Study, *Journal of Knowledge Management,* 7(2), 34-45

Kim, Y. and Jarvenpaa, S.L. (2008), Formal Boundary Spanning and Informal Boundary Spanning in Cross-Border Knowledge Sharing: A Case Study, *Proceedings of the 41st Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*

Lave, J., Wenger, E. (1991), Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Levitt, B., and James March, G. (1996), Organizational Learning, In Cohen, Michael D. and Lee S. Sproull, Organization Learning, Thousand Oaks, California, Sage Publications

Nonaka, I. (1994), A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation, *Organization Science Journal,* Vol. 5, pp. 14–37

Oplatka, I. (2010a), The Legacy of Educational Administration: A Historical Analysis of an Academic Field, Peter Lang Publisher, Hamburg

Polanyi, M., (1966), The Tacit Dimension, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Prahalad, C. & Hammel, G. (1990), The core competence of the corporation, *Harvard Business Review Journal,* Vol. 68, pp. 79–90

Ramachandran, Sharimllah Devi, Chong, Siong-Choy and Wong, Kuan-Yew, (2013), Knowledge Management Practices and Enablers in Public Universities: A Gap Analysis, *Campus-wide Information Systems,* Vol-30, No.2, pp. 76-94, Emerald

Ribbins, P. (2006), History and the study of administration and leadership in education: introduction to a special issue, *Journal of Educational Administration and History,* Vol. 38, No.2, pp. 113-124

Salmador, M.P. & Bueno, E. (2007), Knowledege creation in strategy-making: Implications for theory and practice, *European Journal of Innovation Management,* Vol. 10, pp. 1060–1460

Schubert, P., Lincke, D. and Schmid, B., August 1998, A Global Knowledge Medium as a Virtual Community: The NetAcademy Concept, *Proceedings of the Americas Conference of AIS,* pp. 618-620

Senge, P.M. (1990), The Leader's New York: Building Learning Organizations, *Sloan Management Review,* pp 7-23

Sharimllah Devi, R., Chong, S.C. and Lin, B. (2007), Organization Culture and KM practices from the perspective of the institutions of higher learning, *International Journal of Management in Education,* Vol.1, Nos.1/2, pp.57-79

Spender, J.C., (2003), Knowledge Fields: Some Post 9/11 Thoughts about the Knowledge-Based Theory of the Firm, *Handbook on Knowledge Management, Vol.1-Knowledge Matters,* Edited by C.W. Holsapple, Publisher-Springer, pp.59-71

Storey, J. and Barnett, E. (2000), Knowledge management initiatives: learning from failure, *Journal of Knowledge Management,* Vol.4, No.2, pp. 145-156

Szulanski, G. (1996), Exploring internal stickiness: Impediments to the transfer of best practice within the firm, *Strategic Management Journal,* Vol.17, Winter Special Issue, pp. 27-43

Teece, David and Pisano, Gary, (2003), The Dynamic Capabilities of Firms, *Handbook on Knowledge Management, Vol.2-Knowledge Directions,* Edited by C.W. Holsapple, Publisher-Springer, pp.195-213

Tippins, Michael J. (2003), Implementing knowledge management in academia: teaching the teachers, *International Journal of Educational Management,* Vol. 17, Issue 7, pp.339 – 345, Emerald

Useemay, J. (2014), Business school disrupted, New York Times, 31 May

Wah, C.Y., Menkhoff, T., Loh, B. and Evers, H.D. (2007), Social Capital and Knowledge Sharing in Knowledge-Based Organizations: An Empirical Study, *International Journal of Knowledge Management,* 3(1), 29-48

Wind, J. and Main, J. (1999), *Driving Change,* The Free Press, New York, NY

■■■