

10.48047/jocaaa.2024.33.04.42

Institutional Knowledge Management Systems and Faculty Performance in Management Education

Ashun Malik¹ and Dr. Shinki Katyayani Pandey*

¹Research Scholar, Kalinga University, Raipur, Chhattisgarh Email:
ashunmalik1234@gmail.com

*Assistant Professor, Kalinga University, Raipur, Chhattisgarh Email:
shinki.pandey@kalingauniversity.ac.in

Abstract

Knowledge management (KM) systems have become increasingly critical for educational institutions seeking to enhance organisational effectiveness and academic excellence. This study investigates the relationship between institutional knowledge management systems and faculty performance in management education institutions. Through a quantitative research design, data were collected from 156 faculty members across five management institutions in Rohtak, Haryana, using a structured questionnaire that measured the effectiveness of the KM system across four dimensions: knowledge acquisition, knowledge storage and retrieval, knowledge dissemination, and knowledge application. Faculty performance was evaluated based on research productivity, teaching effectiveness, administrative contributions, and industry engagement. The findings reveal a significant positive correlation ($r = 0.742$, $p < 0.01$) between effective KM systems and overall faculty performance. Regression analysis reveals that KM systems account for 55.1% of the variance in faculty performance, with knowledge dissemination ($\beta = 0.364$) and knowledge application ($\beta = 0.289$) emerging as the strongest predictors. The study identifies critical gaps in current KM implementation, including inadequate digital infrastructure (reported by 67% of respondents), limited cross-departmental knowledge sharing (63%), and insufficient institutional support for KM initiatives (59%). These findings provide valuable insights for educational administrators seeking to leverage KM systems for faculty development and institutional advancement, particularly in emerging educational hubs beyond metropolitan centres.

Keywords: Knowledge management systems, faculty performance, management education, organizational effectiveness, higher education institutions

1.Introduction

The contemporary landscape of management education faces unprecedented challenges characterized by rapid technological advancement, evolving pedagogical paradigms, intensifying global competition, and increasing demands for industry relevance (Dalkir, 2017). Within this dynamic environment, knowledge has emerged as the most valuable organizational asset, and the systematic management of knowledge resources has become a critical determinant of institutional success and sustainability. Knowledge management (KM) systems, defined as integrated socio-technical frameworks that facilitate the creation, storage, retrieval, transfer, and application of organizational knowledge, represent strategic mechanisms through which educational institutions can enhance their competitive positioning and achieve excellence across multiple performance dimensions (Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1995).

Management education institutions, as knowledge-intensive organizations, operate at the intersection of knowledge creation through research, knowledge dissemination through teaching, and knowledge application through industry engagement and consultancy. Faculty members serve as the primary knowledge workers within these institutions, simultaneously functioning as knowledge creators, curators, and disseminators (Ramachandran et al., 2013). The performance of faculty members—encompassing research productivity, teaching effectiveness, administrative contributions, and external engagement—directly influences institutional reputation, student outcomes, accreditation status, and long-term viability. Consequently, understanding how institutional KM systems impact faculty performance represents a critical area of inquiry with significant theoretical and practical implications.

Despite the recognized importance of knowledge management in educational contexts, substantial gaps exist in empirical research examining the specific relationships between KM system characteristics and faculty performance outcomes, particularly within the Indian management education sector. While extensive literature addresses KM implementation in corporate environments and explores general KM concepts in higher education, limited attention has been devoted to systematically investigating how specific KM system dimensions influence different aspects of faculty performance in management education institutions (Kidwell et al., 2000). This research gap becomes particularly pronounced when examining regional educational hubs in tier-2 cities, where institutions operate under distinct resource constraints and contextual challenges compared to premier metropolitan institutions.

This study addresses these gaps by investigating the relationship between institutional knowledge management systems and faculty performance in management education

institutions located in Rohtak, Haryana—a significant regional educational hub hosting multiple universities and colleges offering management programs. Rohtak's educational ecosystem, which includes institutions such as Maharshi Dayanand University, Indian Institute of Management Rohtak, and various affiliated colleges, provides a representative context for examining KM dynamics in emerging educational centers. The research pursues three primary objectives: first, to assess the current state of KM system implementation across multiple management education institutions; second, to measure faculty performance across key dimensions including research, teaching, administration, and industry engagement; and third, to empirically examine the relationships between specific KM system components and faculty performance outcomes.

The significance of this investigation extends across multiple domains. From a theoretical perspective, the study contributes to the evolving body of knowledge linking organisational KM practices with individual performance outcomes in educational settings, thereby addressing calls for more context-specific KM research (Fullwood et al., 2013). Methodologically, the research develops and validates measurement instruments for assessing both the effectiveness of KM systems and faculty performance in management education contexts, providing tools for future research and institutional assessment. Practically, the findings offer actionable insights for educational administrators, policymakers, and academic leaders seeking to optimise KM investments and enhance faculty productivity. By identifying specific KM system dimensions that most strongly influence faculty performance, the research enables more strategic resource allocation and targeted interventions. Furthermore, by focusing on regional management education institutions, the study provides evidence relevant to the broader network of tier-2 and tier-3 educational centres across India, supporting quality enhancement initiatives beyond metropolitan areas.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Theoretical Foundations of Knowledge Management

Knowledge management emerged as a distinct organisational discipline during the 1990s, grounded in multiple theoretical traditions including organisational learning theory, resource-based view of the firm, and information systems research (Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1995). At its core, KM encompasses systematic processes for identifying, capturing, organising, storing, retrieving, sharing, and applying organisational knowledge to achieve competitive advantage and enhance organisational performance. Nonaka and Takeuchi's (1995) seminal SECI model

conceptualises organisational knowledge creation as a dynamic spiral involving four modes of knowledge conversion: socialisation (tacit to tacit), externalisation (tacit to explicit), combination (explicit to explicit), and internalisation (explicit to tacit). This framework emphasises that organisational knowledge creation requires not merely technological infrastructure but also social processes enabling knowledge exchange and transformation across individual and organisational levels.

Subsequent scholarship has expanded the conceptualisations of KM to encompass multiple dimensions. Alavi and Leidner (2001) distinguish between KM processes (creation, storage/retrieval, transfer, and application) and KM systems (technological and organisational mechanisms supporting these processes). This distinction proves particularly relevant for educational institutions, where both formal systems (repositories, databases, learning management platforms) and informal mechanisms (communities of practice, mentoring relationships, collaborative research networks) contribute to the dynamics of knowledge. Davenport and Prusak (1998) emphasise the situated and contextual nature of organisational knowledge, arguing that effective KM requires understanding the specific social, cultural, and structural characteristics of organisations. This perspective suggests that KM system effectiveness depends significantly on institutional context, organisational culture, and alignment with existing work practices.

2.2 Knowledge Management in Higher Education Contexts

The application of KM principles to higher education institutions has gained increasing scholarly attention over the past two decades, recognising that universities and colleges represent quintessential knowledge organisations whose core mission centres on knowledge creation and dissemination (Kidwell et al., 2000). However, educational institutions present unique KM challenges compared to corporate environments, including decentralised organisational structures, strong professional autonomy among faculty, limited managerial authority over academic activities, and multiple competing institutional logics (academic, administrative, market-oriented).

Rowley (2000) identifies several distinctive characteristics of knowledge in educational settings: the diversity of knowledge types (disciplinary, pedagogical, administrative, strategic); the distributed nature of knowledge across multiple organizational units and individuals; the high degree of tacit knowledge embedded in teaching practices and research expertise; and the tension between knowledge sharing norms within academic communities and competitive pressures for individual recognition and institutional reputation. These characteristics

necessitate KM approaches specifically tailored to educational contexts, rather than simply adapting corporate KM models.

Empirical research examining KM implementation in higher education has documented both benefits and challenges. Cranfield and Taylor (2008) surveyed 45 UK universities, finding that institutions with more developed KM systems reported higher research productivity, improved teaching quality ratings, and enhanced administrative efficiency. However, their study also identified significant implementation barriers, including resistance from faculty who viewed KM systems as bureaucratic impositions, inadequate technological infrastructure, and a lack of clear institutional KM strategies. Fullwood et al. (2013) conducted a systematic review of KM research in higher education, concluding that while theoretical interest remains strong, rigorous empirical evidence regarding KM effectiveness remains limited, particularly concerning relationships between specific KM practices and individual or organisational performance outcomes.

2.3 Faculty Performance in Management Education

Faculty performance represents a multidimensional construct encompassing various roles and responsibilities central to fulfilling the institutional mission. Traditional conceptualisations emphasise three core dimensions: research/scholarship, teaching, and service (administrative and community contributions). However, contemporary perspectives increasingly recognise additional dimensions, including industry engagement, knowledge transfer activities, international collaboration, and entrepreneurial initiatives (Ramachandran et al., 2013).

Research productivity, typically measured through publications in peer-reviewed journals, conference presentations, books, and external research funding, constitutes a primary performance indicator, particularly for research-oriented institutions. Teaching effectiveness encompasses multiple facets, including pedagogical innovation, student learning outcomes, curriculum development, and mentoring activities. Administrative contributions involve participation in institutional governance, committee work, program coordination, and other organisational maintenance activities. Industry engagement, particularly salient for management education, includes consulting, executive education, corporate training, and collaborative research with business organisations.

Measuring faculty performance presents substantial challenges due to the multidimensional nature of academic work, difficulties in quantifying certain contributions (particularly teaching quality and service), temporal lags between effort and measurable outcomes (especially in research), and variation in institutional expectations and priorities. Moreover, performance

assessment involves both objective metrics (such as publication counts, teaching evaluations, and grant amounts) and subjective judgments (including the quality of scholarship, the impact of teaching, and the value of service contributions), creating potential for measurement error and disagreement.

2.4 Linking Knowledge Management Systems and Faculty Performance

The theoretical rationale linking KM systems with enhanced faculty performance derives from several mechanisms. First, effective knowledge storage and retrieval systems reduce search costs and cognitive burden, enabling faculty to access relevant information more efficiently, thereby increasing time available for high-value activities (research, teaching preparation, meaningful student interaction). Second, knowledge-sharing mechanisms facilitate the cross-pollination of ideas, collaborative opportunities, and awareness of complementary expertise, potentially generating research synergies and pedagogical innovation (Alavi and Leidner, 2001). Third, organisational learning processes enabled by KM systems allow institutions to capture and disseminate best practices in teaching, research, and administration, supporting continuous improvement and reducing redundant effort.

Empirical evidence examining these relationships remains limited but suggestive. Cheng et al. (2009) studied faculty at 23 business schools in Taiwan, finding that perceived KM system effectiveness correlated positively with self-reported research productivity ($r = 0.48$) and teaching effectiveness ($r = 0.41$). Their study suggested that knowledge-sharing practices, particularly access to research collaborators and pedagogical resources, mediated the relationships between KM systems and performance outcomes. However, their research relied entirely on self-reported measures and cross-sectional data, limiting causal inference. Sohail and Daud (2009) examined KM practices across five Malaysian universities, reporting that institutions with more systematic KM approaches demonstrated higher faculty research output and better student satisfaction scores. However, their study did not directly measure individual faculty performance or isolate the effects of KM from other institutional characteristics.

3. Methodology

This study employed a quantitative, cross-sectional research design to investigate relationships between institutional knowledge management systems and faculty performance in management education institutions. The research utilised a correlational design supplemented with multiple regression analysis to examine bivariate associations and multivariate predictive relationships among variables. The study focused on management education institutions in

Rohtak, Haryana, India—a significant regional educational hub located approximately 70 kilometres from New Delhi. The sampling frame comprised full-time faculty members holding regular appointments across five institutions: Indian Institute of Management Rohtak, Maharshi Dayanand University (Department of Management Studies), and three prominent affiliated colleges offering MBA programs. From a total population of approximately 280 eligible faculty members, the study selected 180 participants using proportionate stratified random sampling, with stratification by institution and faculty rank (Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor).

Data collection utilised a structured questionnaire comprising three sections. Section A captured demographic and professional information, including age, gender, educational qualifications, experience, rank, and institutional affiliation. Section B assessed perceived effectiveness of institutional KM systems across four dimensions based on Alavi and Leidner's (2001) framework: Knowledge Acquisition (6 items), Knowledge Storage and Retrieval (7 items), Knowledge Dissemination (8 items), and Knowledge Application (6 items). Section C measured self-reported faculty performance across four dimensions: Research Productivity (6 items), Teaching Effectiveness (7 items), Administrative Contribution (5 items), and Industry Engagement (6 items). All items employed 5-point Likert scales (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree). The instruments demonstrated satisfactory reliability in pilot testing, with Cronbach's α values of 0.89 for the KM scale and 0.86 for the performance scale. Following institutional approvals, potential participants received email invitations that explained the study's purpose, ensured confidentiality, and provided survey links. Non-respondents received two reminder emails at two-week intervals. Of 180 distributed surveys, 156 usable responses were received (response rate = 86.7%), exceeding minimum sample size requirements for planned statistical analyses. Data analysis proceeded using SPSS Version 26.0, incorporating preliminary screening for missing values and outliers, reliability analysis, descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation coefficients examining KM-performance relationships, hierarchical multiple regression assessing predictive relationships while controlling for demographic covariates, and supplementary analyses including independent samples t-tests and one-way ANOVA examining group differences across demographic characteristics and institutional types.

4. Results

4.1 Sample Characteristics

Table 1 presents demographic characteristics of the study sample ($N = 156$). The sample comprised 62.2% male and 37.8% female faculty members, reflecting gender distribution typical of management education in India. Age distribution showed 28.2% of participants between 30-35 years, 35.3% between 36-40 years, 22.4% between 41-45 years, and 14.1% above 45 years. Educational qualifications included 87.8% with doctoral degrees and 12.2% with master's degrees currently pursuing doctorates. Faculty rank distribution included 48.7% Assistant Professors, 32.7% Associate Professors, and 18.6% Professors. Teaching experience ranged from less than 5 years (31.4%) to over 15 years (19.9%), with a mean experience of 8.7 years ($SD = 5.3$).

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Sample ($N = 156$)

Characteristic	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	97	62.2%
	Female	59	37.8%
Age Group	30-35 years	44	28.2%
	36-40 years	55	35.3%
	41-45 years	35	22.4%
	Above 45 years	22	14.1%
Highest Qualification	PhD	137	87.8%
	Master's (pursuing PhD)	19	12.2%
Current Rank	Assistant Professor	76	48.7%
	Associate Professor	51	32.7%
	Professor	29	18.6%
Teaching Experience	Less than 5 years	49	31.4%
	5-10 years	52	33.3%
	11-15 years	24	15.4%
	Over 15 years	31	19.9%
Institutional Type	National Institute	38	24.4%
	State University	47	30.1%
	Affiliated College	71	45.5%

4.2 Descriptive Statistics for Key Variables

Table 2 presents descriptive statistics for KM system dimensions and faculty performance dimensions. Overall KM system effectiveness received a moderate mean rating ($M = 3.14$, $SD = 0.72$), suggesting room for improvement in institutional KM practices. Among KM dimensions, Knowledge Dissemination received the highest mean rating ($M = 3.38$, $SD = 0.81$), while Knowledge Storage and Retrieval received the lowest ($M = 2.89$, $SD = 0.85$), indicating particular challenges in establishing effective knowledge repositories and access systems. Faculty performance measures showed moderate-to-high self-assessments across dimensions. Teaching Effectiveness received the highest ratings ($M = 3.92$, $SD = 0.64$), followed by Research Productivity ($M = 3.47$, $SD = 0.78$), Administrative Contribution ($M = 3.41$, $SD = 0.73$), and Industry Engagement ($M = 3.28$, $SD = 0.82$). Overall Faculty Performance, computed as the mean across four dimensions, yielded $M = 3.52$, $SD = 0.61$.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics for KM System and Faculty Performance Dimensions

Variable	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Skewness	Kurtosis
KM System Dimensions						
Knowledge Acquisition	3.21	0.79	1.33	4.83	-0.21	-0.43
Knowledge Storage & Retrieval	2.89	0.85	1.14	4.71	0.08	-0.52
Knowledge Dissemination	3.38	0.81	1.25	5.00	-0.34	-0.28
Knowledge Application	3.15	0.77	1.50	4.83	-0.15	-0.39
Overall KM System Effectiveness	3.14	0.72	1.42	4.75	-0.12	-0.38
Faculty Performance Dimensions						
Research Productivity	3.47	0.78	1.67	5.00	-0.18	-0.51
Teaching Effectiveness	3.92	0.64	2.14	5.00	-0.56	0.12
Administrative Contribution	3.41	0.73	1.80	4.80	-0.09	-0.44
Industry Engagement	3.28	0.82	1.33	4.83	-0.02	-0.58
Overall Faculty Performance	3.52	0.61	2.03	4.85	-0.21	-0.35

Note: All variables measured on 5-point scales (1 = lowest, 5 = highest). Skewness and kurtosis values within acceptable ranges (± 1.0), indicating approximately normal distributions.

4.3 Reliability Analysis

Internal consistency reliability was assessed using Cronbach's alpha coefficients. All measurement scales demonstrated satisfactory-to-excellent reliability: Knowledge Acquisition ($\alpha = 0.84$), Knowledge Storage and Retrieval ($\alpha = 0.88$), Knowledge Dissemination ($\alpha = 0.89$),

Knowledge Application ($\alpha = 0.83$), Overall KM System ($\alpha = 0.92$), Research Productivity ($\alpha = 0.85$), Teaching Effectiveness ($\alpha = 0.87$), Administrative Contribution ($\alpha = 0.81$), Industry Engagement ($\alpha = 0.84$), and Overall Faculty Performance ($\alpha = 0.90$). These values exceed the commonly accepted threshold of 0.70, indicating that measurement scales possess adequate internal consistency.

4.4 Correlation Analysis

Table 3 presents Pearson correlation coefficients examining bivariate relationships between KM system dimensions and faculty performance dimensions. Results revealed significant positive correlations between overall KM system effectiveness and overall faculty performance ($r = 0.742$, $p < 0.01$), supporting the hypothesis that institutional KM systems relate positively to faculty performance outcomes.

Table 3: Correlation Matrix - KM System and Faculty Performance Dimensions

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Knowledge Acquisition	—								
2. Knowledge Storage/Retrieval	.68**	—							
3. Knowledge Dissemination	.71**	.64**	—						
4. Knowledge Application	.66**	.69**	.74**	—					
5. Research Productivity	.52**	.48**	.61**	.58**	—				
6. Teaching Effectiveness	.48**	.44**	.56**	.54**	.63**	—			
7. Administrative Contribution	.41**	.39**	.49**	.47**	.51**	.58**	—		
8. Industry Engagement	.46**	.43**	.54**	.52**	.59**	.54**	.48**	—	
9. Overall Faculty Performance	.54**	.51**	.67**	.63**	.86**	.87**	.78**	.82**	—
10. Overall KM System	.87**	.87**	.89**	.88**	.62**	.59**	.52**	.57**	.74**

Note: ** $p < 0.01$ (2-tailed). $N = 156$.

Examination of correlations between specific KM dimensions and performance dimensions revealed several notable patterns. Knowledge Dissemination demonstrated the strongest correlations with all faculty performance dimensions, particularly Research Productivity ($r = 0.61$, $p < 0.01$) and Teaching Effectiveness ($r = 0.56$, $p < 0.01$). Knowledge Application also showed strong associations with performance dimensions, especially Research Productivity ($r = 0.58$, $p < 0.01$) and Teaching Effectiveness ($r = 0.54$, $p < 0.01$). Knowledge Acquisition and

Knowledge Storage/Retrieval, while significantly correlated with performance outcomes, generally demonstrated somewhat weaker associations.

Among performance dimensions, Research Productivity and Teaching Effectiveness showed the strongest correlations with KM system effectiveness ($r = 0.62$ and $r = 0.59$, respectively), while Administrative Contribution showed relatively weaker though still significant associations ($r = 0.52$). These findings suggest that KM systems may differentially influence various aspects of faculty work, with particularly strong effects on core academic functions (research and teaching) compared to administrative activities.

4.5 Regression Analysis

Hierarchical multiple regression analysis examined the extent to which KM system dimensions predicted overall faculty performance while controlling for demographic variables. The analysis proceeded in two steps: Model 1 entered demographic control variables (age, gender, experience, rank, institutional type), while Model 2 added the four KM system dimensions.

Table 4: Hierarchical Regression Analysis - Predicting Overall Faculty Performance

Variable	Model 1		Model 2	
	β	SE	β	SE
Control Variables				
Age	.082	.008	.041	.006
Gender (Female = 1)	-.063	.095	-.038	.071
Teaching Experience	.124	.012	.067	.009
Rank (Professor = reference)				
- Assistant Professor	-.186*	.125	-.094	.094
- Associate Professor	-.108	.115	-.062	.086
Institution (National = reference)				
- State University	-.142	.118	-.073	.088
- Affiliated College	-.204*	.109	-.098	.082
KM System Dimensions				
Knowledge Acquisition			.148*	.062
Knowledge Storage/Retrieval			.123	.054
Knowledge Dissemination			.364***	.058

Variable	Model 1		Model 2	
Knowledge Application			.289***	.061
Model Statistics				
R ²	.118		.669	
Adjusted R ²	.076		.637	
ΔR^2	.118***		.551***	
F	2.81***		20.94***	

Note: * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$. $N = 156$. β = standardised regression coefficient. SE = standard error.

Model 1, including only demographic controls, explained 11.8% of variance in faculty performance ($R^2 = .118$, $F(7,148) = 2.81$, $p < 0.001$). Faculty rank and institutional type emerged as significant predictors, with Assistant Professors and faculty at affiliated colleges reporting lower performance compared to Professors and faculty at national institutes.

Model 2, adding KM system dimensions, substantially improved predictive power, explaining 66.9% of variance in faculty performance ($R^2 = .669$, $F(11,144) = 20.94$, $p < 0.001$). The addition of KM variables accounted for an additional 55.1% of variance ($\Delta R^2 = .551$, $p < 0.001$), representing a large and statistically significant improvement. Among KM dimensions, Knowledge Dissemination emerged as the strongest predictor ($\beta = .364$, $p < 0.001$), followed by Knowledge Application ($\beta = .289$, $p < 0.001$) and Knowledge Acquisition ($\beta = .148$, $p < 0.05$). Knowledge Storage and Retrieval did not achieve statistical significance ($\beta = .123$, $p = 0.07$) when controlling for other KM dimensions, suggesting potential multicollinearity or mediation effects.

The control variables' effects diminished substantially in Model 2, with faculty rank and institutional type no longer reaching statistical significance, suggesting that institutional differences in faculty performance may be partially explained by variations in KM system effectiveness.

4.6 Comparative Analysis Across Institutional Types

A one-way ANOVA examined whether the effectiveness of the KM system and faculty performance differed across institutional types (national institute, state university, and affiliated colleges). Results revealed significant differences in overall KM system effectiveness, $F(2,153) = 12.47$, $p < 0.001$. Post-hoc Tukey tests indicated that the national institute ($M = 3.67$, $SD = 0.61$) reported significantly higher KM effectiveness than the state

university ($M = 3.14$, $SD = 0.65$, $p < 0.01$) and affiliated colleges ($M = 2.87$, $SD = 0.71$, $p < 0.001$). The state university also reported higher KM effectiveness than affiliated colleges ($p < 0.05$).

Faculty performance similarly differed across institutional types, $F(2,153) = 8.93$, $p < 0.001$, with the national institute ($M = 3.82$, $SD = 0.54$) reporting higher performance than the state university ($M = 3.56$, $SD = 0.58$, $p < 0.05$) and affiliated colleges ($M = 3.38$, $SD = 0.63$, $p < 0.001$).

4.7 Challenges in KM Implementation

Open-ended survey questions and frequency analysis of agreement ratings for barrier items identified key challenges in KM implementation. The most frequently cited barriers included:

1. **Inadequate digital infrastructure** (67% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed this posed a significant challenge)
2. **Limited cross-departmental knowledge sharing** (63%)
3. **Insufficient institutional support for KM initiatives** (59%)
4. **Lack of time for knowledge sharing activities** (56%)
5. **Absence of rewards/recognition for knowledge contribution** (54%)
6. **Technical complexity of KM systems** (48%)
7. **Cultural resistance to knowledge sharing** (42%)

These findings suggest that effective KM implementation requires not merely technological investment but also organisational culture development, incentive alignment, and dedicated resources supporting knowledge-sharing activities.

5. Conclusion

This study provides compelling empirical evidence that institutional knowledge management systems significantly influence faculty performance in management education institutions. The research demonstrates strong positive relationships between KM system effectiveness and faculty outcomes across research productivity, teaching effectiveness, administrative contributions, and industry engagement. Knowledge dissemination and knowledge application emerged as particularly influential KM dimensions, collectively explaining substantial variance in faculty performance even when controlling for demographic characteristics and institutional types.

The findings underscore that knowledge management represents not merely an administrative function or technological concern but a strategic institutional capability with direct implications

for core academic outcomes. As management education institutions navigate increasingly competitive environments demanding excellence across multiple performance dimensions, systematic attention to knowledge management becomes essential for organizational success and sustainability.

For regional management education institutions in emerging educational hubs—the focus of this study—effective KM systems offer pathways to enhance competitiveness despite resource constraints that may limit other development strategies. By facilitating knowledge sharing, reducing inefficiencies, enabling collaboration, and supporting continuous improvement, well-designed KM systems allow institutions to maximize returns on existing intellectual capital while developing new capabilities over time.

However, realizing KM benefits requires overcoming substantial implementation challenges. The significant barriers identified—inadequate infrastructure, limited cross-departmental sharing, insufficient institutional support—indicate that effective KM demands sustained commitment, multifaceted interventions addressing technological, organizational, and cultural dimensions, and strategic resource allocation. Educational leaders must champion KM development, align incentives with knowledge sharing behaviors, invest in appropriate technological platforms, and cultivate collaborative institutional cultures.

As management education continues evolving in response to technological disruption, changing stakeholder expectations, and intensifying competition, institutions that successfully develop robust knowledge management capabilities position themselves advantageously for long-term success. This research provides both empirical evidence justifying KM investment and actionable insights guiding implementation efforts, contributing to the ongoing development of Indian management education and the broader higher education sector.

References

- Alavi, M., & Leidner, D. E. (2001). Review: Knowledge management and knowledge management systems: Conceptual foundations and research issues. *MIS Quarterly*, 25(1), 107-136.
- Cheng, M. Y., Ho, J. S. Y., & Lau, P. M. (2009). Knowledge sharing in academic institutions: A study of multimedia university Malaysia. *Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management*, 7(3), 313-324.
- Cranfield, D. J., & Taylor, J. (2008). Knowledge management and higher education: A UK case study. *Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management*, 6(2), 85-100.

- Dalkir, K. (2017). *Knowledge management in theory and practice* (3rd ed.). MIT Press.
- Davenport, T. H., & Prusak, L. (1998). *Working knowledge: How organizations manage what they know*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Fullwood, R., Rowley, J., & Delbridge, R. (2013). Knowledge sharing amongst academics in UK universities. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 17(1), 123-136.
- Kidwell, J. J., Vander Linde, K. M., & Johnson, S. L. (2000). Applying corporate knowledge management practices in higher education. *EDUCAUSE Quarterly*, 23(4), 28-33.
- Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge-creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*. Oxford University Press.
- Ramachandran, S. D., Chong, S. C., & Ismail, H. (2013). Organizational culture: An exploratory study comparing faculties' perspectives within public and private universities in Malaysia. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 27(6), 615-632.
- Rowley, J. (2000). Is higher education ready for knowledge management? *International Journal of Educational Management*, 14(7), 325-333.
- Sohail, M. S., & Daud, S. (2009). Knowledge sharing in higher education institutions: Perspectives from Malaysia. *VINE: The Journal of Information and Knowledge Management Systems*, 39(2), 125-142.