

# KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT AS INDEX OF ADMINISTRATIVE INNOVATION IN UNIVERSITIES IN SOUTH-SOUTH ZONE OF NIGERIA

Sunday I. Efang<sup>1</sup>, Chinyere M. Nwachukwo<sup>2</sup>, Idorenyin IniAbasi Ekanem<sup>3</sup>

Department of Curriculum, Studies, Educational Management and Planning,  
University of Uyo, NIGERIA.

<sup>1</sup> drefanga200@gmail.com

## ABSTRACT

*The thrust of this study was to determine relationship between knowledge management as index of administrative innovation in universities in South-South zone of Nigeria. Three null hypotheses were formulated to guide the study. The sample was drawn using stratified random sampling techniques from the universities in the studies. The sample size was 530 front-line (HODs) from the universities under the study. Data collection was done with the use of researcher's developed instrument. The data obtained was analyzed using Pearson's Product Moment Correlation at 0.05 level of significance. The findings of the studies shows that there was significant relationship between the variables of the studies. Based on these findings, it was recommended that knowledge management should be focused on getting right people at the right time.*

**Keywords:** Knowledge management capturing, sharing application innovation

## INTRODUCTION

Knowledge management research has gained momentum in recent years. Specifically, the work has been characterized by examining the unique effects of various types of knowledge (procedural knowledge, strategic knowledge, tacit knowledge and explicit knowledge) on different outcomes. Plethora of literature in the subject suggesting that linear focus on the effects of specific types of knowledge management may not capture the depth, essence and richness of individual's knowledge experience.

In this article, we would now pulse for clarification of some basic concept. Efang and Ogbodo (2014) avered that knowledge is the most significant variable in the equation of economic development in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Author such as Peter Drucker has argued that knowledge is not just another resource like labour, capital, but it is the only important resources today. Efang and Ogbodo (2014) subscribed to the view of Drucker by proclaiming that knowledge as a product has many facets. Knowledge as know-how involves having practical knowledge of how to do something as in subduing ones environment, exploiting natural resource and adding value to them by processing. This invariably bring us to the dimension of knowledge management (KM). Knowledge management is essentially a process of capturing, developing, sharing, creating and effectively using organizational knowledge (OK). The concept of sharing implies getting the right knowledge to the right person at the appropriate time. Armstrong (2014) theorized that KM involves transferring knowledge resources by identifying relevant information and then disseminating it so that learning can take place.

It is worth noting that knowledge management is not about managing knowledge for knowledge sake. If knowledge is created, produced and it has no value, it is useless. The main thrust should be to create value and to leverage the organizational competences and knowledge asserts mission. Knowledge management (KM) for its own sake is therefore not enough. Higher Education must therefore manage knowledge that is problem specific. Mecklenberg, Dearing and Sharp (1999) citing in Armstrong (2014) argued that organizations should “start with business value of what they gather. If it does not generate value, drop it”. This is a divide between knowing-how and “knowing what”. This paper is premised on KM and organizational learning theory while anchoring on interaction and relationship between explicit and tacit knowledge.

Explicit knowledge can be codified while tacit knowledge exist in the mind of the people. This concept has been popularized by Nonaka (1994) and remained a theoretical framework of this discipline. However, Bontis (2008) argued that explicit and tacit knowledge should be seen as a spectrum (that is a colour of rainbow) rather than as definite point. This limitation is observed in this study.

As a member of global world, we cannot afford the luxury of developing resources just to be recycling and distributing existing or extant knowledge. We cannot afford to rediscover America or to think in term of analogous in the digital age. We must ask the question “why” before the “what” when it comes to knowledge management.

The relevance of knowledge management (KM) is corroborated by influential research studies such as a survey by Pricewater-house coopers and world economic forum which found that 95% of CEO’s saw KM as an essential ingredient for the success of their company. Specifically, knowledge management focus on managing knowledge to meet existing needs, exploit existing and acquired knowledge assets without compromising the development of new opportunities.

Higher Education is the Education given after Secondary Education in universities, Colleges of Education, Polytechnics, Monotechnics including those institutions offering correspondence courses (Federal Republic of Nigeria, 2014). Higher Education everywhere is in the business of knowledge production. Today’s economy is knowledge-driven, hence the role of higher education needs to be examined in terms of sector’s role in creating knowledge. Ogbodo (2013) opined that it is in Higher Education that we have the highest concentration of specialized knowledge personnel with the right composition of ideas that can be processed with appropriate material and of monetary inputs to produce knowledge that would continue to advance the course of human progress. With regards to knowledge management, knowledge creation, process involves the creation of new knowledge in the organization. It includes processes like teaching, research and development. Ogbodo (2013) avers that knowledge-based view consists of assumptions which include characteristics of knowledge and the conditions of its acquisition, sharing and application. Nonaka (1994) explained that the signature of effectiveness in knowledge management is characterized by three attributes. He listed them to include: (1) knowledge acquisition or knowledge generation, (2) knowledge sharing or knowledge transfer, and (3) knowledge utilization or application.

It is against this background that this study seeks to examine the relationship between knowledge management as index of administration innovation in universities in South-South zone, Nigeria.

## **RESEARCH HYPOTHESES**

The following null hypotheses were formulated to direct the study:

1. There is no significant relationship between knowledge acquisition effectiveness and administrative innovation in universities in South-South zone of Nigeria.
2. There is no significant relationship between knowledge sharing effectiveness and administrative innovation in universities in South-South zone, Nigeria.
3. There is no significant relationship between knowledge application effectiveness and administrative innovation in universities in South-South zone, Nigeria.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Design of the Study**

The ex-post facto research design was used in this study. The design was deemed most appropriate because the researcher investigated phenomena in which interaction between the dependent and independent variables had already occurred and were not manipulated. That is the independent variables were studied in retrospect in order to establish their possible influence on dependent variables.

The population of this study consisted of the total number of heads of department in the universities in South-South Zone Nigeria. That is estimated at eight hundreds and thirty source: National Universities Commission, NUC, Abuja).

### **Sample and Sampling Technique**

Multi-stage sampling technique was used for the study. The universities were first clustered. The basis of clustering was alphabetical order (name of the universities), after which simple random sampling using “hat and draw” was used to select 530 HODs from the zone. The choice of Heads of Department was informed by the fact that in the university hierarchy the HODs occupied the position of “front-line staff”. Front-line staff are those who interact directly with the public. They normally have defined job roles.

### **Instrumentation**

The instrument used for data collection in this study is called “Knowledge Management Index and Administrative Innovation” (KMIAAI), which was developed by the researcher. It has three sections, A, B and C. Section A contains 4 demographic variables sex, marital status, qualification and institution.

Data in section A play no significant role in the study but were there to show the caliber of people who responded to the instrument. Section B is a 20 –item on a four-point rating scale questionnaire with four responses option ranging from “Strongly Agree” to “Strongly Disagree”. The item measured the knowledge management/production of the university. Section C is a 16-item also on four-point rating scale ranging from “Strongly Agree” to “Strongly Disagree”. The items measure administrative innovation. In all therefore, the instrument contains 40 items which sought to obtain information concerning the variable of this study.

## **RESULTS**

This section presents the results obtained in the study in line with the three null hypotheses raised.

**HYPOTHESIS 1**

This null hypothesis speculated that there is no significant relationship between knowledge acquisition effectiveness and administrative innovation in universities in South-South zone of Nigeria. The result of the analysis is presented in Table 1.

**Table 1. Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Analysis of Relationship between Knowledge Acquisition effectiveness and administrative innovation in South-South Zone Universities in Nigeria (n = 530).**

Variables	$\Sigma X$ $\Sigma Y$	$\Sigma X^2$ $\Sigma Y^2$	$\Sigma XY$	<i>r-cal</i>	<i>r-crit.</i>
Knowledge acquisition (x)	12040	243800	606040	0.927	0.195
Administrative innovation (Y)	29920	1508880			

\* P < .05, df = 528, critical or = 0.195

**Dependent Variable**

Administrative innovation

The null hypothesis was rejected and the alternate hypothesis was retained (i.e.  $r\text{-cal } 0.927 > r\text{-critical} = 0.195$ ). This finding implies that there is a positive relationship between knowledge acquisition and administrative innovation in the universities. In summary the result is significant.

**HYPOTHESIS 2**

The null hypothesis stated that there is no significant relationship between knowledge sharing effectiveness and administrative innovation in universities in South-South zone, Nigeria.

To test for significance, two variables were identified as follows:

1. Knowledge sharing effectiveness as the independent variable
2. Administrative innovation and dependent variable.

**Table 2. Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Analysis of Relationship between Knowledge sharing effectiveness and administrative innovation in South-South Zone Universities in Nigeria (n = 530).**

Variables	$\Sigma X$ $\Sigma Y$	$\Sigma X^2$ $\Sigma Y^2$	$\Sigma XY$	<i>r-cal</i>	<i>r-crit.</i>
Knowledge sharing (x)	9480	151240	475989	0.4737	0.195
Administrative innovation (Y)	29920	1508880			

\* P < .05, df = 528, critical or = 0.195

The result from Table 2 showed the computed r-value as 0.473. This value of 0.473 was compared with the critical r-value of 0.195 at 0.05 alpha level. It was observed that the computed r-value was greater than the critical value. The null hypothesis was rejected and the alternate retained. This result implies that there is a significant positive relationship between knowledge sharing and administrative innovation.

### HYPOTHESIS 3

This null hypothesis stated that there is no significant relationship between knowledge application effectiveness and administrative innovation in universities in South-South zone, Nigeria.

**Table 3. Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation Analysis of Relationship between Knowledge Application and administrative innovation in South-South Zone Universities in Nigeria (n = 530).**

Variables	$\Sigma X$ $\Sigma Y$	$\Sigma X^2$ $\Sigma Y^2$	$\Sigma XY$	<i>r-cal</i>	<i>r-crit.</i>
Knowledge application (x)	114800	222120	578240	0.894	0.195
Administrative innovation (Y)	29920	1508880			

\* P < .05, df = 528, critical or = 0.195

#### Dependent variable

Administrative innovation. From the result the analysis in Table 3, the obtained r-value of .894 is greater than the table – value of .195 at 0.05 alpha level with degree of freedom of 528. Hence, the result was significant. The positive r in this finding implies that there is a significant positive relationship between knowledge application and administration innovation.

### DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The results of the study were discussed based on the hypotheses as follows:

The result obtained for the test of null hypothesis one shows that there is a significant relationship between knowledge acquisition and administrative innovation in South-South Zone universities in Nigeria. This result resonates with findings of Efanga and Ogbodo (2014) that knowledge is the most significant variable in the equation of economic development in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. If this is correct, it will be reasonable to assume that knowledge acquisition helps to ensure sustainable development and establishment of new organizational, dynamic and effective administrative innovation.

#### Knowledge Sharing Effectiveness and Administrative Innovation

The finding of this hypothesis revealed that there is a significant positive relationship between knowledge sharing or transfers and administrative innovation. This finding agreed with that of Armstrong (2014) and Nonaka (1994), who all in their studies reported that knowledge sharing has a positive influence on administrative innovation in South-South universities in Nigeria. As an asset, knowledge needs to be invested in other assets for effective management. Thus, the investment could be for other activity like knowledge capturing. This would demonstrate a greater propensity for administrative innovation in the South-South zone universities in Nigeria. Knowledge application effectiveness and administrative innovation in the South-South universities in Nigeria.

The finding of this hypothesis indicated that there is a significant positive relation between knowledge management effectiveness and administrative innovation in South-South zone universities in Nigeria. The result was in conformity with findings of Nonaka (1994) and

Bontis (2008) who advocated that tacit and explicit knowledge should be seen as a spectrum rather than definite point.

The relevance of all these empirical results to this study's findings was the increasing close relationship between knowledge management effectiveness and administrative innovation in the South-South universities in Nigeria.

## **CONCLUSION**

Based on the outcome of this study, it was therefore concluded that knowledge management effectiveness as perceived by front-line staff South-South universities in Nigeria in terms of acquisition, sharing and application are significant joint relationship to administrative innovation.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Based on the findings of this research it was recommended that:

1. Knowledge management should focus on getting right knowledge to the right people at the right time.
2. Knowledge management essentially should be about management and motivation of knowledge workers who played active roles in sharing it.

## **REFERENCES**

- [1] Armstrong, M. (2014). *A Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice*. New Delhi, Kogan Page India.
- [2] Bontis, N. (2008). Intellectual Capital: An Exploratory Study that Develops Measures and Model. *Management Decision*, 36(2): 63-76.
- [3] Efang, S. I., & Ogbodo, C. M. (2014). Knowledge Production in Higher Education: Policies and Practices in Nigeria. *International Education Studies*, 6(12): 9-14.
- [4] Federal Republic of Nigeria (2014). National Policy on Education. Yaba, Lagos: NERDC Press.
- [5] Nonaka, I. (1994). A Dynamic Theory of Organizational Knowledge Creation. *Organization Science*, 5:14-37.
- [6] Ogbodo, C. M. (2013). Partnering for Education Finance in Nigeria. *Journal of Studies in Education*.