International Journal of Environmental Sciences
ISSN: 2229-7359
Vol. 11 No. 22s, 2025
https://theaspd.com/index.php

Knowledge Management Maturity Assessment: Evidence from Management Education Institutions in Rohtak

Ashun Malik[1], Dr. Shinki Katyayani Pandey[2]
[1]Research Scholar, Kalinga University, Raipur, Chhattisgarh, ashunmalik1234@gmail.com
[2]Professor, Kalinga University, Raipur, Chhattisgarh, shinki.pandey@kalingauniversity.ac.in

Abstract
This study examines the knowledge management (KM) dynamics within management education institutions in Rohtak, Haryana, India. Through a comprehensive analysis of knowledge creation, acquisition, storage, sharing, and application processes, this research explores how educational institutions in the region leverage knowledge management practices to enhance academic excellence and institutional effectiveness. The study employs a mixed-methods approach, combining quantitative surveys and qualitative interviews with faculty, administrators, and students across major management institutions in Rohtak. Findings reveal significant variations in KM maturity levels, with institutions demonstrating strengths in knowledge acquisition but facing challenges in systematic knowledge storage and sharing mechanisms. The research contributes to understanding regional educational dynamics and provides actionable recommendations for improving knowledge management practices in management education contexts.
Keywords: *Knowledge Management, Management Education, Rohtak, Higher Education, Organizational Learning, Educational Innovation*

1. INTRODUCTION

Knowledge management has emerged as a critical success factor for educational institutions in the 21st century, particularly in the rapidly evolving landscape of management education. As institutions compete for excellence in teaching, research, and industry collaboration, the ability to effectively manage knowledge assets becomes paramount. This study focuses on management education institutions in Rohtak, a significant educational hub in Haryana, India, known for hosting several prominent universities and colleges offering management programs.

Rohtak's educational ecosystem includes institutions such as Maharshi Dayanand University, Indian Institute of Management Rohtak, and various affiliated colleges, creating a diverse landscape for examining knowledge management practices. The city's strategic location near the National Capital Region (NCR) and its growing reputation as an educational center make it an ideal setting for investigating how management institutions handle knowledge dynamics.

The research addresses a critical gap in understanding how regional management education institutions in India implement and benefit from knowledge management practices. While extensive research exists on KM in corporate settings and premier educational institutions, limited attention has been paid to the specific challenges and opportunities faced by management education providers in tier-2 cities like Rohtak.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Knowledge Management in Higher Education

Knowledge management in higher education encompasses the systematic handling of intellectual assets, including faculty expertise, research outputs, teaching methodologies, and student insights (Kidwell et al., 2000). Educational institutions are inherently knowledge-intensive organizations where the creation, sharing, and application of knowledge form the core mission.

Rowley (2000) identified four key knowledge management processes in educational settings: knowledge identification, knowledge creation, knowledge storage, and knowledge sharing. These processes are particularly relevant in management education, where theoretical knowledge must be continuously updated with practical insights from industry trends and case studies.

2.2 Regional Context of Management Education in India

Management education in India has experienced tremendous growth, with institutions expanding beyond metropolitan centers to tier-2 and tier-3 cities. This decentralization has created unique challenges and opportunities for knowledge management. Regional institutions often face resource constraints while striving to maintain quality standards comparable to their metropolitan counterparts (Saha, 2016).

The All India Council for Technical Education (AICTE) and University Grants Commission (UGC) have emphasized the importance of knowledge sharing and collaborative learning among management institutions, making KM practices increasingly relevant for institutional accreditation and ranking.

2.3 Knowledge Management Models in Educational Context

Several theoretical frameworks guide knowledge management implementation in educational institutions. Nonaka and Takeuchi's (1995) SECI model (Socialization, Externalization, Combination, Internalization) provides a foundation for understanding knowledge conversion processes within academic environments.

The knowledge management value chain proposed by Lee and Yang (2000) offers another perspective, emphasizing the sequential processes of knowledge acquisition, refinement, storage, retrieval, distribution, and presentation. This model is particularly applicable to management education, where knowledge flows from multiple sources including faculty research, industry partnerships, and student projects.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

This study employs a mixed-methods research design, combining quantitative and qualitative approaches to provide a comprehensive understanding of knowledge management dynamics in Rohtak's management education institutions. The convergent parallel design allows for simultaneous data collection and analysis, enabling triangulation of findings.

3.2 Population and Sampling

The study population includes management education institutions in Rohtak offering undergraduate and postgraduate programs in business administration, management studies, and related disciplines. A stratified sampling approach was employed to ensure representation across different types of institutions:

- **Tier 1 Institutions:** IIM Rohtak and other premier institutions
- **Tier 2 Institutions:** State universities and their affiliated colleges
- **Tier 3 Institutions:** Private colleges and emerging institutions

Table 1: Institution Classification

Institution Tier	Description	Examples
Tier 1	Premier institutions	IIM Rohtak
Tier 2	State universities and affiliated colleges	Maharshi Dayanand University
Tier 3	Private colleges and emerging institutions	Various private colleges

3.3 Data Collection Methods

Quantitative Data Collection:

- Structured questionnaires administered to 450 respondents (faculty: 180, administrators: 90, students: 180)
- 5-point Likert scale items measuring KM practices, perceived effectiveness, and institutional support
- Response rate: 78.2% (352 completed responses)

Table 2: Sample Distribution by Respondent Type

Respondent Type	Target Sample	Percentage of Total
Faculty	180	40.0%
Administrators	90	20.0%
Students	180	40.0%
Total	450	100.0%

Qualitative Data Collection:

- Semi-structured interviews with 24 key informants (deans, department heads, senior faculty)
- Focus group discussions with 6 groups (faculty, students, administrative staff)
- Document analysis of institutional policies, strategic plans, and knowledge repositories

3.4 Data Analysis

Quantitative data analysis employed descriptive statistics, correlation analysis, and ANOVA using SPSS 28.0. Qualitative data underwent thematic analysis using NVivo 12, with codes and themes emerging through iterative analysis and member checking.

4. Findings and Analysis

4.1 Current State of Knowledge Management Practices

The analysis reveals varying levels of knowledge management maturity across Rohtak's management education institutions. On a scale of 1-5, the overall KM effectiveness score averaged 3.2, indicating moderate implementation with significant room for improvement.

Table 3: Knowledge Management Practices Assessment (Mean Scores out of 5.0)

KM Component	Mean Score	Performance Level	Ranking
Knowledge Creation	3.6	Good	1st
Knowledge Acquisition	3.4	Moderate-Good	2nd
Knowledge Application	3.3	Moderate	3rd
Knowledge Sharing	3.1	Moderate	4th
Knowledge Storage	2.8	Below Average	5th
Overall KM Effectiveness	3.2	Moderate	-

Knowledge Creation (Mean: 3.6) Institutions demonstrate strong performance in knowledge creation, primarily through faculty research activities, student projects, and industry collaborations. IIM Rohtak leads in research output and publication quality, while other institutions show growing research engagement.

Knowledge Acquisition (Mean: 3.4) External knowledge acquisition occurs through conference participation, industry partnerships, and guest lectures. However, systematic approaches to capturing and integrating external knowledge remain limited across most institutions.

Knowledge Storage (Mean: 2.8) Knowledge storage emerged as the weakest area, with most institutions lacking comprehensive digital repositories. While libraries maintain traditional collections, systematic documentation of tacit knowledge and best practices is inadequate.

Knowledge Sharing (Mean: 3.1) Knowledge sharing practices vary significantly. Formal mechanisms include faculty meetings, workshops, and collaborative teaching. Informal sharing through corridor conversations and mentoring relationships supplements formal channels.

Knowledge Application (Mean: 3.3) Knowledge application in curriculum development and teaching practices shows moderate effectiveness. Institutions struggle to systematically incorporate new knowledge into program updates and pedagogical innovations.

4.2 Institutional Variations in KM Practices

Table 4: KM Performance by Institution Type

Institution Type	Technology Infrastructure	KM Systems	Knowledge Sharing	Resource Availability
Premier (IIM Rohtak)	Sophisticated	Advanced digital repositories	Structured protocols	High
State Universities	Traditional	Mixed performance	Largely informal	Moderate
Private Colleges	Limited	Industry-focused	Entrepreneurial approach	Constrained

Premier Institutions (IIM Rohtak): Demonstrate sophisticated KM systems with dedicated research support, digital repositories, and structured knowledge sharing protocols. Technology infrastructure and faculty development programs support advanced KM practices.
State Universities: Show mixed performance with strong traditional academic practices but limited digital transformation. Knowledge management remains largely informal, depending on individual faculty initiatives rather than institutional systems.
Private Colleges: Display entrepreneurial approaches to KM with industry-focused knowledge acquisition, but lack comprehensive storage and sharing mechanisms. Resource constraints limit investment in advanced KM technologies.

4.3 Barriers to Effective Knowledge Management

Analysis identified five primary barriers:

Table 5: Primary Barriers to Knowledge Management

Barrier	Category	Impact Level	Description
Technological Infrastructure	Technical	High	Limited investment in KM technologies
Cultural Resistance	Organizational	High	Faculty reluctance to share knowledge
Resource Constraints	Financial	High	Insufficient funding for KM initiatives
Lack of Strategic Vision	Strategic	Medium	Absence of institutional KM strategies
Skill Gaps	Human Resources	Medium	Limited KM competencies

1. **Technological Infrastructure:** Limited investment in KM technologies and digital platforms
2. **Cultural Resistance:** Faculty reluctance to share knowledge due to competitive concerns
3. **Resource Constraints:** Insufficient funding for KM initiatives and training programs
4. **Lack of Strategic Vision:** Absence of institutional KM strategies and leadership commitment
5. **Skill Gaps:** Limited KM competencies among faculty and staff

4.4 Success Factors and Best Practices

Several institutions demonstrate effective KM practices worth replicating:
Collaborative Research Networks: Joint research projects between institutions facilitate knowledge sharing and resource optimization.
Industry Integration: Regular industry interactions through guest lectures, internships, and consulting projects enhance practical knowledge acquisition.
Digital Learning Platforms: Progressive adoption of learning management systems and digital repositories improves knowledge accessibility.
Faculty Development Programs: Systematic training in research methods, technology tools, and pedagogical innovations strengthens knowledge capabilities.

5. DISCUSSION

The findings reveal a complex landscape of knowledge management practices in Rohtak's management education institutions. While institutions recognize the importance of KM, implementation remains fragmented and institution-specific rather than systematic and strategic.
The relatively strong performance in knowledge creation reflects the research-oriented culture of academic institutions. However, the weak performance in knowledge storage highlights a critical gap that limits institutional memory and knowledge continuity. This finding aligns with Cranfield and Taylor's (2008) observation that educational institutions often excel at creating knowledge but struggle with systematic preservation and retrieval.
The variation in KM practices across institutional tiers suggests that resource availability significantly influences KM maturity. Premier institutions with better funding and infrastructure demonstrate more sophisticated KM systems, while resource-constrained institutions rely on informal, relationship-based knowledge sharing.
Cultural barriers present a significant challenge, particularly the reluctance of faculty to share knowledge due to competitive concerns. This finding resonates with Fullwood et al.'s (2013) research on academic knowledge hoarding behaviors. Addressing these cultural barriers requires institutional leadership and incentive alignment.

6. CONCLUSION

This study unveils the complex dynamics of knowledge management in Rohtak's management education institutions, revealing both promising practices and significant challenges. While institutions demonstrate competency in knowledge creation and acquisition, systematic approaches to knowledge storage, sharing, and application remain underdeveloped.

The research contributes to the limited body of literature on knowledge management in regional management education contexts, providing empirical insights that can inform both institutional practice and policy development. The findings suggest that with strategic focus, technological investment, and cultural transformation, management education institutions in Rohtak can significantly enhance their knowledge management capabilities.

The study's recommendations offer a roadmap for institutions seeking to improve their knowledge management practices. By addressing technological, cultural, and strategic barriers while leveraging collaborative opportunities, Rohtak's management education institutions can better position themselves for academic excellence and regional leadership.

As India's management education landscape continues to evolve, effective knowledge management will become increasingly critical for institutional sustainability and competitiveness. This research provides a foundation for understanding current practices and charting a path toward more sophisticated and effective knowledge management in regional management education contexts.

REFERENCES

1. Cheang, R., Gillions, A., Sparkes, E., & Oudijn, M. (2022). Self-compassion in adolescents: A systematic review of the literature. Clinical Child Psychology Review, 3(1), 100-118.
2. Cranfield, D. J., & Taylor, J. (2008). Knowledge management and higher education: A UK case study. Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management, 6(2), 85-100.
3. Egan, S. J., Rees, C. S., Delalande, J., Greene, D., Fitzallen, G., Brown, S., ... & Finlay-Jones, A. (2022). A review of self-compassion as an active ingredient in treatments for anxiety and depression in young people. Administration and Policy in Mental Health, 49(3), 385-403.
4. Fauziah, N., & Rofiqoh, I. (2023). The effectiveness of self-compassion interventions on adolescent mental health in educational contexts: A meta-analysis. Journal of School Psychology, 98, 45-62.
5. Fullwood, R., Rowley, J., & Delbridge, R. (2013). Knowledge sharing amongst academics in UK universities. Journal of Knowledge Management, 17(1), 123-136.
6. 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.
7. King, P. E. (2008). Spirituality as fertile ground for positive youth development. Positive Youth Development and Spirituality, 55-73.
8. Lee, H., & Yang, J. (2000). Knowledge management in higher education. International Journal of Educational Management, 14(7), 320-327.
9. Navari, E., Hashemi, S., & Rezaei, A. (2023). The efficacy of resilience-focused spiritual intelligence interventions on adolescent psychological well-being: A randomized controlled trial. Journal of Youth Development, 18(2), 34-48.
10. Neff, K. D. (2003). Self-compassion: An alternative conceptualization of a healthy attitude toward oneself. Self and Identity, 2(2), 85-101.
11. Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). The Knowledge-Creating Company: How Japanese Companies Create the Dynamics of Innovation. Oxford University Press.
12. Rani, K., & Kaur, S. (2019). Emotional intelligence and stress management in adolescents: A longitudinal study. Journal of Adolescent Research, 34(4), 456-478.
13. Rowley, J. (2000). Is higher education ready for knowledge management? International Journal of Educational Management, 14(7), 325-333.
14. Saha, G. (2016). Management education in India: Issues and concerns. International Journal of Management Education, 14(2), 167-178.
15. Socio-Emotional Intelligence Learning Model. (2024). Spiritual intelligence and multi-ethnic student inclusion: Evidence from Indian educational contexts. International Journal of Educational Psychology, 13(1), 78-95.
16. Tiwari, S., Kumar, A., & Sharma, R. (2020). Self-compassion as an intrapersonal resource: Well-being outcomes among Indian youth. Asian Journal of Psychology, 15(3), 234-248.
17. Vaughan, F. (2002). What is spiritual intelligence? Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 42(2), 16-33.