

# The Role of Culture in a Successful Knowledge-Creation and Sharing In Higher Academic Institution– Survey/Questionnaire

<sup>1</sup>Fatima Ahmed Mohamed, <sup>2</sup>Nurul Fahimah Bt Fakhri,  
<sup>3</sup>Abdul Rahman B. Ahmad Dahlan

Kuliyah of Information Technology, International Islamic University, MALAYSIA

---

**Abstract:** The purpose of this paper is to contribute to the limited previous research on the role of culture in knowledge creations and knowledge sharing within higher education's institutions knowledge by examines the role of culture and also by identifying the factors that contributed to the successfulness of the creations and sharing of the knowledge. Design/methodology/approach A questionnaire-based survey was used to gather a side view of university academics' lecturers and students of International Islamic university Malaysia (IIUM) view, attitudes, perception and intentions toward the culture of knowledge creations and knowledge sharing and related factor, including 35 Responses were received from International Islamic university Malaysia that has a lot of faculties and departments in a university, eight faculties were selected for the study. All items were measured using five-point scales in which 1 "strongly disagree" and 5 "strongly agree", with the exception of the initial section on\_Good practices of Knowledge creation and knowledge Sharing In this case a space provided in the form for the respondent to give their feedback. In addition, the questionnaire included a contextual question related to the types of information that academics share, and demographic data including: university, department, length of time in universities (within current department, and also total career-length), position, and gender. The finding The responses toward practicing the culture of KC and KS are varied based on the finding. However, positive feedback on demonstrating those good practices from the respondents to accomplish the status of excellence for IIUM is received. KC and KS are believed as the dynamic elements contributed towards the excellent performance. The KC is a research focus based while KS refers to the re-use of existing for advanced commitments.

**Keywords:** Knowledge creations, Knowledge sharing, Culture, Universities, Academic.

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Knowledge has turn into a significant property and Knowledge Management (KM) has been broadly honed by numerous associations and college as a standout amongst the most able methods for making progress in the data age. by understanding the criticalness of learning as a scholarly resource, the Malaysian Ministry of Higher Education has perceived KM as one of the basics to transform Malaysia into a focal point of greatness for advanced education and to accomplish its main goal to create and put set up an advanced education environment that empowers the development of chief information focuses and people who are skilled, developed with high good values so as to meet national and universal needs (Mohayidin et al., 2007) . In the economy learning based, HEIs are confronting difficulties to satisfy their crucial part in directing scholarly research, information sharing, and exchanging learning to society. Over the course of the years, Knowledge Management (KM) has turn into a key issue in administration method in HEIs everywhere throughout the world, incorporating in the creating nations. They are presently thought to be in the "information business" since they are included in learning creation, dispersal and learning(Savitri, 2013). This study is done in International Islamic University Malaysia which is questionnaire-based survey. The next section briefly reviews previous research into the role of culture in knowledge creation sharing, and the components that may impact it in Academic Institutions and

likewise in other associations. Next the methodology is outlined, including the questionnaire design, sampling, and data gathering. The findings and discussion section profiles and discusses attitudes and intentions towards the role of culture in successful knowledge creation and sharing and respondents' views on the factors that might affect knowledge sharing. Finally, conclusions are summarized and recommendations are presented for practice and further research

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

According to (Fakhri, Mohamed, & Dahlan, 2015), organization culture refers to the organization's character or its behavior. The organizational culture consists of three elements including value, belief and assumptions wherein interaction among them designate the culture's role enables organizational behavior carry out under organizational behavior surface to be shown. People be dependent on assumption that denotes the shared mental models, the broad worldviews or theories-in-use for them to steer their perceptions and behaviors. Next, the beliefs symbolize the individual's insight and perceptions of the reality whereas values are ultimate beliefs about what is essential and direct us to distinguish which is right and wrong, or what is moral and immoral, in the world(Objectives, n.d.).The IHL is the educational-based organizations need to create knowledge and nurture the culture of knowledge sharing for ensuing academic excellence and innovation in research. The culture is a social product in which it is not natural, inherent and will-less to allow people learned culture through relation between each other (Mahadi&Jafari, 2012).Furthermore, it is crucial for higher educations to acknowledge the role of culture in valuing the knowledge creation and stimulating the knowledge sharing practice within their organizations. According to Nassuora & Hasan (n.d), Institutions of Higher Learning (IHL) plays a central role on knowledge creation and knowledge sharing. The creation of knowledge through implicit knowledge produced by academics is embedded in their minds and creates the storehouse of intellectual capital (IC). Besides, IHL is a place for knowledge widely developed and delivered and this indicates universities have great and massive resources of IC.

The role of culture refers to a group which brings in individuals as group members definite behavior, lays the analysis phases accordingly. As for the example, the faculty members have enormous opportunity to encourage students develop an essential set of skills that may be necessary all over their lives. On the hand, knowledge sharing is a good culture in an educational system ensures that academic staff is updated with the latest knowledge periodically (Nassuora & Hasan, n.d). Consequently, faculty members have to be highly motivated to learn as well as exposure to the opportunity for sharing which drives to the creation of new ideas and promote creativity. Besides, by adopting best practices of work culture throughout the organization is important to facilitate culture of excellence within IHL.

By its temperament, college environment is suitable for the use of learning administration standards and routines .The reasons incorporate the followings:

- universities more often than not have cutting edge data base,
- Knowledge imparting to others is common for instructors, and
- The yearning of understudies is to procure learning from available sources as quick as could reasonably be expected.

Universities need to satisfy any desire for the worldwide society. They must receive and adjust great practices that make from ICT and globalization. By custom, the fundamental elements of colleges are to make and offer information and these are should be possible through their exploration and showing exercises and additionally their effort programs. There are three noteworthy missions of Universities:

- Teaching – to get ready understudies to wind up effective deep rooted learners, Research – to extend the boondocks of human learning and to advance imagination, moreover
- Service – to serve on groups and in authority positions inside of the college and in expert associations, and to partake in effort exercises that serve the neighborhood, national, and global groups. (Mohayidin et al.,2007)

Organizational culture knowledge creations, knowledge sharing, Universities are knowledge concentrated environments, and play a vital role in knowledge Creation all the way through research, and in knowledge distribution through publication. They also play a significant role in knowledge transfer through working and collaborations with businesses industries and other organizations to hold up innovation, and social and cultural enterprise, as well as supporting learning through their teaching and research training programs. (Fullwood et al., 2013)

Numerous HEIs view themselves as have as of now been applying KM in courses, for example, sharing learning through showing and learning exercises; making information by leading research; and utilizing the data and correspondence innovation to backing the exercises. It is accepted by numerous top supervisors that KM can be utilized by HEIs to acquire thorough, integrative and reflexive comprehension of the effect of data on their foundations. Yet, would they say they are truly actualizing KM? Is dealing with the authoritative learning a vital piece of their business methodology? What's more, does it expand their game changer? The livelihood of data and correspondence innovation (ICT) is regularly for the most part considered by associations as Knowledge Management. Despite the fact that the innovation does bring constructive outcomes for data sharing and correspondence exercises, it is too early for associations to announce themselves as a learning association. In actualizing KM procedures and practices approach, instructive establishments are obliged to concentrate further from small scale level of data sharing exercises, and look at the bigger connection of data sharing inside of the association, particularly how their kin, procedures and innovation work inside of it. (Nassuora & Hasan, 2009)

### **3. METHODOLOGY**

A questionnaire-based survey was used to gather a side view of university academics' lecturers and students of International Islamic university Malaysia (IIUM) view, attitudes, perception and intentions toward the culture of knowledge creations and knowledge sharing and related factor, including 35 Responses were received from International Islamic university Malaysia that has a lot of faculties and departments in a university, eight faculties were selected for the study. All items were measured using five-point scales in which 1 "strongly disagree" and 5 "strongly agree", with the exception of the initial section on **Good practices of Knowledge creation and knowledge Sharing** In this case a space provided in the form for the respondent to give their feedback. In addition, the questionnaire included a contextual question related to the types of information that academics share, and demographic data including: university, department, length of time in universities (within current department, and also total career-length), position, and gender. The questionnaire was pre-piloted with expert researchers, and then piloted with a small sample of typical respondents. Questionnaires were distributed to a convenience stratified sample of academics in different Departments and disciplines. A number of academics and student were selected and a professor from specific department with specific subject areas. Departments were chosen to give a good representation of subject disciplines within the broad groups of Humanities, Science and Technology, and Islamic studies subjects. A total 35 questionnaire were sent to different Kulliyahs, in term of gender the female response is the highest with 65.7% while male 34.3%. the status of the respondents were Student with 82.9% which is the highest ,and Acadmic Staff 17.1%, the age of the respondent is vary the highest rate age is between 25-29 with total percent of 37.1%.the second highest age rate with 30-35 with percentage 25.7%

### **4. FINDING AND DISCUSSION**

#### **A. The Role Of Culture: Knowledge Creation And Knowledge Sharing:**

For this section, the questionnaire has been conducted to indicate the performance of work culture, interaction, willingness to share knowledge, recognition and information technology as a medium for collaborative KC and KS in IHL. Each performance indicators have been given some basic questions to be scaled by both IIUM academic staffs and students: The scale was (5-Very Effective; 4-Effective; 3-Somewhat Effective; 2-Less effective; 1-Not at all effective).

#### **➤ Performance Indicator : Work Culture:**

Responses on work culture shown more than half respondents agree that faculty is highly motivated to learn and have the opportunity for sharing and believe that the academic organization is flexible, open to new ideas and promotes creativity chose either "very effective" or "effective" with 68.5% and 57.1% respectively. Besides, many respondents felt that the best practices in internal methods are reviewed and shared throughout the organization is somewhat effective with percent 48.6%, followed by 42.9% effective. The rest are shown apparently lesser with 5.7% very effective and 2.9% less effective.

#### **➤ Performance Indicator : Interaction:**

At present, online discussion forums are receiving highest participation rate is believed by respondents is less than half with 40% either "very effective" or "effective" followed by 34.3% with somewhat effective. Next, there is interaction of faculty even at intra Institute level (Group of Institutes under the same management) is felt as somewhat effective by

respondents at 54.3%, 28.6% and 17.1% for effective and less effective. The same percentage for both “effective” and “somewhat effective” are 45.7% respectively for knowledge sharing amongst the internal faculty takes place through regular interactions by means of review meetings and workshops in our institute. The remaining of 8.6 % felt it less effective for this interaction.

➤ **Performance Indicator : Willingness to share Knowledge:**

In general, respondents have an identical positive outlook towards knowledge sharing. Based on the result, 40% chose effective and 31.4% chose very effective that Knowledge sharing improves the interpersonal relationships amongst the faculty. As well 22.9% the result should be somewhat effective. However, only 5.7% felt the consequences less effective. Next, 74.3 % felt either “very effective” or “effective” that Collaborative Knowledge sharing enhances learning. Furthermore, more than half agreed with the total percentage of 65.7 either “very effective” or “effective” believe that Knowledge Creation and Sharing can be seen as strength. Whereas 25.7% and 8.6% decide on somewhat effective and less effective correspondingly.

➤ **Performance Indicator : Recognition:**

For Knowledge Sharing is monitored and recorded positively in Performance appraisal of the faculty shown the highest percentage either “very effective” or “effective” with 88.5%. In contrast, less than half think that individual faculty members are recognized for team work and Knowledge Sharing with 48.6% while the rest chose 37.1% for somewhat effective and less effective at 14.3%. The highest percentage of respondents at 48.6% selected somewhat effective followed by 37.1% effective for the academic organization symbolically recognizes (through newsletter or website) those who support and put their efforts towards Collaborative Knowledge sharing. Whereas, 11.4% and 2.9% of respondents chose less effective and not effective at all. For feedback mechanism is in place and seen as an opportunity to learn, just about semi-quarter of respondents at 51.5% be of the opinion either “effective” or “very effective” followed by somewhat effective with 40%. Yet, the percentage of respondents select less effective or not effective at all are very small at less than 10%.

➤ **Performance Indicator : Information Technology (IT):**

Above average at 57.1% believe Information Technology facilitates Collaborative Knowledge Sharing through various tools in organization. Still, more than quarter indicated somewhat effective at 37.1%. Same goes to IT supports effective communication among the faculty members and the students in organization, above quarter of respondents at 48.8% decided on somewhat effective. Nevertheless, 48.6% decided on either “effective” or “very effective”. Expressively, 80% indicated either “very effective” or “effective” for the formation of IT Forum for Knowledge Creation & Sharing and Development can provide a platform for knowledge creation and sharing in University.

**B. Communities of Practice (Cop):**

Communities of practice (CoP) are groups of individuals who have same concern or a passion for something they do and figure out how to improve as they collaborate routinely (Wenger, n.d). Naturally, the group will arrange assemble as one to share ideas in achieving mutual interest between them (Lotfi, Aziz, & Dahlan, 2015). The concept has turned out to provide a useful perspective on knowing and learning. A growing number of people and organizations in various sectors are now focusing on communities of practice as a key to improving their performance. Thus, the distribution of questionnaire is to scale the degree of CoP agreed by IIUM communities about the KC and KS activities based on listed questions. The scale was (Scale: 5-Strongly Agree; 4-Agree; 3- Undecided; 2-Disagree; 1-Strongly disagree). For this section, result shown positive feedback from respondents with total more than 70% chose either “strongly agree” or “agree” for all listed questions.

In general, 71.4% is certain of either “strongly agree” or “agree” that the forum of the nature CoP could result in increased co-operation and co-ordination between faculties of different institutes. Then, 77.1% either strongly agreed or agreed that in spite of the heavy workload, faculty should actively participate in knowledge creation and sharing activities. For the support from top management is crucial for participation in activities related to knowledge creation and sharing, the total of 71.4% respondents either strongly agreed or agreed about it. Furthermore 74.3% either “strongly agree” or “agree” for faculty of different institutes to meet at least four times a year for knowledge creation and sharing. In addition, 80% felt either “strongly agree” or “agree” that knowledge amongst faculty improves quality of teaching.

### **C. Industry Institute Interaction:**

The institutions are conveying the fundamental knowledge and skill, but the Industry-Institute Interaction drives to embark on research by staff and students applicable to the Industry (B.M.B.Patil, 2014). The institution is a place of human capital to be delivered for the information society, need to keep themselves side by side of the innovation patterns and react to the present and future innovation and product advancement needs of the industries.

Overall, 65.7% think either “strongly agree” or “agree” that Industry Institute Interaction is vital for Knowledge Creation and Sharing, followed by 28.6% undecided and 5.7% disagree. In addition, 74.2% consider either strongly agree or agree that Industry and Institutes should collaborate for joint research programs / projects pursued by undecided at 22.9% and disagree at 2.9%. Moreover, 77.1% elected either “strongly agree” or “agree” for Industry Institute Interaction should be constant for updating of academic curriculum whilst 20% undecided and 2.9% strongly disagree.

The results of respondents who have started Industry Institute Interaction in organization are 37.1% for Yes and 65.7% for No. Accordingly, those who have started Industry Institute Interaction shown that 54.3% interaction started because of extended invitation to industry representatives of large Industrial units, Owners of small /medium enterprises on opening and closing sessions of training programs and during various/events of the Institute. Whereas 48.6% because Training and Placement activity of the academic institute and 22.9% for advanced level of linkage through signing of Memorandum of understanding (MOU) or establishment of research centre. From the result as well, 62.9% gave the opinion either “strongly agree” or “agree” that the outcome gained through Industry Institute Interaction has been positive, pursued by 34.3 % undecided and 2.9 disagree.

### **D. Good Practices of Knowledge Creation and Knowledge Sharing:**

The responses on KC and KS may demonstrate good practice in a variety of diverse areas to accomplish the excellence’s status of institutions are varied. KC and KS are among the vital elements contributed towards the excellent performance. The good practices are KC represents Research focus while KS refers to the existing of knowledge which can be re-used for innovative purposes. Besides, the basic of an educational institution is knowledge creation and sharing. This is the main purpose of the institution. Thus, this will enhance Comprehensive Excellence quality as in the mission of IIUM. With the KC and KS, institutions able to deliver programs or subjects that are relevant to the industry. Also, the industry can benefit more with the institutions by providing research that can enhance or develop the industry to perform better. Thus, the students are in position to exhibit high degree of excellence in the industry after graduation, thus crediting the institution. On the other hand, sharing knowledge will help to enhance skills of an individual as well as the excellence of an institution and through sharing, we can move forward on a fast pace. KS definitely opens up awareness of new knowledge which can be further acquired via sharing Different ideas on application of knowledge buds out during discussions. Overall, most respondents agreed that KC and KS can establish good practice in a diversity of varied areas to achieve the excellence’s status of institutions. Only one respondent disagree without justification.

## **5. CONCLUSION**

In general, the questionnaires with some basic questions about KC and KS have been distributed to both IIUM academic staffs and students. The questionnaires have been divided into four sections including The Role of Culture: Knowledge Creation and Knowledge Sharing, Communities of Practice (Cop), Industry Institute Interaction as well as Good Practices of Knowledge Creation and Knowledge Sharing. For the first section, the performance of work culture, interaction, willingness to share knowledge, recognition and information technology as a medium for collaborative KC and KS in IHL have been measured.

The responses toward practicing the culture of KC and KS are varied based on the finding. However, positive feedback on demonstrating those good practices from the respondents to accomplish the status of excellence for IIUM is received. KC and KS are believed as the dynamic elements contributed towards the excellent performance. The KC is a research focus based while KS refers to the re-use of existing for advanced commitments. Thus, this will heighten the quality of comprehensive excellence as in the mission of a University. Next, with the KC and KS, institutions can convey programs or subjects which applicable to the industry. Consequently, the students are in position to exhibit high degree of excellence in the industry after graduation, thus crediting the institution. Then again, sharing learning will help to improve abilities of an individual and also opens up attention to new information. Overall, most respondents believe that KC and KS can build up great practice in a differing qualities of many areas to accomplish the excellence’s status of institutions.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] B.M.B.Patil, P. (2014, March). Industry-Institute Interaction. International Journal of Latest Trends in Engineering and Technology (IJLTET) ISSN: 2278-621X, Vol. 3 (Issue 4), p.40.
- [2] Fakhri, N. F., Mohamed, F. A., & Dahlan, A. R. (2015). The Role Of Culture: A Successful Knowledge Creation (Kc) And Knowledge Sharing (Ks) Within Higher Education Institutions. International Journal of Management and Commerce Innovations, Vol. 3 (Issue 1), P.41.
- [3] Lotfi, N. A., Aziz, N. F., & Dahlan, A. R. (2015). The Culture of Knowledge Creation and Knowledge Sharing In Successful Institute Of Higher Learning (IHL): A Literature Review. International Journal of Management and Commerce Innovations ISSN 2348-7585 (Online), p.100.
- [4] Moghtadaie, S. A. S. R. H. M. A. L. (2012). Knowledge Creation in Universities and Some Related Factors. [Http://Doi.Org/10.1108/02621711211253286](http://doi.org/10.1108/02621711211253286)
- [5] Mohayidin, M. G., Azirawani, N., Kamaruddin, M. N., & Idawati, M. (2007). The Application Of Knowledge Management In Enhancing The Performance Of Malaysian Universities. The Electronic Journal Of Knowledge Management Volume X Issue Xx, Pp Xx-Xx, Available Online At [Www.Ejkm.Com](http://www.ejkm.com), 5(3), 301–312.
- [6] Nassuora, A., & Hasan, S. (2009). Knowledge Sharing Among Academics In Institutions Of Higher Learning. Kmice. Cms. Net. My, 164–173. Retrieved From [Http://Www.Kmice.Cms.Net.My/Prockmice/Kmice2010/Paper/Pg164\\_173.Pdf](http://www.kmice.cms.net.my/prockmice/kmice2010/paper/pg164_173.pdf).
- [7] Nassuora, A. B., & Hasan, S. (n.d). Knowledge Sharing among Academics in Institutions of Higher. P.165-166.
- [8] Objectives, L. (n.d.). Organizational Culture, p.496–523.
- [9] Mahadi, D. T., & Jafari, S. M. (September 2012). Language and Culture. International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, Vol. 2, No. 17, p.232.
- [10] Savitri, F. (2013). Knowledge Management Implementation within the Higher Education Institutions In Bandung, Indonesia' S City Of Education. South East Asia Journal of Contemporary Business, Economics and Law, Vol. 2, Issue 1 (June) Issn 2289 - 1560, 2(1), 59–63.
- [11] Wenger, E. (n.d). Communities of practice: A brief introduction. p.1.