

## Assessing the Degree of Knowledge Management Practices among a sample of Adrar University Teachers

KALOUNE Djilali<sup>1\*</sup>, AYAD Saleh<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Algerian African Economic Integration Laboratory, Faculty of Economics, Commercial and Management Sciences, University of Adrar (Algeria),

<sup>2</sup>Algerian African Economic Integration Laboratory, Faculty of Economics, Commercial and Management Sciences, University of Adrar (Algeria),

\* [K\\_djilali@univ-adrar.edu.dz](mailto:K_djilali@univ-adrar.edu.dz)

Received:14/06/2024, Published: 10/10/2024

### ABSTRACT (Times New Roman, bold, 10)

This study aimed at appraising how Adrar University teachers treated knowledge and discovering whether there was any difference in importance in knowledge management in relation to demographic and occupational factors. We conducted descriptive statistics and analyses of variance to test the research hypothesis. The findings of the present study demonstrate that teachers have a strong knowledge management process. Knowledge management capabilities did not vary with the demographic and occupational characteristics that these samples of teachers were making.

### Keywords (Times New Roman, bold, 9)

knowledge management practices, university teachers, Adrar University, one way ANOVA, Demographic and occupational Characteristics.

### Introduction (Times New Roman, bold, 12)

Universities are often hailed as premier institutions dedicated to serving diverse societal needs competently. Given this significant role, universities are compelled to constantly seek improved methods to enhance their offerings, which include teaching, learning, research, consulting, and more. Within this framework, extensive research has been conducted on university performance, particularly regarding knowledge management.

Despite the abundance of academic and practitioner research on knowledge management within various organizations, there is still a lack of substantial evidence to accurately assess knowledge management practices in higher education. This is due to various inherent challenges, such as inadequate infrastructure, limited financial resources, and increasing student populations, which continue to significantly hinder these institutions. This backdrop motivated the researcher to embark on this timely study, aimed at capturing a realistic snapshot of the situation.

### Study Questions:

This study boldly addresses knowledge management practices, driven by the belief that empirical research can enhance the existing knowledge base. It aims to answer the following questions:

- What is the definition of knowledge management?
- What does a knowledge management process entail?
- What level of knowledge management practices exist among teachers at Adrar University?
- Do knowledge management practices among teachers vary based on their demographic and occupational characteristics?

### Study Hypotheses:

We developed the following hypotheses to align with the study questions.

- H1: There is no significant difference between the teachers' average scores on the knowledge management process and the theoretical mean of the scale.
- H2: The degree of knowledge management practices among teachers does not vary based on their demographic and occupational characteristics.

### Study Aims:

This research has the following primary goals:

- To clarify the concept of knowledge management.
- To evaluate the extent of knowledge management practices among teachers at Adrar University.
- To explore any differences in knowledge management practices among teachers related to their demographic and occupational characteristics.

#### **Significance of the Study:**

The study's contributions are significant:

- It adds to the existing knowledge by examining the degree of knowledge management practices among teachers in a previously unstudied setting, specifically Adrar University.
- The practical outcomes could aid university teachers in enhancing their knowledge management practices, which are essential to the teaching-learning process.

#### **Delimitations of the Study:**

The study's scope is defined by the following:

- It focused solely on teachers from Adrar University who participated voluntarily through an online survey. Consequently, the findings might not be generalizable to other university teacher populations.
- It evaluated knowledge management practices in relation to five specific demographic and occupational characteristics: gender, age, work experience, academic ranks, and faculty. The inclusion of additional characteristics might have broadened the scope of the findings.

### **1- Theoretical Background:**

#### **1.1 Literature Review:**

Numerous studies have delved into knowledge management practices within higher educational institutions, as evidenced by the broad literature on the topic. This section highlights several studies pertinent to the current research's objectives.

One such study by Kanyundo, Chipeta, and Chawinga (2023) focused on knowledge management among academic and senior administrative staff at LUANAR. Utilizing a census approach, the researchers gathered data from 173 academic staff members, discovering

that the primary forms of explicit knowledge created included theses, dissertations, memos, emails, and policies. The predominant methods for sharing this knowledge were through emails and meetings. A key recommendation from this study was to establish a dedicated knowledge management unit to oversee these activities.

Another study by Nawaz Nishad et al. (2020) examined knowledge management practices across higher education institutions in Europe, Asia, and Gulf Cooperation Council countries. The study collected data using a structured online questionnaire and analyzed it using statistical tools such as one-way ANOVA and T-tests. The findings revealed uniformity in knowledge perception, creation, sharing, and diffusion across institutions, but noted significant differences in knowledge gathering and retention.

Nair and Maunusami (2020) conducted further research to investigate the communication of knowledge management practices to employees in higher education. The study discovered through a questionnaire that employees actively participated in knowledge management activities.

Xuan Vu (2019) explored the impact of knowledge management on organizational efficiency within 300 Vietnamese companies and universities. The researcher used Confirmatory Factor Analysis and Structural Equation Modeling Methods to analyze the data, concluding that effective knowledge management significantly enhances organizational efficiency.

In a similar vein, Supermane and Moh Tahir (2018) assessed the extent of knowledge management practices in Malaysian primary schools. After surveying 250 teachers, they discovered a moderate implementation of knowledge management. They recommended clinical workshops on knowledge management to elevate the quality of educational activities.

Nunes and colleagues (2017) conducted a systematic literature review on knowledge management within South Asian higher education institutions. Their research underscored the recognized importance of knowledge management across academic, institutional, and governmental spheres.

Lastly, a study by Khan Baber et al. (2016) explored knowledge management practices at the

International Islamic University Islamabad. Interviews with teachers revealed a broad awareness of knowledge management concepts. Meanwhile, Laal (2011) emphasized the critical role of knowledge management in enhancing the missions of higher education institutes, suggesting that success in knowledge management hinges on improving individual abilities, motivations, and opportunities for learning and knowledge dissemination.

## 1.2 Conceptual Frame:

### 1-1-1. Understanding Knowledge Management:

Knowledge management is a modern term with various interpretations. According to the Oxford Dictionary, it refers to "the creation and sharing of knowledge within an organization" (Oxford University Press, 2009). Different fields perceive it as a human-centric approach to managing knowledge. Scholars like Batman and Snell describe it as "the practices aimed at utilizing an organization's intellectual resources" (Batman & Snell, 2009). Similarly, another definition states it as "the process of acquiring, exchanging, renewing, and managing data and knowledge in an organization to enhance productivity and performance" (Dennis, Christine, & Okeke, 2022). Higher education views it as a structured endeavor to develop and apply knowledge practices, assisting academic institutions in effectively harnessing and utilizing academic knowledge (Ramachandran, Chong, & Wong, 2013). These definitions underscore its role as both a scientific discipline and a management practice, particularly vital in higher education, where knowledge is both the principal input and output.

### 1-1-2. The Four Pillars of Knowledge Management:

Experts often break down knowledge management into four primary elements, detailed as follows:

#### - Knowledge Acquisition:

This involves the systematic collection of knowledge from various internal and external sources (Ugwu, 2018).

#### - Knowledge Storage:

Abubakar Mohammed, Hamza, Maher Ahmed, & Alev (2019) discuss the methodologies and systems used to save and organize knowledge in accessible formats, ensuring its retrieval as needed.

#### - Knowledge Distribution:

Defined as the sharing of knowledge within and outside the organization, enhancing its utility and application across different sectors (Namdev Dhamdhere, 2015).

#### - Knowledge Application:

This refers to the actual utilization of knowledge in activities such as problem-solving and decision-making, crucial for organizational success. The correct implementation of knowledge is vital, as misapplication can severely disrupt the entire knowledge management cycle (Namdev Dhamdhere, 2015).

## 2. Methods and Materials

### 2-1. Population and Sample:

The study's target group included all faculty members employed at the University of Adrar. Utilizing a census approach, the research aimed to gather comprehensive data from the entire faculty population. During the second quarter of 2023, a total of 522 faculty members were approached with a questionnaire, and 102 responded, resulting in a 19.54% response rate.

### 2-2. Instrumentation:

We conducted primary data collection using an online questionnaire that directly collected information from the participants. The questionnaire consisted of five demographic questions (covering gender, age, work experience, academic rank, and faculty affiliation) and 15 items addressing the four facets of the knowledge management process: Knowledge Acquisition (4 items), Knowledge Storage (3 items), Knowledge Distribution (4 items), and Knowledge Application (4 items). We adapted these items from existing literature. We used a five-point Likert scale to organize our comments, with a range of 1 (indicating strong disagreement) to 5 (indicating strong agreement). We upheld ethical considerations by ensuring respondent confidentiality, ensuring voluntary participation, and using the collected data solely for academic purposes.

### 2-3. Reliability and Validity of the Research Instrument:

#### 2-3-1. Reliability:

The reliability of the research instrument was confirmed through the Cronbach's alpha coefficient. The overall instrument showed a

Cronbach's alpha of 0.884, indicating high reliability. The alpha coefficients for the individual dimensions varied from 0.693 to 0.783, suggesting that the questionnaire is a reliable tool for reproducing consistent outcomes under similar conditions (see **table 01**).

#### **1-1-1. Validity of the toll:**

The instrument's validity was assessed by calculating the correlation values between the scores in each dimension and the overall scale score. Upon calculating the Pearson Correlation Coefficients, as presented in Table 02, it is evident that the correlation values between the average of each dimension of the knowledge management process and the average, as well as the overall average, of the total scale (knowledge management process as a cumulative variable), were positive and fell within the range of 0.648 to 0.860. This indicates that the scale is highly valid. Therefore, the instrument may be confidently utilized in this investigation for data collection.

## **2- Results and Discussion:**

### **1-2- Demographic and Occupational profile of the Participants:**

The first component of the questionnaire consisted of five (05) inquiries about the respondents' demographic and vocational attributes. **Table 3** presents the demographic characteristics of the participants in this research. The prevalence of male lecturers at the University of Adrar is shown by the (74.50%) male participants in this survey. Regarding age distribution, a minority of instructors (07.80%) were less than 31 years old, while the majority (38.20%) were within the age range of 31–40. An equal percentage of teachers were in the age range of 41–50, and the smallest proportion (15.70%) consisted of teachers over the age of 50. We observed that 46.10% of instructors had less than 10 years of job experience, 46.10% had 11 to 20 years of experience, and the lowest proportion, 12.70%, had more than 21 years of experience at the institution. The data indicates that 29.40% of the respondents held assistant instructor positions, 45.10% were lecturers, and nearly a quarter had the title of professor. The

distribution of respondents according to their faculties revealed a disparity among the faculties. The faculty of sciences and technology accounted for 30.40% of the respondents, the faculty of law and political sciences accounted for 6.90%, the faculty of economic, commerce, and management sciences accounted for 29.40%, the faculty of human, social, and Islamic sciences accounted for 22.50%, and the faculty of arts and languages accounted for 10.80%.

### **1-3- Descriptive Analysis:**

We computed the mean and standard deviation for each dimension and the aggregate mean of all dimensions (mean group) to characterize the reactions towards knowledge management approaches. According to the data shown in **Table 4**, the scores varied from 3.44 to 3.89. Knowledge acquisition and knowledge application had the greatest average score, while knowledge storage and knowledge dissemination had the lowest average score. Therefore, these results showed a rather high level of knowledge management techniques among university lecturers.

### **1-4- The Test of Normal Distribution:**

Assessing the data's normalcy assumption is a common practice in data analysis. It is a critical step in selecting appropriate statistical techniques and ensuring an effective study. In normalcy testing, the null and alternative hypotheses typically take the following form:

H0: The data follows a normal distribution.

H1: The data does not follow a normal distribution.

The p-values for the (S K) and (W S) tests in **Table 05** are clearly higher than the usual 0.05 significance level. They are  $0.20 > 0.05$  for the (S K) test and  $0.18 > 0.05$  for the (W S) test. It indicates that the assumption of normalcy was met, and hence, the null hypothesis should be accepted while the alternative hypothesis should be rejected. Therefore, the data follows a normal distribution. Furthermore, we permit and view the use of parametric statistics favorably.

### **1-5- Statistical Hypotheses Testing:**

#### **1-5-1. The Main Hypothesis (H1):**

The first main hypothesis of the study assumes: **There is no significant difference between the participants' mean scores on the knowledge**

### management process and the theoretical mean of the scale.

This hypothesis can be restated in statistical hypothesis form as follows:

$$H_0: \mu = 3$$

$$H_1: \mu > 3$$

In order to confirm the first primary hypothesis, it was necessary to use a single-sample T-test. People often use this type of test to compare the sample data's mean with a hypothetical number. According to **Table 6**, the average scores of the participants in knowledge management were higher than the expected average of the scale ( $3.68 > 3$ ). Concurrently, the computed average value was precisely positioned between the higher and lower limits of the confidence range [3.59–3.77]. In addition, it is worth noting that the p-value (0.00) was below the predetermined threshold (0.05), indicating that the mean scores of the participants were statistically significant. The results disproved the null hypothesis and confirmed the alternative hypothesis. Based on the previous investigation, the professors at the University of Adrar showed a significant level of proficiency in knowledge management procedures.

#### 1-5-2. The Main Hypothesis (H2):

The second main hypothesis of the study states: **There is no significant difference in the degree of knowledge management practices among teachers due to their demographic and occupational characteristics.**

In order to test this hypothesis, it was necessary to use an appropriate analysis of variance to compare the means of two or more independent variables. When there are two independent groups, we use the T-test, and when there are more than two, we use the F-test. The decision rule always depends on comparing the significance level (T or F) with the required significance level (0.05). Furthermore, it was crucial to conduct Levine's test to verify whether the independent groups exhibit identical variance (variance homogeneity). Due to the abundance of demographic and occupational factors among respondents, it is advisable to partition the second primary hypothesis into the following five sub-hypotheses: **Sub-hypothesis (H21): There is no significant difference in the degree of knowledge**

### management practices among teachers due to their gender.

According to **Table 7**, the p-value of Levine's test was higher than the specified significance threshold ( $0.536 > 0.05$ ). It indicates that the variations among the gender groups in knowledge management approaches are equal. Furthermore, the requirement for similar variances in the dependent variable (knowledge management practices) across the two independent groups (male, female) of the overall variable (gender) was met. Once Levine's test has been satisfied, a T-test may be performed. Upon examining the results of the T-test in **Table 7**, it is evident that the significance level of (T) exceeded the predetermined threshold of 0.05. Therefore, we can confirm the first sub-hypothesis. Put simply, the gender (male or female) of instructors did not have an impact on their level of knowledge management methods.

**Sub-hypothesis (H22): There is no significant difference in the degree of knowledge management practices among teachers due to their age.**

According to **Table 8**, the p-value of Levine's test exceeded the specified significance threshold ( $0.056 > 0.05$ ). It indicates that the variability in knowledge management techniques, which is the dependent variable, across the four independent age groups (less than 31, 31–40, 41–50, and over 50) was similar. Therefore, the F-test may be performed. The F-test findings in **Table 8** indicate that the significance level (F) was 0.979, which is more than the threshold of 0.05. Therefore, we might consider the second sub-hypothesis valid. Simply put, the age of instructors did not affect their knowledge management methods.

**Sub-hypothesis (H23): There is no significant difference in the degree of knowledge management practices among teachers due to their working experience.**

According to **Table 9**, the p-value of Levine's test is 0.370, indicating that there is no significant difference in the variances of the working experience groups in knowledge management techniques. In other words, the need for similar variances on the dependent variable (knowledge management techniques) across the three independent groups (less than 10, 11–20, and

more than 21) based on the aggregate variable (working experience) was met. Consequently, it is possible to do an F-test. The findings indicate that the significance level of (F) exceeded the specified cut-off value of 0.05. Therefore, we can confirm the third sub-hypothesis. To put it simply, the level of knowledge management techniques among instructors was unaffected by their differences in working experience (seniority).

**Sub-hypothesis (H24): There is no significant difference in the degree of knowledge management practices among teachers due to their academic rank.**

According to the data in **Table 10**, the p-value of Levine's test above the predetermined significance limit ( $0.060 > 0.05$ ). It indicates that the variations of the academic rank groups in knowledge management techniques are equal. The requirement for equal variances in the dependent variable (knowledge management practices) among the five independent groups [(Assistant Teacher Class B), (Assistant Teacher Class A), (Lecturer Class B), (Lecturer Class A), (Professor)] based on the aggregate variable (academic rank) was met. Once the Levine's test has been satisfied, an F-test may be performed. Upon examining the results of the F-test in **Table 10**, it is evident that the significance level of (F) exceeded the specified threshold of 0.05. Therefore, the fourth sub-hypothesis may be affirmed. Put simply, the variation in academic rank among instructors did not have an impact on their use of knowledge management strategies.

**Sub-hypothesis (H25): There is no significant difference in the degree of knowledge management practices among teachers due to their faculty.**

According to **Table 11**, the p-value of Levine's test was higher than the specified significance threshold ( $0.250 > 0.05$ ). It signifies that the variances among the faculty groups in knowledge management approaches are equal. The variation of the dependent variable (knowledge management techniques) across the five independent groups of the aggregate variable (faculty) was homogenous. When examining the results of the F-test in **Table 11**, it is noteworthy that the significance level of (F) exceeded the predetermined threshold of 0.05. Therefore, we

might conclude that the fifth sub-hypothesis is valid. The variation in faculty employment did not have an impact on instructors' knowledge management techniques.

### Conclusion:

People often regard universities as the foremost institutions for generating knowledge. Therefore, effective management is crucial, especially in a competitive environment that poses several challenges. This particular topic of inquiry has piqued the interest of researchers. Consequently, a multitude of studies have been carried out on the subject of knowledge management within the framework of higher education institutions. The purpose of this research was to provide a comprehensive assessment of the knowledge management procedures at the University of Adrar.

In light of the issues addressed, the current study ends by asserting the following: - The professors of Adrar University effectively engage in knowledge management, primarily via the processes of obtaining, storing, sharing, and applying information.

- The teachers at the University of Adrar exhibited a profound level of expertise in implementing knowledge management practices across all four dimensions of the knowledge management process. These dimensions, as relevant to the current study, encompass four essential components: knowledge acquisition, knowledge storage, knowledge distribution, and knowledge application.

- The user did not provide any text. The variations in demographic and occupational characteristics, such as gender, age, working experience, academic rank, and faculty, did not have an impact on the level of knowledge management methods among instructors.

- The user did not provide any text. The overall level of knowledge management practices among instructors was sufficiently high. However, more efforts are required to improve the storage and dissemination aspects of these practices.

- Upon reviewing the findings of this research, the below suggestions are proposed.

- Create a tailored training program on knowledge management for instructors and other university members to enhance their effectiveness in fulfilling their goal.
- The user did not provide any text. Regularly assess instructors' knowledge management practices to identify any fluctuations in their level of implementation. Additionally, use the outcomes as a methodology to evaluate the efficiency of departments and faculties.
- The user did not provide any text. Develop a knowledge management system and integrate it with the university's strategic objectives. This facilitates strategic thinking and action among all university members, while also promoting collaboration and aligning the activities of all system members.

#### References (APA 6<sup>th</sup> edition):

- [1] Abubakar Mohammed, A., Hamza, E., Maher Ahmed, A., & Alev, E. (2019). Knowledge Management, Decision-Making Style, and Organisation. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, 4(2), 104–114.
- [2] BATMAN, T. S., & SNEEL, S. A. (2009). *Management: Leading & Collaborating in the Competitive World*. New York: McGraw-Hill Irwin.
- [3] Dennis, P., Christine, M., & OKEKE, J.-P. (2022). Knowledge Management Practices: A Public Sector Perspective. *Journal of Business Research*, 1(153), 509–516.
- [4] Kanyundo, A. J., Chipeta, G. T., & Chawinga, W. D. (2023). An analysis of knowledge management practices at Lilongwe University of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Malawi. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 8(1), 1–9.
- [5] KHAN BABER, M. A., JUMANI, N. B., MUHAMMED, S. T., & HAFEZ UDDIN, S. A. (2016). Knowledge Management Practices: Teachers Perception. *European Scientific Journal*, 12(25), 365–372.
- [6] LAAL, M. (2011). Knowledge management in higher education. *Procedia Computer science*, 3(2), 544–549
- [7] NAIR, B. V., & MAUNUSAMI, C. (2020). Knowledge Management Practices: An Exploratory Study at the Malaysian Higher Education Institutions. *Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching & Learning*, 13(2), 174–190.
- [8] NAMDEV DHAMDHERE, S. (2015). Importance of Knowledge Management in the Higher Education Institutes. 16(1), 162–183.
- [9] Nawaz, N., Durst, S., Hariharasudan, A., & Shamugia, Z. (2020). Knowledge Management Practices in Higher Education Institutions - A Comparative Study. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 22(2), 291–307.
- [10] NUNES, J. M., KANWAL, S., & ARIF, M. (2017). Knowledge Management Practices in Higher Educational Institutions: a Systematic Literature Review. Dans I. W. Library (Éd.). Wroclaw, Poland.
- [11] Oxford University Press. (2009). *A Dictionary of Business and Management* (ed. 5th edition). New York: Oxford University Press.
- [12] RAMACHANDRAN, S. D., CHONG, S.-C., & WONG, K.-Y. (2013). Knowledge Management Practices and Enablers in Public Universities: A Gap Analysis. *Campus-Wide Information Systems*, 30(2), 76–94.
- [13] SUPERMANE, S., & MOH TAHIR, L. (2018). An overview of knowledge management practice among teachers. *Global Knowledge, Memory, and Communication*, 67(8/9), 616–631.
- [14] UGWU, C. I. (2018). Organization Factors as Predictors of Knowledge Management Practices in Federal University Libraries in Nigeria. *Evidence-Based Library and Information Practice*, 13(2), 48–69.
- [15] XUAN VU N. (2019). Knowledge management in business and education: Evidence from Vietnam companies and universities. *Management Sciences Letters*, 9(12), 3063–2072.

**Appendices:**

**Table 01 Test reliability for the overall dimensions of K M**

Number	Dimensions	Number of Items	Reliability Coefficients
1	Knowledge Acquisition	04	0.701
2	Knowledge Storage	03	0.693
3	Knowledge Distribution	04	0.783
4	Knowledge Application	04	0.729
	Overall	15	0.884

**Table 02 Test validity for the overall dimensions of K M**

Number	Dimensions	Correlation Coefficients	Level of Sig
1	Knowledge Acquisition	0.648	0.00
2	Knowledge Storage	0.659	0.00
3	Knowledge Distribution	0.830	0.00
4	Knowledge Application	0.653	0.00

**Table 03 Description of the sample**

Variables	Categories	Frequency	Percent (%)
Gender	Male	76	74.50 %
	Female	26	25.50 %
Age	Less than 31	08	07.80 %
	31- 40	39	38.20 %
	41 - 50	39	38.20 %
	above 50	16	15.70 %
Working Experience	Less than 10	47	46.10 %
	11 - 20	42	41.20 %
	More than 21	13	12.70 %
Academic Ranks	Assistant Teacher class (B)	13	12.70 %
	Assistant Teacher class (A)	17	16.70 %
	Lecturer class (B)	16	15.70 %
	Lecturer class (A)	20	29.40 %
Faculty	Professor	26	25.50 %
	Sciences and Technology	31	30.40 %
	Law and political sciences	07	06.90 %
	Economics, commerce, and management sciences	30	29.40 %
	Human, Social, and Islamic Sciences	23	22.50 %
	Arts and Languages	11	10.80 %
	Total Results	102	100 %

**Table 04 Mean value and standard deviation of the dimensions of knowledge management**

Dimensions	Means	SD	Level of Sig	Degree of Agreement
Knowledge Acquisition	3.89	0.53	0.00	High
Knowledge Storage	3.44	0.70	0.00	High
Knowledge Distribution	3.44	0.73	0.00	High
Knowledge Application	3.89	0.55	0.00	High
Overall (the group mean)	3.68	0.46	0.00	High

**Table 05 A Normal Test**

Variable	Normality Test Methods			
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov Statistics	Sig	Shapiro-Wilk Statistics	Sig
Knowledge Management	0.061	0.20	0.98	0.18

**Table 06 T-test Statistics of Knowledge Management**

Variable	T	Mean	Standard Deviation	Confidence Interval		Sig
				Min	Max	
Knowledge Management	79.87	3.68	0.46	3.59	3.77	0.00

**Table 07 Results of T-test on the differences in K M based on Gender**

Variable	Grouping Variable (Gender)	Leven's Test		T - Test	
		F	Sig	T	Sig
Knowledge Management	Male-→ Female	0.386	0.536	0.385	0.701

**Table 08 Results of F- test on the differences in K M based on Age**

Variable	Grouping Variable (Age)	Leven's Test		F - Test	
		F	Sig	F	Sig
KnowledgeManagement	Less than 31	2.600	0.056	0.063	0.979
	31 - 40				
	41 - 50				
	above 50				

**Table 09 Results of F- test on the differences in K M based on working Experience**

Variable	Grouping Variable (Working Experience)	Leven's Test		F - Test	
		F	Sig	F	Sig
Knowledge Management	Less than 10	1.004	0.370	0.720	0.489
	11 - 20				
	More than 21				

**Table 10 Results of F- test on the differences in K M based on Academic Rank**

Variable	Grouping Variable (Academic Rank)	Leven's Test		F - Test	
		F	Sig	F	Sig
Knowledge Management	Assistant Teacher Class (B)	2.350	0.060	1.573	0.188
	Assistant Teacher Class (A)				
	Lecturer Class (B)				
	Lecturer Class (A)				
	Professor				

**Table 11 Results of F- test on the differences in K M based on Faculty**

Variable	Grouping Variable (Faculty)	Leven's Test		F - Test	
		F	Sig	F	Sig
Knowledge Management	Sciences and Technology	1.370	0.250	1.775	0.140
	Law and political sciences				
	Economics, commerce, and management sciences				
	Human, Social, and Islamic Sciences				
	Arts and Languages				