



Knowledge Management (KM) Practices at Northeastern College: Insights from the College of Liberal Arts Students

Jhun F. Fernando¹, Janice D. Bulan², Shiela Marie G. Ancheta³, Mark Kevin Astrero⁴

^{1,2,4} Faculty, Northeastern College

³ Student, Northeastern College

ABSTRACT

Published Online: January 26, 2026

One of the competitions in the knowledge economy is becoming increasingly crucial, and many HEIs are adopting knowledge management as a tool to sustain their market position. This study aims to determine and analyze the level of awareness and knowledge of the respondents from the College of Liberal Arts at Northeastern College regarding knowledge management and their practice of knowledge creation, capture, organization, storage, dissemination, and application. Specifically, it describes how respondents' profiles and their levels of awareness and knowledge of KM relate to KM practice. Using the quantitative method, a survey was administered among 50 students. The data were analyzed using frequency percentages and a weighted mean. Results revealed that respondents are moderately aware and knowledgeable about KM. The study concludes that the institution is practicing the KM processes. However, knowledge organization and knowledge application are the most practiced and observed. The level of awareness of KM affects respondents perceived practice of the knowledge management processes, while the level of knowledge does not.

KEYWORDS:

Knowledge Management, Academic Ideas, Research Management, College

1. INTRODUCTION

Knowledge management (KM) has emerged as a vital organizational strategy, enabling institutions to harness, share, and effectively utilize knowledge to achieve their objectives. In educational institutions, particularly colleges and universities, KM plays a pivotal role in enhancing teaching and learning and administrative efficiency.

Knowledge Management is the organized management of an organization's knowledge assets to create value and meet its targeted objectives (Downing & Hardman, 2009). It comprises systems, processes, and strategies for maintaining and improving the creation, storage, assessment, and dissemination of knowledge. KM also contributes to competitive advantage through innovation, since knowledge is the foundation of innovation (du Plessis, 2007). The role of knowledge management in an organization's innovation is important because organizations with high innovation are difficult competitors in the market (du Plessis, 2007).

Like business organizations, Higher Educational Institutions (HEIs) are affected by rapid economic changes. HEIs must think and act like businesses to sustain their competitive advantage and market position (William & Amin, 2006). How institutions manage the changes in the knowledge economy affects their competitiveness and their ability to stay in business (Zwain, 2012). HEIs need to recognize knowledge management and apply it in their organization so they will achieve effective decision-making, planning, and enhancement (Bhusry, Ranjan & Nagar, 2011).

A study in India by Bhusry, Ranjan, & Nagar (2011) aimed to accentuate HEIs' need for knowledge management. HEIs are growing in India, and as pressure and competition increase, they are recognizing KM as a key asset. HEIs need to recognize knowledge management and apply it within their organizations to achieve effective decision-making, planning, and enhancement.

Ohiorenoya and Eboime (2014) identified that knowledge management across universities in Nigeria influences organizational performance in innovation, growth, and competitive advantage. They also conclude that KM has a positive effect on overall performance, innovation, and competitive advantage in HEIs. Through knowledge management practices, organizations can easily identify the processes involved in enhancing their strategies (Zwain,

Corresponding Author: Jhun F. Fernando

**Cite this Article: Jhun F. Fernando, Janice D. Bulan, Shiela Marie G. Ancheta, Mark Kevin Astrero (2026). Knowledge Management (KM) Practices at Northeastern College: Insights from the College of Liberal Arts Students. International Journal of Social Science and Education Research Studies, 6(1), 68-75*

Jhun F. Fernando et al, Knowledge Management (KM) Practices at Northeastern College: Insights from the College of Liberal Arts Students

2012). Unfortunately, few higher education institutions (HEIs), if any, achieve all, or even most, of these rewards in practice.

This study explores knowledge management practices at Northeastern College, with a specific focus on students' perspectives in the College of Liberal Arts. By understanding their insights, this research aims to identify strengths, challenges, and areas for improvement in the institution's KM strategies, contributing to its overall academic and operational excellence.

Theoretical Framework

This study is anchored on Nonaka and Takeuchi's Knowledge Spiral Theory (1995), which emphasizes the dynamic interaction between tacit and explicit knowledge in organizational contexts. The theory outlines four processes: socialization, externalization, combination, and internalization (SECI). These processes highlight how knowledge is created, shared, and institutionalized.

Key Concepts of the Knowledge Spiral Theory

Tacit Knowledge: Personal, context-specific, and hard-to-formalize knowledge. Examples include skills or insights gained through experience.

Explicit Knowledge: Knowledge that is codified, easily communicated, and shared in documents or systems, such as manuals or reports.

The spiral of knowledge emerges as these two types of knowledge interact through the SECI process:

The SECI Model

Socialization (Tacit to Tacit)

Knowledge is shared through direct interaction, such as mentorship, storytelling, or observation. For example, an apprentice learning from a master craftsman by observing and practicing.

Externalization (Tacit to Explicit)

Tacit knowledge is articulated and converted into explicit knowledge through models, concepts, or diagrams. For instance, a manager translates their leadership insights into training modules.

Combination (Explicit to Explicit)

Existing explicit knowledge is reorganized and synthesized to create new explicit knowledge. This can occur through activities such as data integration, report creation, or knowledge mapping.

Internalization (Explicit to Tacit)

Explicit knowledge is absorbed and internalized by individuals, becoming part of their tacit knowledge base. This process often involves learning by doing or practicing new concepts.

Statement of the Problem

This study aimed to examine knowledge management practices at Northeastern College as perceived by students in the College of Liberal Arts.

Specifically, it attempted to answer the following:

1. What is the level of awareness and knowledge of the respondents in terms of knowledge management?
2. What are the knowledge management practices of Northeastern College as to:
 - 2.1. Knowledge Creation;
 - 2.2. Knowledge Capture;
 - 2.3. Knowledge Organization;
 - 2.4. Knowledge Storage;
 - 2.5. Knowledge Dissemination; and,
 - 2.6. Knowledge Application?

II. METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the research design, the study locale, the research respondents, the research instruments, the data-gathering instruments, the data-gathering procedures, and the statistical treatment of the data.

Research Design

A descriptive quantitative research design was used in this study, in which the researchers collected quantifiable data from respondents in the College of Liberal Arts. Descriptive research involves collecting data that describes events, which are then organized, tabulated, depicted, and detailed. This design is appropriate for assessing respondents' awareness and knowledge of Northeastern College's knowledge management practices.

Locale of the Study

The research was conducted at the institution where the researchers are currently employed and a student of Bachelor of Arts in Communication. The researchers considered visibility and accessibility to the target respondents during the actual administration of the survey questionnaire.

Northeastern College was founded in 1941 by educationally minded citizens, Atty. Francisco E. Pascual, his wife, Doña Emeteria Bautista Pascual, and Mr. Leon Cadaoas, who were all residents of Santiago, Isabela.

The Institute was the first to offer secondary education in the province, originally started with Doña Emeteria B. Pascual serving as the classroom teacher and principal in one.

From 1945 to 1948, enrollment considerably increased. On April 25, 1949, the first commencement exercises of the Normal Department of the college were held, followed by another one on December 17, 1949. The efficient management of the college, coupled with effective instruction, was the college's greatest investment over the past five decades, resulting in more college courses clamored for by the community. Today, in response to this clamor, the college now offers fifteen (15) undergraduate courses, including Bachelor of Science in Nursing and Midwifery Education, Bachelor of Science in Information Technology, Bachelor of Science in Computer Engineering, Bachelor of Arts in Mass Communication, five postgraduate studies, and six computer short-term courses.

Jhun F. Fernando et al, Knowledge Management (KM) Practices at Northeastern College: Insights from the College of Liberal Arts Students

From its humble beginning, NC now stands as one of the formidable educational institutions in the valley, as attested by the constant increase in enrollment, regular faculty development, continuous improvement of its educational facilities, and its active involvement in the community. Foremost, it lives by its mission as the valley's true "Mint of Wisdom".

Respondents of the Study

The respondents of the study were fifty (50) students of the College of Liberal Arts who were randomly selected during the First Semester of the School Year 2024-2025.

A simple random was used to determine the sample size. Random sampling refers to selection techniques in which sample members are selected by chance, with a known probability of selection.

Likewise, the respondents are chosen based on the established criteria:

- Bonafide student of Northeastern College – College of Liberal Arts;
- Willing to participate in the study.

Data Gathering Instruments

Questionnaire. The researchers adapted the questionnaire from Lawson's Knowledge Management Assessment Instrument (2002) and Ramachandran et al. (2013), which contains Likert scales about the knowledge management processes, as to a) Knowledge Creation, b) Knowledge Capture, c) Knowledge Organization, d) Knowledge Storing, e) Knowledge Dissemination, and f) Knowledge Application.

Data Gathering Procedure

A request letter to conduct the study was prepared and sent to the Dean of the College. Once approval was secured, letters to the respondents and questionnaires were distributed to the students. After the students had answered the questionnaire, the results were recorded, tabulated, and interpreted.

In compliance with research ethics, the researchers ensured that respondents were willing to participate, had read and fully understood the terms and conditions, and agreed to complete the questionnaire. The researchers also made sure that every respondent remained anonymous to protect their privacy.

Statistical Treatment of the Data

The data gathered from the respondents were classified, analyzed, and interpreted with the use of the following statistical tools:

Demographic profile data were analyzed using frequency counts and percentages.

Weighted Mean was used to summarize the respondents' levels of awareness and knowledge of knowledge management. The same statistical treatment was also used to interpret the knowledge management practices in the institution where the respondents are, while mean and

standard deviation were used to analyze the knowledge management test results.

III. RESULTS

This chapter presents the results and interpretation of the data gathered.

Table 1. Level of Awareness on Knowledge Management

Particulars	WM	QD
1. I am aware of technology's major role in creating, sharing, and acquiring knowledge.	4.02	MA
2. I am aware that our institution considers knowledge as a part of its asset.	3.82	MA
3. I am aware that our institution has a systematic way of creating, capturing, organizing, disseminating, and transferring knowledge from one department to another.	3.75	MA
4. I am aware that Knowledge Management is being implemented in our institution.	3.64	MA
5. I am aware of what is Knowledge Management.	3.63	MA
Average Weighted Mean	3.77	MA

Table 1 shows that respondents are moderately aware of knowledge management, with an average weighted mean of 3.77. This implies that the students are not fully aware of what knowledge management is. The indicator "I am aware of technology's major role in creating, sharing, and acquiring knowledge" has the highest weighted mean of 4.02, indicating "Moderately Aware." On the other hand, the lowest weighted mean of 3.63 pertains to respondents' moderate awareness of their KM awareness. All the indicators were interpreted as moderately aware. Such awareness may be fostered by technological innovations that have played a significant role in improving an institution's educational services (Bhusry & Ranjan, 2011).

Table 2. Level of Knowledge-on-Knowledge Management

Level	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Highly Knowledgeable	17	34%
Knowledgeable	25	50%
Not Knowledgeable	8	16%
Total	50	100.0%

Table 2 shows that 25 of 50 respondents (50%) are knowledgeable about KM. This means that respondents are knowledgeable about knowledge management. On the other

Jhun F. Fernando et al, Knowledge Management (KM) Practices at Northeastern College: Insights from the College of Liberal Arts Students

hand, 17 or 34% are highly knowledgeable about KM, while the remaining 8 or 16% are not. Likewise, the respondents in this study are knowledgeable about KM, as managing knowledge is a natural practice in HEIs. As Dalkir (2013) reviewed KM, she identified that KM is not a completely new concept; therefore, people in the HEIs are already knowledgeable about it.

Table 3. Knowledge Creation Practice

Knowledge Creation	WM	QD
1. The institution creates new knowledge with the help of Research and Development.	4.23	SA
2. The institution has the means to create and acquire knowledge from different sources such as faculty employees, students, competitors, and industry.	3.64	A
3. The institution encourages the exchange of ideas and knowledge between faculty, students and other employees.	3.86	A
4. The institution has rewards or recognition for new ideas and knowledge.	4.21	SA
5. The institution has a strong focus when it comes to creating new knowledge.	3.87	A
6. The institution uses lessons learned from projects to improve successive projects.	3.30	MA
7. The institution has the means for creating new knowledge from existing knowledge.	3.69	A
8. The institution has processes for exchanging ideas and knowledge between faculty, students and other employees.	3.32	MA
Weighted Mean	3.76	A

Table 3 indicates that respondents agreed with the institution's knowledge-creation practices, with an overall weighted mean of 3.76. This reflects the institution's value for creating new knowledge. Likewise, students strongly agreed that the institution creates new knowledge through Research and Development (WM=4.23) and that it offers rewards or recognition for new ideas and knowledge (WM=4.21). On the other hand, they moderately agreed that the institution has processes for exchanging ideas and knowledge among faculty, students, and other employees (WM=3.32) and that the institution uses lessons learned from projects to improve subsequent projects (WM=3.30).

Table 4. Knowledge Capture Practice

Knowledge Capture	WM	QD
1. The institution collaborates and establishes alliances or partnerships with other business organizations.	3.68	A
2. The institution has policies used to allow faculty employees to present freely new knowledge and ideas.	3.64	A
3. The institution responds to academic ideas, documents and uses them for further development.	3.53	A
4. The institution has a strong focus when it comes to capturing knowledge.	3.55	A
5. The institution has the means of converting knowledge into action plans and designs of new academic services.	3.87	A
6. The institution has the means of absorbing and transferring knowledge to and from faculty employees.	3.76	A
Weighted Mean	3.67	Agree

As with knowledge creation, the results in Table 4 show that the respondents agreed on all processes, indicating knowledge capture, with an average weighted mean of 3.67. This means that the process of making knowledge is explicit, so it can be shared and used. The highest-weighted mean of 3.87 pertains to the institution's methods for translating knowledge into action plans and for designing new academic services. However, the institution's process for responding to academic ideas and documents, and for using them for further development, garnered the lowest weighted mean of 3.53.

Table 5. Knowledge Organization Practice

Knowledge Organization	WM	QD
1. Faculty employees are specially tasked to keep knowledge current and up to date.	4.22	SA
2. The institution has a strong focus when it comes to organizing their knowledge.	3.74	A
3. The institution provides feedback to faculty employees with regards to their ideas and knowledge.	3.96	A
4. The institution has processes for applying knowledge learned from experiences and matches sources of knowledge to problems and challenges.	3.85	A

Jhun F. Fernando et al, Knowledge Management (KM) Practices at Northeastern College: Insights from the College of Liberal Arts Students

5. The institution has the means of filtering, crosslisting and integrating different sources and types of knowledge.	3.88	A
6. This institution has a policy regarding the review of knowledge on a regular basis.	4.33	SA
Weighted Mean	4.00	Agree

Table 5 shows that respondents agreed with the institution's knowledge organization practices, with an average weighted mean of 4.00. This means there are policies for reviewing the institution's knowledge. The results indicate that respondents strongly agreed that the institution has a policy for regularly reviewing knowledge (WM=4.33) and that faculty are specifically tasked with keeping knowledge current and up to date (WM=4.22). However, the statement about the institution's strong focus on organizing its knowledge has the lowest weighted mean of 3.74, indicating "Agree."

Table 6. Knowledge Storing Practice

Knowledge Storing	WM	QD
1. The institution makes use of different written devices such as newsletters, manuals to store knowledge captured from academics.	3.87	A
2. The institution makes use of databases, repositories, database warehouse, and information technology applications to store knowledge.	3.38	MA
3. The institution has a strong focus when it comes to storing knowledge.	3.86	A
4. The institution has the means of converting knowledge into action plans and designs of new academic services.	3.75	A
5. The institution codifies knowledge through databases, directories of expertise, procedural handbooks, and email messages.	3.39	MA
6. The institution has procedures when it comes to patent and copyright new knowledge.	3.32	MA
Average Weighted Mean	3.60	A

Table 6 presents the knowledge storage practice at Northeastern College, with an average weighted mean of 3.60, indicating agreement. This denotes that the institution uses technology and other databases to store knowledge. The

highest weighted mean is 3.87, suggesting that the institution uses various written devices, such as newsletters and manuals, to capture knowledge from academics. Results also show that the respondents agreed that the institution has a strong focus on storing knowledge (WM=3.86) and on converting knowledge into action plans and the design of new academic services (WM=3.75). However, respondents moderately agreed that institution codifies knowledge through databases, directories of expertise, procedural handbooks, and email messages (WM=3.39), make use of databases, repositories, database warehouses, and information technology applications to store knowledge (WM=3.38), and have procedures when it comes to patent and copyright new knowledge (WM=3.32). Institutions nowadays use technology as a tool in different knowledge management systems. Storing knowledge is a positive habit because one of HEIs' responsibilities is to integrate existing knowledge and store it for future reference and development (Devi Ramachandran, Chong & Wong, 2013).

Table 7. Knowledge Dissemination Practice

Knowledge Dissemination	WM	QD
1. The institution has the means of disseminating knowledge through publication, presentations, websites, white papers, teaching and learning activities, policies and reports.	3.31	MA
2. The institution has facilities such as libraries, research centers and other forums to show and disseminate their knowledge.	3.32	MA
3. The institution has frequent lectures, training, teaching symposium, conference sessions to share knowledge.	4.03	A
4. The institution disseminates knowledge that is written in common language, which is understood by all users.	4.13	A
5. The institution has a strong focus when it comes to disseminating knowledge.	3.87	A
6. The institution already has the knowledge that is readily accessible to faculty, students and employees.	3.39	MA
7. The institution transmits timely reports that are suitable for faculty employees, stakeholders and other relevant organizations.	3.55	A
Weighted Mean	3.66	A

Jhun F. Fernando et al, Knowledge Management (KM) Practices at Northeastern College: Insights from the College of Liberal Arts Students

Table 7 indicates that respondents agreed that knowledge dissemination is also being practiced actively in the institution, with an average weighted mean of 3.66. This means that knowledge dissemination is part of the KM process. The statement with the highest weighted mean of 4.13 pertains to the institution disseminating knowledge in a common language understood by all users, followed by the institution offering frequent lectures, training, teaching symposia, and conference sessions to share knowledge (WM=4.03). However, respondents moderately agreed that the institution already has the knowledge that is readily accessible to faculty, students and employees (WM=3.39), has facilities such as libraries, research centers and other forums to show and disseminate their knowledge (WM=3.32) and has the means of disseminating knowledge through publication, presentations, websites, white papers, teaching and learning activities, policies and reports (WM=3.31). Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) also use libraries, research centers, and other forums to show and disseminate their knowledge. These kinds of facilities also contribute to the success of knowledge management implementations (Ling, Bakar & Islam, 2014).

Table 8. Knowledge Application Practice

Knowledge Application	WM	QD
1. The institution has a strong focus when it comes to applying knowledge.	4.43	SA
2. The institution applies different methods for faculty employees in order for them to enhance and develop their knowledge and apply it for new situations.	3.74	A
3. This institution has the means to research and evaluate the knowledge used to create new patterns and knowledge for future use.	3.86	A
4. The institution applies knowledge through decision-making, innovation, and student relationship management.	3.75	A
5. The institution updates its current knowledge.	4.33	SA
6. This institution applies its knowledge in critical competitive needs and quickly connects knowledge in problem-solving.	3.89	A
7. The institution has security measures in protecting their knowledge against unreliable inside or outside institution.	3.94	A
Average Weighted Mean	3.99	A

Table 8 reveals that respondents agreed that knowledge management is applied in the institution, with an average weighted mean of 3.99. This also means that knowledge application is practiced at Northeastern College. It can be inferred that respondents strongly agreed that the institution has a strong focus on applying knowledge (WM=4.43) and updating its current knowledge (WM=4.33). The rest of the statements are interpreted as "Agree". All KM processes, including knowledge application, are positively associated with an HEI's academic performance (Zwain, 2012). The active practice of knowledge application is a good remark.

Table 9. Summary Table of the Knowledge Management Practices

Knowledge Management Practices	WM	QD
1. Knowledge Creation	3.76	Agree
2. Knowledge Capture	3.67	Agree
3. Knowledge Organization	4.00	Agree
4. Knowledge Storing	3.60	Agree
5. Knowledge Dissemination	3.66	Agree
6. Knowledge Application	3.99	Agree
Grand Mean	3.78	Agree

Table 9 shows that all the knowledge management practices, such as knowledge creation, knowledge capture, knowledge organization, knowledge storing, knowledge dissemination, and knowledge application, are interpreted as "Agree" with a grand mean of 3.78.

IV. DISCUSSION

In examining research on Northeastern College's Knowledge Management (KM) programs, it is necessary to situate them within the KM literature on the academic objectives and strategies employed by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) to effectively leverage their collective body of knowledge.

The distribution of responses indicates a propensity for Representation Bias within the Political Science Program: 64% of respondents identified as enrolled in the Political Science Program, whereas only 22% were enrolled in the Communication Program. Conversely, the English Language Program had a very low participation rate of 14% (among 640 respondents). Several decades of research indicate that students' cultural and educational backgrounds strongly influence their perceptions of knowledge and knowledge management (Adhikari & Shrestha, 2022).

Overall, the results of this survey indicate the respondents' overall Awareness of Knowledge Management is slightly higher than average (weighted mean of 3.77). This indicates that the respondents are only slightly aware of what KM is, but are still far from fully educated about its use in HEIs. The Technology Integration (Highest mean of 4.02) component indicates that technology will play a pivotal role in how KM is operationalized within the institution by the students who

Jhun F. Fernando et al, Knowledge Management (KM) Practices at Northeastern College: Insights from the College of Liberal Arts Students

currently have the lowest level of Self-Awareness regarding their own KM expertise (mean of 3.63). In other words, the low mean for Self-Awareness indicates potential to improve the effectiveness of KM practices, eventually leading to enhanced success in HEIs' Sustainability and Academic Performance (Eshbayev et al., 2023).

Current research indicates that technology can facilitate KM. Therefore, based on this and other documented evidence (Galgotia & Lakshmi, 2022), if HEIs were able to adequately utilize appropriate technologies to create and share information, their potential to support KM using technology would increase.

As stated by Dalkir (in Honarpour et al., 2017), KM is not new within academia and has demonstrated desirable intrinsic behaviors that could be improved or enhanced through the implementation of structured KM initiatives.

Based on a mean of 3.76, students indicated that the 'knowledge' produced by their institution is relevant. However, the Mean of 3.32 for the extent to which faculty and students swap ideas indicates that limited faculty-student collaboration may impede effective collaboration and, therefore, likely hinder the KM process (Indrašienė et al., 2021).

In addition, the literature indicates a connection between aligning KM with an organization's business goals and improving educational outcomes (Chatterjee et al., 2020). The school should convert information/data into usable academic services and achieve the school's objectives through those services (Nair & Munusami, 2019).

The respondents indicated a positive perception of the policies related to the organization of knowledge to maintain current knowledge (Mean = 4.33). Organizing knowledge effectively enables better access to and the use of knowledge (Ibrahim & Salleh, 2019). Formal codification of knowledge should be improved. The inference is that there exists an insufficient Level of KM capability within the organization (Terán-Bustamante et al., 2021).

The operational effectiveness of Northeastern College was reflected in the average response to the storage and distribution of knowledge, which was 3.60. However, both scores indicate an opportunity to enhance operational efficiencies through the implementation of knowledge management (KM) programs. Several Options are available for sharing knowledge; however, the respondents rated the degree of accessibility of Knowledge (3.39) to be just adequate, and that making institutional resources Easier to see and access would result in Better KM Program outcomes.

The item average on Knowledge Application (3.99) indicates Northeastern College's ongoing commitment to KM in education. These results indicate that KM will likely improve Research Collaboration and Student Performance. It is well documented through past Research that there is a Positive correlation between implementing KM Practices and Organizational success (Nair & Munusami, 2019). While the

positive perception of Knowledge Application within the College indicates a favorable association with KM, there is likely Much Room for Improvement in the integration of Knowledge into the College's Teaching and Learning Processes (Galgotia & Lakshmi, 2022).

V. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the gathered data, below are the conclusions drawn from the study:

1. The moderate level of students' awareness of KM indicates a significant knowledge gap, suggesting that half of the respondents lack sufficient knowledge of KM principles. This limited awareness may undermine the effectiveness of KM initiatives, as students may not fully engage with or maximize the benefits of these practices.
2. While respondents acknowledged the institution's efforts in knowledge creation, capture, organization, storage, dissemination, and application, the relatively moderate scores suggest that these processes may not be fully optimized.
3. The lower mean scores in knowledge capture and storage raise concerns about the institution's ability to systematically retain and utilize valuable information. Furthermore, while the institution has policies for reviewing knowledge, their actual implementation and effectiveness remain uncertain.
4. Northeastern College has established KM practices; however, they may not be effectively integrated or fully understood by students. Without stronger awareness, training, and reinforcement, the institution risks inefficiencies in knowledge utilization, limiting its ability to foster a truly knowledge-driven academic environment.

VI. DISCLOSURE

The author reports no conflicts of interest in this work.

REFERENCES

1. Adhikari, D. & Shrestha, P. (2022). Knowledge management initiatives for achieving Sustainable Development Goal 4.7: Higher Education Institutions' Stakeholder Perspectives. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 27(4), 1109–1139. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jkm-03-2022-0172>
2. Bhusry, M., & Ranjan, J. (2011). Implementing Knowledge Management in Higher Educational Institutions in India: A Conceptual Framework. *International Journal of Computer Applications*. <https://doi.org/10.5120/3527-4805>
3. Chatterjee, S., Rana, N., & Dwivedi, Y. (2020). Social media as a tool of knowledge sharing in academia: an empirical Study using valence, instrumentality, and expectancy (VIE)

Jhun F. Fernando et al, Knowledge Management (KM) Practices at Northeastern College: Insights from the College of Liberal Arts Students

- approach. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 24(10), 2531–2552. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jkm-04-2020-0252>
4. Dalkir, K. (2013). Knowledge management in theory and practice. In *Knowledge Management in Theory and Practice*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780080547367>
 5. Devi Ramachandran, S., Chong, S. C., & Wong, K. Y. (2013). Knowledge management practices and enablers in public universities: A gap analysis. *Campus-Wide Information Systems*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/10650741311306273>
 6. Downing, K., & Hardman, F. (2009). Knowledge Management Practices in Higher Learning Institutions in Sarawak. *Asian Journal of University Education*, 4(69–89).
 7. du Plessis, M. (2007). The role of knowledge management in innovation. *Journal of Knowledge Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13673270710762684>
 8. Eshbayev, O., Mirzaliev, S., Sultonov, M., Igamberdiev, A., Kholikova, N., Razikov, N., ... & Aziz, A. (2023). A digital sustainability approach for effective knowledge and information management in education-specific non-profit organizations: Culture Intelligent IS Solutions. *E3s Web of Conferences*, 452, 07023. <https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202345207023>
 9. Galgotia, D. & Lakshmi, N. (2022). Implementation of Knowledge Management in Higher Education: A Comparative Study of Private and Government Universities in India and Abroad. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.944153>
 10. Honarpour, A., Jusoh, A., & Long, C. (2017). Knowledge management and total quality management: a reciprocal relationship. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, 34(1), 91–102. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijqrm-03-2014-0040>
 11. Ibrahim, F. & Salleh, N. (2019). Embedding Knowledge Management Theory in Learning and Teaching Approach. *International Journal of Learning and Development*, 9(1), 19. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijld.v9i1.13786>
 12. Indrašienė, V., Jegelevičienė, V., Merfeldaitė, O., Penkauskienė, D., Pivorienė, J., Railienė, A., ... & Valavičienė, N. (2021). Linking Critical Thinking and Knowledge Management: A Conceptual Analysis. *Sustainability*, 13(3), 1476. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13031476>
 13. Ling, N. E., Bakar, R., & Islam, M. A. (2014). Awareness of knowledge management among higher learning institutions: A review. *Advances in Environmental Biology*.
 14. Nair, B. & Munusami, C. (2019). Knowledge management practices. *Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching & Learning*, 13(2), 174–190. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jrit-01-2019-0008>
 15. Ohioresnoya, J. O., & Eboreime, O. F. (2014). Knowledge management practices and performance in Nigerian universities. *European Scientific Journal*.
 16. Ramachandran, S., Chong, S., & Ismail, H. (2009). The practice of knowledge management processes. *Vine*, 39(3), 203–222. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03055720911003978>
 17. Terán-Bustamante, A., Martínez-Velasco, A., & Aragón, G. (2021). Knowledge Management for Open Innovation: Bayesian Networks through Machine Learning. *Journal of Open Innovation Technology Market and Complexity*, 7(1), 40. <https://doi.org/10.3390/joitmc7010040>
 18. William, N., & Amin, G. (2006). Higher Education in Sudan and Knowledge Management Applications. <https://doi.org/10.1109/iccta.2006.1684345>
 19. Zwain, A. A. A. L. K. T. S. N. O. (2012). Knowledge Management Processes and Academic Performance in Iraqi HEIs: An Empirical Investigation - ProQuest.