

# “Analysis of Implementation of Knowledge Management Process in University at Surabaya”

Eppy Setiyowati

Address: [eppyseti@gmail.com](mailto:eppyseti@gmail.com) , UNUSA JL SMEA 57 Surabaya

## I Background

Management of higher education can not be separated from the input, process and output. Input in higher education include: students, faculty, librarians, staff (administration) as well as physical infrastructure, while the process include: teaching and learning, management and administration of education management, and outputs include: the number of graduates and the quality of graduates.

Table 1.1 Profile of lecture in the public health faculty base on lecture functional academic, 2010 years

Functional academic	Σ Lecture					
	2008		2009		2010	
	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>
No job functional academic	11	14,66	8	10,1	8	10,1
Assistant experts	17	22,1	21	26,58	23	29,1
Lector	24	32,0	26	32,9	26	31,6
Head Lector	14	18,7	15	18,98	15	18,98
Professor	7	9,3	8	10,1	8	10,1
<b>Total</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>100</b>

Soucer: Self evaluation of public health faculty '10

Table 1.1 Position of functional academic lecturer at the Faculty of Public Health in 2008-2010 an assistant professor of experts to look up. Although it has not yet decreased academic position, with the addition of new faculty 6 people, there are still professors from years 2008-2009 have not been adequate job.

Efforts to improve the performance of teachers, in implementing Tridharma college workload equivalent to 12 (twelve) credits and a maximum of 16 (sixteen) credits in each semester in accordance with academic qualifications.

Performance is defined in this study were college faculty performance Tridharma is, teaching, research and community service as in faculty workload form.

The authors study the performance issues Tridharma college lecturer in the Faculty of Public Health to study the managerial approach of knowledge management.

The study objective was to analyze the effect of the application of knowledge management process to a willingness to learn, analyze the effect of the application of the knowledge management process toward personal goals, analyzing the effect of the application knowledge management to organizational reward perception, analyzing the effect of the application of knowledge management on performance Tridharma college.

## **II Research Methodology**

Types of quantitative research with action research designs, samples from two faculty lecturers, 55 lecturers of the number of samples as the treatment group called FPKM faculty and 51 lecturers of the sample as a control group called FNPKM.

Data collection was conducted: 1) Pretest and posttest to measure the willingness to learn, personal goals, perceptions of organizational reward and performance Tridharma college, before and after the implementation of knowledge management. 2) Conducting observations using the observation sheet to determine the application of the knowledge management process.

Stage intervention application of the knowledge management process in the treatment group as follows:

- 1) Stage 1: workshop for faculty include Dean management, department leaders, and Head of education.
- 2) Phase II: workshop for professors from each department.
- 3) Phase III, the application of the knowledge management process as follows: the process of change (innovation process), individual learning (individual learning process), the process of learning together (collective learning process), collaboration in decision-making processes (collaborative decision making).

### III Research hypothesis

**H1** Willingness to learn in the intervention group application of the knowledge management process will be greater than in the control group. Descriptive statistical tables 1.2 willingness to learn and FNPKM FPKM as follows,

Table 1.2 Distribution of Willingness to learn and FNPKM FPKM

No	Variabel	FPKM				FNPKM			
		Min	Maks	Rerata	SD	Min	Maks	Rerata	SD
1.	Willingness to learn ( <i>Pre</i> )	400	420	6,6200	1,0189	430	830	6,3843	9,9466
2.	Willingness to learn ( <i>Post</i> )	490	840	698,3636	88,2497	430	810	639,0196	99,98510
3.	Willingness to learn difference	-130	200	36,3636	6,8755	-160	210	0,5882	8,6288

In Table 1.2 are known differences in the mean willingness to learn in FPKM larger than FNPKM group with a value of 36.3636, while on FNPKM at 0.5882. The difference in the standard deviation is lower than FPKM FNPKM group is equal to 6.8755 and 8.6288.

**H2** Personal goal in the intervention group application of the knowledge management process will be greater than in the control group. Table 1.3 Descriptive statistics FPKM personal goal and FNPKM as follows,

Table 1.3 Distribution of personal goal and FNPKM FPKM

No	Variabel	FPKM				FNPKM			
		Min	Maks	Rerata	SD	Min	Maks	Rerata	SD

1.	personal goal ( <i>Pre</i> )	460	950	6,8782	1,0363	520	830	6,5824	8,6132
2.	personal goal ( <i>Post</i> )	470	860	657,4545	91,5952	510	790	662,549	75,17561
3.	personal goal difference	-90	70	-30,3636	3,3745	-60	70	4,3137	2,9137

In Table 1.3 mean difference known personal goals in FPKM at -30.3636, whereas in FNPKM at 4.3137. The difference in the standard deviation higher than FPKM FNPKM group is equal 3.3745 and 2.9137.

**H3** Perceptions of organizational reward in the intervention group application of the knowledge management process will be greater than in the control group. Table 1.4 Descriptive statistics on perceptions of organizational rewards and FNPKM FPKM as follows,

Table 1.4 Distribution of Perceptions of Organizational Reward in FPKM and FNPKM

No	Variabel	FPKM				FNPKM			
		Min	Maks	Rerata	SD	Min	Maks	Rerata	SD
1.	Perseption of organizational reward ( <i>Pre</i> )	30	270	1,8564	5,4862	30	270	1,800	5,0279
2.	Perseption of organizational reward ( <i>Post</i> )	60	280	188,90	53,3566	30	270	175,098	50,6901
3.	Perseption of organizational reward difference	-180	210	3,2727	8,2440	-120	190	-4,9020	5,8150

In Table 1.4 mean difference of perception known organizations FPKM award at 3.2727, while FNPKM of -4.9020. The difference in the standard deviation higher than FPKM FNPKM group is equal 8.2440 and 5.8150. It can be concluded that the differences in mean and standard deviation in the perception of organizational reward FPKM higher than FNPKM.

**H3** Performance in the intervention group application of the knowledge management process will be greater than in the control group. Table 1.5 Descriptive statistics and FNPKM FPKM performance.

Table 1.5 Distribution of Performance in FPKM and FNPKM

No	Variabel	FPKM				FNPKM			
		Min	Maks	Rerata	SD	Min	Maks	Rerata	SD
1.	Performance (Pre)	9	25	14,0702	3,99469	9	18	11,3725	2,09724
2.	Performance (Post)	9	23	12,9818	2,6140	9	17	11,5294	2,05283
3.	Performance difference	-12	6	-1,0909	3,76274	-8	6	0,1569	2,94192

In Table 1.5 are known FPKM mean difference in the performance of -1.0909, while FNPKM at 0.1569. The difference in the standard deviation higher than FPKM FNPKM group is equal 3.76274 and 2.94192.

MANCOVA analysis results influence the application of the knowledge management process to a willingness to learn, the personal goal, perceptions of organizational reward and performance shown in the table 1.6 below:

Table 1.6 MANCOVA test results influence the implementation of knowledge management

No	Variabel Independent	Variabel covariat	Variabel dependent	Hasil Analisis P (Sig)	Keterangan
1.	willingness to learn (pre)		willingness to learn (post)	0,001	signifikan
2.	personal goal (pre)		personal goal (post)	0,805	Not signifikan
3.	perceptions of organizational reward (pre)		perceptions of organizational reward (post)	0,349	Not signifikan
4		performance (Pre)	performance (post)	0,004	signifikan

Table 1.6 shows the application of the knowledge management process does not significantly influence the personal goals and perceptions of organizational reward ( $p =$

0.805,  $p = 0.349$ ). While the willingness to learn and the performance showed a significant effect ( $p = 0.001$ ,  $p = 0.004$ ). It can be stated that hypothesis 1 and hypothesis 4 accepted while hypothesis 2 and hypothesis 3 is rejected.

#### **IV. Discussion**

The main objective of the research is to increase the willingness to learn, personal goals, perceptions of reward and performance lecturer at the faculty of public health through the application of the knowledge management process.

The difference in the willingness to learn on the pre and post measurements on the faculty and faculty FPKM FNPKM as shown in Table 1.2 shows the application of the knowledge management processes are improved, however, in the application of the knowledge management process of at the faculty FPKM and FNPKM very initiation is required to maintain the continuity of the process.

Mean difference in measurements of pre and personal goals personal goal post on the faculty and faculty FNPKM and FPKM shows the changes, as shown in Table 1.3. However, the application of knowledge management process on faculty initiation FPKM necessary to maintain the continuity of the implementation of knowledge management process runs continuously.

Mean difference in measured perceptions of the award on the organization's faculty and faculty FPKM FNPKM, showed a pretty good change, it is seen in Table 1.4. However, the application of knowledge management integration process faculty initiation FPKM necessary to maintain the continuity of the implementation of the knowledge management process and the organization remains continues over time.

Mean difference in performance measurement in FPKM faculty and faculty FNPKM, showed a pretty good change, as shown in Table 1.5. However, in order to keep

of the knowledge management process can be run continuously teru necessary according to the needs of the organization that is able to sustain the initiation of the implementation of knowledge management process.

MANCOVA analysis results obtained results as shown in Table 1.6 shows that the independent variable is the willingness to learn (Pre), personal goals (pre), perceptions of organizational reward (pre), covariate variable is the performance of (pre) and the dependent variable is the willingness to learn (post), personal goals (post), perception of the organizational reward (post) and performance (post). From the MANCOVA test results show of the application knowledge management processes significantly affect the willingness to learn and performance but the application of knowledge management process does not significantly affect the perception of personal goals and the organizational reward.

## **V Conclusions**

Conclusion the analysis of the influence of test results can be explained as follows:

- a) Implementation of the knowledge management process takes a long time.
- b) Efforts to improve performance will be more effective after an increase in the willingness to learn through the application of knowledge management process.
- c) Efforts to implement of the knowledge management process required a think-tank that can sustain the implementation of the knowledge management process constantly and continuously.

## Bibliography

- Albescu, F., Pugna, I., Paraschiv, D., 2009. *Cross culture knowledge Management*, Academy of economic studies, Bucharest. Informatica Economica Vol.13, No. 4/2009.
- Aggestam, L. 2006. *Learning organization or pengelolaan pengetahuan which came first, the chicken or the egg?*. Information teknologi and control, 2006, vol.35.No.3A.ISSN 1392-124X
- Buschor, C. Bieri., Forrer Esther., Merki, K, Maag., 2002. *The Willingness of young Swiss to learn in continuing education and training : initial finding from a survey of young adults*. Journal Education & Training, vol. 44. No 4/5 pp 224-232 ISSN: 0040-0912.
- Bowo Dwinantyo, 2009. *Manajemen Perguruan Tinggi*.  
<http://manajemenpendidikantinggi.blogspot.com>
- Castaneda, D. I. and Rios, M. F 2007 . *"From Individual Learning to Pembelajaran organisasi."* The Electronic Journal of Pengelolaan pengetahuan Volume 5 Issue 4, pp. 363 - 372, available online at [www.ejkm.com](http://www.ejkm.com)
- Cliff Figalo & Nancy Rhine, 2002. *Building the Pengelolaan pengetahuan Network*. Printed in the United States of America. ISBN : 0-471-21549-X
- Dalkir, K. 2005. *Pengelolaan pengetahuan in Theory and Practice*, Elsevier Inc. All right reserved. McGill University
- Figuroa, A.H et.al, 2006. *Management of knowledge, information and pembelajaran organisasi* in University Libraries. Libri, 2006, vol.56, pp.180-190. ISSN 0024-2667
- Gaspersz, V (1997) *Manajemen Kualitas Dalam Industri Jasa* . Gramedia Pustaka Utama Jakarta
- Gardner and Lambert (2001): *" Attitudes, motivation and willingness to communicate in their second language: students' experiences in intensive French and Intensive English"*. (Yuki Hashimoto, University of Hawai'i, Journal Second Language Studies, 20 (2) Spring 2002, pp29-70).
- Gibbons, F.X., Gerrard, M., Blanton, H., & Russel, D.W (1998). *Reasoned action & social reaction: willingness and intention as independent predictors of health risk*. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74, 1164-1181.



Gibbons, F.X., 2005. *Intention, Expectation, and Willingness*. Iowa State University  
<http://www.cancercontrol.cancer.gov/brp/construct/intent.expect.willingness/iew/html>

