Journal of Pedagogy and Education Science (JPES)
Vol. 3, No. 02, pp. 165-177
journal.iistr.org/index.php/JPES
DOI: 10.56741/jpes.v3i02.462

Knowledge Management and Pedagogical Innovativeness of Business Educators in Nigerian Universities

[1]Helen Edowaye Chukwuemeke*, [1]Yetunde Tracy Owie
Corresponding Author: *helen.chukwuemek@uniben.edu
[1] University of Benin, Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria

ARTICLE INFO

Article history
Received 16 November 2023
Revised 22 December 2023
Accepted 29 April 2024

ABSTRACT

The sole responsibility of business educators through pedagogical innovativeness is to equip their students with skills to make them self-sufficient; and to positively get involved in the nation's well-being economically and otherwise. Considering this, hence a need to investigate the relationships between the three dimensions of knowledge management (KM) and pedagogical innovativeness (PI) of business educators in Nigerian Universities. The study adopted a correlational design and data were collected from 137 business educators in public universities in Nigeria. The authors employed a bivariate correlation linear regression and path analysis via the 5000 re-samples bootstrap method. The results revealed that knowledge management dimensions such as knowledge dissemination, and responsiveness to knowledge significantly predict pedagogical innovativeness while knowledge acquisition did not significantly predict pedagogical innovativeness. The results indicate that knowledge acquisition (KA) knowledge dissemination (KD) responsiveness to knowledge (RK) are the major pointers of pedagogical innovativeness. This result will help business education program stakeholders understand the important role knowledge management plays in all work processes.

This is an open-access article under the CC–BY-SA license.

Keywords
Business Educators
Innovativeness
Knowledge Management
Pedagogy

Introduction

Business Educators are lecturers of business education programs in Nigerian higher educational establishments or institutions like colleges of education, polytechnics, and universities. In most universities, they are housed in the Department of Vocational and Technical Education, Faculty of Education, while in some other institutions, they are either housed in the Faculty of Vocational and Technical Education or stand on their own, this structure of domiciliation reflects the eclectic nature of business education program. Business educators are faced with the sole mandate of making all the objectives of business education programs a reality.

According to Ref. [1] the education programs in Nigerian higher educational establishments or institutions have specific objectives. Offer practical job preparation and business studies to equip students for effective service in various occupations. Tailor education to students' interests and aptitudes for business success. Foster understanding of the national economic system and active participation as consumers and producers. Cultivate essential personal qualities and attitudes for both personal and professional situations. Offer guidance for suitable placement in business and office employment. Foster career awareness and understanding of the free enterprise system. Prepare students for leadership roles in both public and private sectors.

Knowledge is a core performance determinant and for business educators to carry out their job descriptions, they need to be well-equipped with appropriate knowledge for the job. In other words, individuals with high cognitive ability through good knowledge management practices seem to have favorable outcomes in getting job-relevant knowledge that in turn helps in accomplishing their job descriptions or tasks with some level of pedagogical creativity or innovativeness. Given the value pedagogical innovativeness adds to educational institutions, knowledge management practices are emphasized to enhance business educators' pedagogical innovativeness or creativity for the overall benefit of the institutions. Pedagogical innovativeness is hinged upon the knowledge, skills, and abilities available to workers. If knowledge (whether tacit or explicit) is properly managed the worker (business educator) is likely to think innovatively in his pedagogical applications.

Pedagogical innovativeness (PI) entails creativity for the adoption of appropriate teaching methods for subject content absorption by students or for conveying subject content for students' understanding. Pedagogical innovativeness means going out of conventional ways of doing regular tasks. It is about thinking out of out-of-the-box and making decisions that satisfy the current needs of students with extraordinary solutions. According to Pedagogical innovativeness can be likened to creative thinking because creative thinking involves the ability of an employee to combine existing knowledge with a new or unique

process of doing things to have an improved result [2]. Creative thinking enhances business educators' task performance, thereby making them creative instructors because of the creativity they display in discharging the duties educators have, and which they bring to bear on their task performance polished by creative thinking. This in turn depends on the knowledge management (KM) practices prevalent in their institutions. Knowledge management practices/strategies are interpersonal relationships that help to acquire, share, and exchange tacit knowledge across organizations [3]. In the same vein, Ref. [4] stated that knowledge management involves the acquisition, sharing, and exchange of tacit knowledge across organizations, via IT-based systems. Therefore, acquisition, sharing, and exchange of tacit knowledge across organizations may provide opportunities for employees to be cognitively, emotionally, and physically engaged on the job thereby leading to pedagogical innovativeness of business educators, in as much as organizations do not exist alone, rather they mutually dependent on knowledge about their operation to work effectively. Consequently, institutions need to utilize their resources (knowledge), in a way that could result in success and sustainable institutional growth, stemming from pedagogical innovativeness, enhanced task performance, and high student outcomes. This reflects the importance of knowledge management that institutions should demonstrate to ensure the acquisition, and utilization of knowledge management practices to fulfill the changing needs, of the institutions leading to the pedagogical innovativeness of their employees leading to high academic outcomes of business education graduates as well as high productivity of business educators. Consequently, this study focused on the influence of the three dimensions of knowledge management (i.e. acquisition, dissemination, and responsiveness to knowledge) on the pedagogical innovativeness of business educators, and two research questions were posited:

1. Is there any relationship between knowledge management and the pedagogical innovativeness of business educators?
2. Knowledge management does not significantly predict the pedagogical innovativeness of business educators.

Literature Review

A. Knowledge Management (KM)

According to Ref. [5], KM is a deliberate effort to manage the knowledge of employees in an organization. Also, in the view of Ref. [3] knowledge management is a strategy that draws upon interpersonal relationships to exchange and share tacit knowledge across the organization. From the views of the two aforementioned authors, it can be said that KM involves the exchange of knowledge across organizations, through IT systems that can be

implemented via a wide range of methods such as the direct use of a particular type of IT, or an indirect method such as management of social processes in organizations (mentorship, coaching among others.) or via the use of particular culture. This culture such as people management practices (training, seminars, conferences, and workshops, among others) helps in connecting people, processes, and technology to leverage knowledge, which is a key resource of management.

KM deals with an organizational mandate to improve the job performance of their employees, keep competitive advantages, be innovative, and also strive for continuous improvement of the organization's objectives. Knowledge management also involves transforming knowledge resources through the identification of important and appropriate information and disseminating such so that knowledge acquisition can take place effectively, leading to organizational innovativeness. Since business educators serve as sources of knowledge acquisition for students, KM dimensions (knowledge acquisition, knowledge dissemination, and responsiveness to knowledge) seek to assist them (business educators) in acquiring competencies to perform better on the job. Ref. [6] developed a KM scale that can be classified under three dimensions: knowledge acquisition, knowledge dissemination, and responsiveness to knowledge.

Knowledge acquisition is the first dimension of knowledge management. Knowledge acquisition entails the creation or discovery of knowledge. It can emerge from a range of different sources in an organization. Knowledge acquisition can come from those employed by an organization. For example, business educators in higher institutions can acquire knowledge acquisition through staff orientation, workshops, seminars, conferences, board meetings, inaugural lectures, symposiums, and academic lecture series, among others. Many authors have given different definitions of knowledge acquisition. Knowledge acquisition according to Ref. [7] is the search for, identification, selection, mapping, collection, and organization of knowledge. Also, Ref. [8] stated that knowledge acquisition can be fostered through an organization’s external and internal networks to promote employee self-actualization within the organization to make employees more motivated and more committed and to improve their pedagogical innovativeness. For example, customer feedback systems, data mining, business intelligence, or collaboration with partners and research institutions are characteristic highly developed knowledge acquisition practices. This implies that the acquired knowledge would help business educators to exert a high level of skills and competencies in executing their jobs (classroom teaching, course advising, conducting research, teaching practices supervision, Students Industrial Work Experience Scheme (SIWES) supervision, examination supervision, results computation and presentation, internal and external examination and other administrative activities). Furthermore, the acquired knowledge when

shared and disseminated may likely lead to effective pedagogical innovativeness among business educators.

Knowledge dissemination which is the second dimension entails how knowledge is dispersed from one person or group to others. Ref. [9] provides a conceptualization of knowledge dissemination with a knowledge acquisition spiral of four categories: socialization, externalization, combination, and internalization. Socialization is a situation where people acquire knowledge directly from others; Externalization is a situation where people transform knowledge into tangible form via dialogue; Internalization is a situation where people learn or acquire knowledge via experience; and Combination involves the addition of explicit knowledge, as contained in documents or databases. According to Ref. [10], socialization is the process of transferring knowledge from existing knowledge to new knowledge; externalization is the transfer of knowledge from tacit to explicit knowledge; and combination is the process of transferring knowledge from existing explicit knowledge to new explicit knowledge. Effective knowledge dissemination could lead to better pedagogical innovativeness of business educators and enable them to respond to knowledge timely. Thus, some of the key factors that could foster knowledge dissemination among business educators include brainstorming sessions during conferences, informal communication with colleagues, and mentoring and coaching by older and more experienced colleagues.

The last dimension of knowledge management which is responsiveness to knowledge involves, how an institution manages or responds to knowledge. How this is done could be beneficial to business educators. For instance, business educators can exert quality and timely responses to ideas by putting into effective use the knowledge they have acquired. This may be evident in the way and manner they handle their teaching, research, and administrative tasks. Thus, business educators' responsiveness to knowledge may lead to the effective execution of tasks and contextual performance in the workplace.

B. Pedagogical Innovativeness (PI)

Pedagogical innovativeness is a transformation, an actual change, and not only the idea or the plan to change [11]. This transformation can be brought about by different actors and carried out at a local or global level. According to the authors, this transformation must have positive effects on the organization (improvements to system efficiency). Whilst innovativeness allows a state to be improved, it does not constitute the solution to a problem but demands creativity and originality [12]. Pedagogical innovativeness is creativity, inventiveness, and initiative through the renewal of an institutional measure, a method, or a process [13]. In line with this statement, the word, pedagogical innovativeness and creativity will be used interchangeably in this study. Also, innovativeness seeks to advance positive

change brought about by the actions or activities of the teachers [14]. Furthermore, innovativeness is an intentional and precise act of creation. Innovativeness engenders the performance of a better understanding, a 'better way of doing', and also a 'better being' containing the applied knowledge and expectations of efficiency and profitability [15].

Pedagogy provides a framework, for the multitude of decisions teachers have to make about how they have to teach. Innovativeness, in pedagogy, as in any kind of innovativeness, takes existing ideas, tools, or practices and brings them together in new ways to solve problems when existing practices are not adequately meeting needs. Currently, the choice of pedagogy has often been made ad hoc or based on whatever a teacher has encountered in their teacher education or their schooling [16]. But where teachers are supported by high-quality teacher education and strong professional infrastructures, they are enabled to make concerted decisions about pedagogy, acting as designers of learning by selecting approaches with a clear sense of their intended impact. Certain lines of education research are aimed at providing teachers with the evidence to make informed decisions about pedagogy [17],[18]. But, developing and selecting relevant, and appropriate pedagogy involves, more than working out what is "effective" as indicated by impact assessment on diverse measures of learning. Different perspectives of pedagogy are based on different theories of learning, and these theories entail different views of psychology and philosophy regarding what is most important in learning. The full power of pedagogy and pedagogical innovativeness can only be evaluated by taking into cognizance all the things the pedagogies are trying to achieve.

Teachers make choices about their pedagogy not based on their preference but according to a local/national curriculum structure. Many curricula now include "core competencies", "transversal skills" or "general capabilities" which point towards certain kinds of pedagogy and provide alternative starting points for learning design [19]. Some curricula are constructed to be competency-based, with the mindset that students should move through the development of different skills and knowledge levels at their own pace [20]. According to Ref. [21], the final advantage to thinking in terms of established pedagogical approaches is that an approach typically groups together sets of discrete research-based practices. He further, explained that inquiry-based learning may involve working with students on developing questions; developing self-regulated learning habits; and conducting assessments using portfolios, and presentations of learning. A teacher who begins by using an inquiry-based approach can find a range of high-quality supports for each of these practices, such as the Right Question Institute on constructing questions, or Exploratorium's Institute for Inquiry on formative assessment in science inquiry. The pedagogy can act as a cornerstone that brings together a professional community and knowledge management efforts, all geared towards developing and refining practices

C. Knowledge Management and Pedagogical Innovativeness

Organizations do not exist in a vacuum, rather they are mutually dependent on knowledge about their operation to work effectively. Knowledge acquisition means the development or creation of skills, insights, and relationships. It also includes all activities, that bring to reality, new knowledge, whether to the individual, to the group, or the world. Knowledge acquisition may help organizations most especially educational institutions to stand out in their operations, in this technological era of globalization. One important factor that differentiates successful institutions from unsuccessful ones is their vision of the future and their practical ability to act to realize that future by using their aesthetic sensibilities to create knowledge. The knowledge created is capable of making employees reach the operational goals of the institution. Specifically, the knowledge created should help business educators' pedagogical innovativeness leading to high academic outcomes of business education graduates as well as high productivity of business educators.

Although, knowledge has always existed in all types of organizations, individuals, and societies. However, in the past knowledge was treated like something trivial, something that always existed and was taken for granted [22]. But, nowadays, knowledge is seen as one of the most important strategic resources with the ability to create and maintain a competitive advantage. Only institutions with a knowledge-based view can maximally maintain a competitive advantage. The concept of a knowledge-based view is a view in which a company uses knowledge to gain an advantage over its competitors by knowing more about its customers, products, technologies, markets, and environment. The level of such competitive advantage depends on how effectively people in the institutions share their competence including knowledge with those who can use it.

The way these competencies which include knowledge are generated, developed, and applied, enable institutions to sustain distinctive competencies and explore innovativeness and opportunities [23]-[26]. As such, those institutions with greater innovativeness tend to be more successful in responding to changing conditions and developing new capacities to achieve better performance [3],[27]. This unfolding reality may lead to an orientation towards innovativeness, which is the pedagogical innovativeness of business educators. Despite, the growing acknowledgment of knowledge management's vital contribution to enhancing innovativeness, most extant studies have not provided clear guidance as to what particular knowledge processes are believed to have the most significant effects [28],[29]. Further research into the interactions among institution's knowledge processes, on the one hand, and between these processes and innovativeness, on the other, is very much called for [30]-[37]. By exploring the relationship between knowledge acquisition and business educators'

pedagogical innovativeness, institutions can enhance their competitive advantage and effectiveness leading to high productivity of business educators.

Methods

The study respondents comprised 137 business educators in public universities in South-South Nigeria. There are 12 public universities in the zone, out of which five are managed by the Federal Government and seven are managed by the State Government. KM dimensions (knowledge acquisition, knowledge dissemination, and responsiveness to knowledge) were measured with a scale adapted from Ref. [6]. Knowledge acquisition originally had six sub-factors measuring 21 items but was reduced to one factor with 10 items; knowledge dissemination originally had four sub-factors measuring 16 items but was reduced to one factor with 10 items; and responsiveness to knowledge originally had five sub-factors measuring 20 items but was reduced to one factor with 10 items. A sample of the item for knowledge acquisition is: "My institution encourages employees to attend training seminars and conferences". A sample of the item for knowledge dissemination is: "My institution allows employees to provide feedback to others whenever they attend conferences, seminars, or exhibitions". A sample of the item for responsiveness to knowledge is: "My institution keeps abreast with important happenings in the global academic communities".

PI was measured by 10 items developed by Ref. [38]. A sample of the item for pedagogical innovativeness is "I acquire understanding from a variety of information sources without difficulty".

The statistics performed are Cronbach's alpha, correlational matrix, regression, and PROCESS Macro for Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 3.4.1 (Model 4). Cronbach alpha was performed to determine the internal consistency of participants' responses. A correlational matrix was performed to determine the extent of correlation among the variables in the research question raised. Linear regression was performed to test the hypothesis.

The decision criteria for the use of correlational Metrix was based on a range of a coefficient value (r) as recommended by Ref. [39]. Coefficients r-value between ± .8 and ± 1.0 means very high correlation; ± .6 and ± .8 means high correlation; ± .4 and ± .6 means moderate correlation; ± .2 and ± .4 means low correlation; ± .0 and ± .2 means very low correlation; ± 1.0 means perfect correlation; and coefficient r-value of 0 means there is no correlation. Note that when a coefficient r-value is a negative value, it is a negative correlation; which means also that as one variable increases the other decreases. When a coefficient r-value is a positive value, it is a positive correlation; which means that as one variable increases the other increases. For regression estimates, the probability p-value less than or equal to .05 implies significance (accept H0) while the probability value greater than .05 implies no significance (reject H0).

Results

Data in Table 1 depict the bivariate correlations between knowledge management practices and pedagogical innovativeness. The results reveal a positively low correlation between knowledge acquisition and pedagogical innovativeness (r = .109). There are positive low correlations between knowledge dissemination and pedagogical innovativeness (r = .257), as well as responsiveness to knowledge and pedagogical innovativeness (r = .233). The overall correlation between knowledge management and pedagogical innovativeness is found to be positively low (r = .234). In all, there is a positive low relationship between knowledge management practices and the pedagogical innovativeness of business educators.

Table 1. Bivariate Correlations between KM and PI

Variables	1	2	3	4	5
1. Knowledge Acquisition	1				
2. Knowledge Dissemination	.643**	1			
3. Responsiveness to Knowledge	.552**	.465**	1		
4. Knowledge Management	.880**	.824**	.808**	1	
5. Pedagogical Innovativeness	.109	.257**	.233**	.234**	1

Note. **p < .01.

The results in Table 2 indicate the overall model of the multiple regression of knowledge acquisition, knowledge dissemination, and responsiveness to knowledge as predictors of pedagogical innovativeness of business educators. Table 9, therefore, reveals a statistically significant relationship or prediction: (F (3, 133) = 4.893, p < .01). The Table also reveals that the joint effect of knowledge acquisition, knowledge dissemination, and responsiveness as knowledge management practices causes 7.9% (Adjusted R^2 = .079) of variances in pedagogical innovativeness.

Table 2. ANOVA Results of Multiple Regression Model

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Decision
Regression	1.367	3	.456	4.892	.003	Significant
Residual	12.388	133	.093			
Total	13.755	136				

Note. R^2 = .099, Adjusted R^2 = .079.

Thus, knowledge acquisition, knowledge dissemination, and responsiveness to knowledge jointly significantly predict the pedagogical innovativeness of business educators. Table 3 shows the discrete estimates of each dimension of knowledge management practices. Data presented in Table 3 revealed the discrete coefficients for each predictor variable (knowledge acquisition, knowledge dissemination, and responsiveness to knowledge) on the outcome variable (pedagogical innovativeness). Table 3 shows that separate prediction of knowledge acquisition on pedagogical innovativeness is not statistically significant, (β = - .183, t = - 1.585, p > .05). Conversely, knowledge dissemination (β = .279, t = 2.560, p < .05) and

responsiveness to knowledge (β = .205, t = 2.042, p < .05) significantly predict pedagogical innovativeness of business educators.

Table 3. Coefficients of Multiple Regression

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			
	B	SEB	Beta	T	Sig.	Decision
(Constant)	2.622	.160		16.366	.000	
Knowledge Acquisition	-.103	.065	-.183	-1.585	.115	Not Significant
Knowledge Dissemination	.182	.071	.279	2.560	.012	Significant
Responsiveness to Knowledge	.120	.059	.205	2.042	.043	Significant

Table 4 shows the regression model of the aggregated data for knowledge management practices to determine the extent to which knowledge management predicts the pedagogical innovativeness of business educators.

Table 4. ANOVA of Simple Linear Regression Model for the Overall Aggregated

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Decision
Regression	.754	1	.754	7.826	.006	Significant
Residual	13.001	135	.096			
Total	13.755	136				

Note. R^2 = .055, Adjusted R^2 = .048.

The table reveals that knowledge management significantly predicts pedagogical innovativeness: (F (3, 135) = 7.826, p < .01). Thus, knowledge management explains 4.8% (Adjusted R^2 = .048) variation in pedagogical innovativeness among business educators.

Table 5 reveals the estimates of the coefficient of relationship between knowledge management practices and pedagogical innovativeness.

Table 5. Coefficients of Simple Linear Regression for the Overall Aggregated

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			
	B	SEB	Beta	T	Sig.	Decision
(Constant)	2.719	.158		17.180	.000	
Knowledge Management	.167	.060	.234	2.798	.006	Significant

The table reveals significant coefficients (β = .234, t = 2.798, p < .01), which confirms the results. By and large, knowledge management practices predict the pedagogical innovativeness of business educators.

Discussion

The result from research question one showed that there was a positive moderate relationship between knowledge management practices and the pedagogical innovativeness of business educators. Similarly, the result of the corresponding hypothesis 1 revealed that

knowledge management practices significantly predicted the pedagogical innovativeness of business educators as knowledge management accounts for a 7.9% variation in pedagogical innovativeness. Therefore, knowledge management practices predict the pedagogical innovativeness of business educators of South-South universities in Nigeria. It means that when there are proper knowledge management practices among business educators, this will enhance their creativity leading to pedagogical innovativeness.

The finding corroborates the finding of Ref. [40], who stated that the existence of formal knowledge management practices in scientific research in higher education institutions is positively correlated with organizational learning and innovation. The finding is also in consonance with Ref. [29] who posited that knowledge management practices enable institutions to sustain distinctive competencies and explore innovative opportunities. The finding is at variance with the findings of Ref. [30]-[37] who maintained that most extant studies have not provided clear guidance as to what particular knowledge management practices are believed to have the most significant effects on pedagogical innovativeness. This difference could be attributed to the type of statistical tools used in analyzing the data of the studies.

Conclusion

This study examined the relationship between KM and PI of business educators. Specifically, they examined the relationships between the three dimensions of KM (i.e. knowledge acquisition, knowledge dissemination, and responsiveness to knowledge), pedagogical innovativeness, and PI of business educators. The results showed that all three dimensions of KM significantly and positively predict PI, suggesting that acquisition of knowledge, dissemination of knowledge, and responsiveness to knowledge are among the key antecedents of PI among business educators. Consequently, institutions should provide opportunities for business educators to acquire, share, and respond to knowledge within and outside their academic institutions as this will promote a high level of PI which, in turn, leads to a high level of student outcomes. It was evident that there is a positive relationship between KM and PI of business educators. However, future studies can be carried out to establish whether KM is a key managerial strategy to achieve effective PI through other intervening variables such as transformational leadership style (TLS); learning self-efficacy (LSE), and organizational culture (OC). Additionally, future studies could include experimental studies to provide a more in-depth view of the research variables proposed and research questions raised because the questionnaire may have not been able to articulate the nitty-gritty of the actual issues. Experimental studies could also cover a wider scope and attract a higher number of respondents.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

References

[1] Ogunode, N. J., Ohibime, E. O., & Oluwaseun, D. J. (2023). Core curriculum and Minimum Academic Standards (CCMAS) for Nigerian universities: Possible implementation problems and way forward. *Journal of Education, Ethics and Value*, *2*(1), 24-37.

[2] Chukwuemeke, H. E., & Igbinedion, V. I. (2021). Relationship between knowledge dissemination, learning self-efficacy and task performance of business educators. *NAU Journal of Technology & Business Education, 6*(1), 13-21.

[3] Chen, A., N., K., Hwang, Y., & Raghu, T., S. (2010). Knowledge life cycle, knowledge inventory, and knowledge acquisition strategies. *Journal compilation, Decision Science, 41*(1), 223-231.

[4] Dinh, T. M., Tran, N. T., Ngo, N. G. N., Nguyen, Y. V., Nguyen, T. T. L. & Pham, C. M. (2021). Perceived risk of sharing other people's information on Facebook: The perspective of young people in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. *Management Review: An International Journal, 16*(2), 69-85.

[5] Hislop, D. (2013). *Knowledge management in organizations: A critical introduction (3rd Ed.)*. UK: Oxford University Press.

[6] Darroch, J. (2005). Knowledge management, innovation, and firm performance. *Journal Knowledge Management, 9*(3), 43-52.

[7] Pinho, I., Rego, A., & Pina e Cunha, M. (2012). Improving knowledge management processes: a hybrid positive approach. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 16*(2), 215242.

[8] Wilfredo Bohorquez Lopez, V., & Esteves, J. (2013). Acquiring external knowledge to avoid wheel reinvention. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 17*(1), 87-105.

[9] Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge-creating company*. New York: Oxford University Press.

[10] Yoshiki, M. (2020). A research framework of tacit knowledge transfer and educational practice in global hotel chains. *Management Review: An International Journal, 16*(1), 4-22.

[11] Charlier, B., & Peraya, D. (2003). *Nouveaux dispositifs de formation pour l'enseignement supérieur, allier technologie et innovation*. Bruxelles: De Boeck.

[12] Cros, F. (2007). *L'agir innovationnel: entre créativité et formation*. Bruxelles: De Boeck.

[13] Cros, F. (2002). *L'innovation en éducation aurait-elle un avenir? In certainties and paradoxes of innovation*. Paris: INRP, 221-229.

[14] Béchard, J-P. (2000). *Apprendre à enseigner au supérieur: l'exemple des innovateurs pédagogiques*. Cahier de recherche OIPG n°2000-001, Septembre, 6.

[15] Cros, F. & Adamczewski, G. (1996). *L'innovation en éducation et en formation*. Bruxelles: De Boeck.

[16] Lortie, D.C. (2002). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study (2nd edition)*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

[17] Hattie, J. (2011). *Visible learning for teachers: Maximizing impact on learning (1st edition)*. London, New York.

[18] Higgins, S., Katsipataki, M., Villanueva-Aguilera, A. B., Coleman, R., Henderson, P., Major, L. E., ... & Mason, D. (2016). *The Sutton trust-education Endowment Foundation teaching and learning toolkit*. Education Endowment Foundation, London.

[19] UNESCO (2015). *Transversal competencies in education policy and practices (Phase 1 Regional Synthesis Report)*. Paris, France.

[20] Peterson, A. (2016). Getting "what works" working: Building blocks for the integration of experimental and improvement science. *International Journal of Research and Method in Education, 39*(3), 299–313.

[21] Bristow, S. F., & Patrick, S. (2014). An International Study in Competency Education: Postcards from Abroad. CompetencyWorks Issue Brief. *International Association for K-12 Online Learning*.

[22] Zack, M. H. (1999). *Developing a knowledge management strategy*. California management

[23] Grant, R. (1996). Toward a knowledge-based theory of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal, 17*, 109–122.

[24] Teece, D. F., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal, 18*(7), 509-533.

[25] Chen, C. J. (2004). The effects of knowledge attribute, alliance characteristics, and absorptive capacity on knowledge transfer performance. *R&D Management, 34*, 311–321.

[26] Chen, C. J., Huang, J. W., & Hsiao, Y. C. (2010). Knowledge management and innovativeness: The role of organizational climate and structure. *International Journal of Manpower*, *31*(8), 848-870.
[27] Montes, F. J. L., Moreno, A. R., & Fernandez, L. M. M. (2004). Assessing the organizational climate and contractual relationship for perceptions of support for innovation. *International Journal of Manpower, 25*(2),167–180.
[28] Chapman, R., & Magnusson, M. (2006). Continuous innovation, performance, and knowledge management: An introduction. *Knowledge and Process Management, 13*(3), 129–131.
[29] Bueno, E., Rodriguez Anton, J.M., & Salmador, M.P. (2008). Knowledge creation as a dynamic capability: Implications for innovation management and organizational design. *International Journal of Technology Management, 41*(1–2), 155–168.
[30] Jantunen, A. (2005) Knowledge-processing capabilities and innovative performance: an empirical study. *European Journal of Innovation Management, 8*(3), 336–349.
[31] Du Plessis, M. (2007). Knowledge management: what makes complex implementations successful? *Journal of Knowledge Management*, *11*(2), 91-101.
[32] Andreeva, T. & Kianto, A. (2011). Knowledge processes, knowledge-intensity, and innovation: a moderated mediation analysis. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 15*(6), 1016–1034.
[33] Durodie, B. (2003). Is real resilience attainable? *The Monitor, 2*(6), 15-19.
[34] Dalziell, E., & McManus, S. (2004). Resilience, vulnerability, and adaptive capacity: implications for system performance. *The International Forum for Engineering Decision Making.*
[35] Mitroff, I. I. (2005). From my perspective: Lessons from 9/11 Are companies better prepared today? *Technological Forecasting & Social Change, 72*(3), 375-376.
[36] Ichijo, K., & Nonaka, I. (2007). *Knowledge creation and management: New challenges for managers*. USA, Oxford University Press.
[37] Parsons, D. (2007). National Organisational Resilience Framework Workshop: The outcomes. *National Organisational Resilience Framework Workshop (pp. 15)*, 5-7th December 2007, Mt. Macedon, Victoria, Australia.
[38] Fields, Z., & Bisschoff, C. A (2013). A theoretical model to measure creativity at a university. *Journal of Social Sciences, 34*(1),47-59.
[39] Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. W. (2011). *Educational research competencies for analysis and applications (10th ed.)*. New York: Pearson Educational International
[40] Keeley, E. J. (2004). *Institutional research as the catalyst for the extent and effectiveness of knowledge-management practices in improving planning and decision-making in higher education organizations* (Doctoral dissertation, Northcentral University).

Authors



Helen Edowaye Chukwuemeke (PhD) is a Lecturer 1 in the Department of Vocational and Technical Education, Faculty of Education University of Benin, where she is a course adviser to final year students of the business education program and also the transcript officer. She is a member of the Association of Vocational and Technical Educators of Nigeria (AVTEN) and a Member of the Association of Business Educators of Nigeria (ABEN). (email: helen.chukwuemek@uniben.edu).



Yetunde Tracy Owie is a Lecturer II in the Department of Vocational and Technical Education, Faculty of Education University of Benin, where she is a course adviser to first-year students of the Department. She is a member of the Association of Vocational and Technical Educators of Nigeria (AVTEN) and a member of the Association of Business Educators of Nigeria (ABEN). (email: yetunde.owie@uniben.edu).