



# Institutional Knowledge Creation and Sharing as Predictors of Faculty Retention in South-South Universities

**Nnenda Jennifer Igbudu**

Department of Educational Management  
Faculty of Education  
Rivers State University, Port Harcourt, Nigeria.  
[igbudujenny@gmail.com](mailto:igbudujenny@gmail.com)

**Destiny Dede**

Department of Educational Management  
Faculty of Education  
Rivers State University, Port Harcourt, Nigeria.  
[destinydede2017@gmail.com](mailto:destinydede2017@gmail.com)

---

## Abstract

The study examined institutional knowledge creation and sharing as predictors of faculty retention in South-South Nigerian universities. Two (2) research questions and 2 hypotheses were answered and tested in the study, respectively. The design for the study was correlational, the population was 7 federal universities in South-South Nigeria and sampled 1562 academic personnels selected from a population of 15620 personnel, using the stratified random sampling technique. Respondents of the study responded to 2 instruments. These were the validated 18-item Institutional Knowledge Creation and Sharing Scale (IKCSS) and the 22-item Faculty Retention Scale (FRS), designed by the researcher in the modified 4-point Likert Scale models of Very High Extent (VHE), High Extent (HE), Low Extent (LE) and Very Low Extent (VLE) and Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D) and Strongly Disagree (SD) for IKCSS and FRS, obtained using the Cronbach Alpha procedure. Simple regression was used in answering the research question while t-test associated with simple regression was used in testing the hypotheses at .05 level of statistical significance. The results of the study showed institutional knowledge creation and sharing predict faculty retention in South-South Nigerian universities to very high extent and also established significant predictions of institutional knowledge creation and sharing on faculty retention in South-South Nigerian universities. The study concluded that institutional knowledge creation and sharing activities are strong and viable predictors of continuing retention of faculties in South-South Nigerian universities. Consequently, the study recommended that stakeholders in institutional staff management should continue to initiate programmes for academic personnel.

**Keywords:** Institutional, Knowledge Creation, Knowledge Sharing, Faculty Retention, Universities.

Reference to this paper should be made as follows:

Igbudu, N. J., & Dede, D. (2025). Institutional Knowledge Creation and Sharing as Predictors of Faculty Retention in South-South Universities. *International Journal of Scientific Research in Education*, 18(1), 24-34.

---

Copyright © 2025 IJSRE

## INTRODUCTION

In local, national, continental and global communities, educational institutions have and are saddled with the sole responsibility of seeing to the introduction of members of the communities into communities' worthwhile knowledge, skills and values from one generation to another. The members of the communities referred to in this presentation may be the young, the needy and those who desire to have education. This latter explanation becomes expedient and imperative because, education is considered very important for the categories of communities' members so identified. Firstly, education is considered inevitable for the introduction of the younger folks of the communities into communities' worthwhile knowledge, skills and values from now to succeeding generations. This proposition agrees with the definitional perception of Schofield (1990) on what education or its institution should do in society as a pre-occupation.

In the second categorization, some members of the communities, irrespective of their age bracket and other social attributes, may find themselves disconnected from their permanent places of abode, for reasons that may be deliberate, as in the case of leaving one's home to another because of occupational or other social requirements or emergencies, which are considered artificial. There are also cases where individuals and or families leave their homes under emergency situation to other locations for reasons that may be artificial or natural, for fear of death or harm as in cases of epidemics, wars, insurgency and insecurity. In all of these, individuals find themselves away from home. This category of individuals are considered as the needy and therefore need to be introduced to the worthwhile knowledge, skills and values of their communities (education). In the third and last categorization, there are those community members, who could not access formal education, when they were young or their prime, arising from the socio-economic statuses of their backgrounds. However, when they come of age and status and can sponsor formal education, they can therefore desire to be educated. This is the category of individuals Afangideh and Nwideduh (2010) and Afangideh and Alixi (2016) categorize as those who desire education.

The conceptualization on what constitutes education, its beneficiaries and dimensions represents the new thinking on what education connotes in contemporary times, especially as it seeks to explain what some schools exist to do and why some individuals attend certain schools. In the Nigerian context, the categorization and explanation will explain why there are the normal formal schools, nomadic education programmes and distance education programme by both the private and public sectors, but under the regulation of government agencies.

Educational institutions, the world over, see to some important aspect of individual and societal life. These include among others socialization, civil engagement, knowledge transmission, personal development, economic development, critical thinking and problem solving.

Arising from the foregoing disposition of education and its institutions, the Nigerian system divides its education system into three parts that are referred to as levels. These are the basic, senior secondary and tertiary levels of education (Federal Republic of Nigeria, FRN, 2014). While the basic level of education takes charge of primary and junior secondary education, the senior secondary level of education accepts products from junior secondary schools and prepares them for the world of work and higher education, while the tertiary level of education accepts product from the senior secondary level of education and prepares them for consumption by society and itself after continuous preparation (Afangideh & Ewhrudjakpo, 2024).

One important thing about the present academic excursion is that, it is focused on the tertiary level of education and this presents explanations for the more deep information about higher education. On this, tertiary educational institutions are responsible for the education of the citizenry after secondary education. In the Nigerian context, these institutions include universities, colleges of education, polytechnics, monotechnics and allied institutions. These institutions play different roles that lead to the development of the Nigerian society in the different perspectives. But, in this study, the emphasis is on universities. Universities are centres of excellence in learning, that are into teaching, research and community services (Anyia, 2013; Obomanu, 2008, Nwideduh, 2003; Okeke, 2007) these special roles of the universities is what Obomanu (2008) further referred to as the tripartite function of the universities.

In quite a different contribution. Afangideh and Aleru (2014) added what may be referred to as the fourth function of the universities. For the scholars universities, apart from the traditional tripartite functions of teaching, research and community services also perform incidental functions. They are considered as those roles which universities play to ensure that, they attain a certain level of internal revenue generation as entrepreneurial and autonomous institutions to help in their self-funding. This explains why universities go on such ventures like bakery, water bottling. Information and Communication Technology, pharmaceuticals, fish farming, poultry farming, piggyery, mushroom farming and the like.

Away from conceptual conceptualizations, it is now settled that, universities perform three basic functions, namely, teaching, research and community services and that arising from the pressures of actualizing autonomy and be self-sustaining. Universities have become entrepreneurial and therefore perform the fourth function considered as incidental.

In this study, the researchers are interested in the first and second components of the universities roles. These are teaching and research. Conceptually driven, teaching has to do with the art and science of impacting knowledge of concepts, skills and values to learners by significant individuals, who may be teachers, instructors, lecturers and scholars while research represents the deliberate efforts made by academics to find practical solutions to problems bedeviling the society and humanity. In all of these, knowledge is taught and researched into, since it is the article of operation in teaching and research efforts. Through research, knowledge is created and through teaching knowledge is shared.

As the most identified article of operation in teaching and research, knowledge creation and sharing are at the centre of the two academic involvements. It is on this note that this study sought to find out whether institutional knowledge creation and sharing can predict the retentions of faculties in universities.

## **Institutional Knowledge Creation**

Institutions of higher education, the world over, are centres of excellence in learning. The article of learning is undoubtedly knowledge, which must be created by the different institutions as part of their knowledge management efforts. Knowledge creation describes the construction of the new knowledge in a collaborative process (Urike, 2024). For the scholar, knowledge creation is based on the knowledge of individuals which is then combined in a systematic way, where individuals contribute their knowledge and build on and combine the contributions of others. Put in another perspective, knowledge creation process includes inventing and innovating new concept, approaches, methods, techniques, products, services and ideas that can be used for the benefit of the people and organizations.

According to HelpJuice (2025), knowledge creation is an iterative process of transforming, combining and converting various knowledge types and thrives on the exchange of ideas, collaboration, practice and learning. This is explained in the fact that as employees interact and share knowledge they enrich the organization's collective intelligence, as relevant data and information can enhance decision making, serving as a vital building blocks for new knowledge. Little wonder, Hajric (2024) noted that knowledge creation according to the Nonaka's SECI model is about continuous transfer, combination and conversation of the different knowledge types. Helpjuice was therefore right in concluding that knowledge is created through practices, collaboration, interaction and education.

According to Nonaka's knowledge creation theory, four components are involved in the knowledge creation process. These are:

- Socialization (tacit to tacit): Knowledge is shared through direct experience, observation and practice example apprentices learning from mentors.
- Externalization (tacit to explicit): Tacit knowledge is articulated through explicit concepts through documentation, storytelling or models.
- Combination (explicit to explicit): Different pieces of explicit knowledge over combined to form new knowledge (example, creating response, manuals, etc.).
- Internationalization (explicit to tacit): Explicit knowledge is absorbed and internalized by individuals through learning, training or practice.

Knowledge creation is an activity that is done in systematic stages. For Murugesan (2024) the following are required:

- Identification of the purpose of the knowledge;
- Identification of the need for the knowledge;
- Definition of the core elements of the knowledge;
- Preparation of the knowledge base structure;
- Organization of the knowledge base constant;
- Preparation of new articles for the new knowledge base;
- Publication of information from the new knowledge base;
- Gathering feedback from the users of the knowledge base; and
- Improvement in the knowledge based on the feedback.

In other to be able to ensure effective knowledge creation exercises, the knowledge creators have to learn from others, gather customers feedback, audit their contacts, take care when designing their knowledge base, choose the right knowledge base software, enlist customers support and make it early to contact support (Murugesan, 2004). Differently but still related to Murugesan (2024), and Richardson and Nucci (2024) presented a different strategy for knowledge creation. The strategy includes conducting researchers to determine the knowledge base, determining the type of knowledge base, developing knowledge base structure, establishment of subject matter, experts writing, knowledge resources, uploading resources to the platform and frequent updates of contents.

## Knowledge Sharing

Another component of knowledge management for examination in this study is knowledge sharing. One important information in knowledge management is that knowledge, especially in the information age, is a commodity, that has to be sold or shared for a price and this makes discussions on knowledge sharing very important.

According to Goldstein (2022), knowledge sharing is defined as the process within an organization that facilitates exchange of critical information across the workforce. Goldstein gathered that knowledge sharing refers to the process of exchanging information between people, team or organization. For Spiro (2023), it is the exchange of information, expertise or skills among employees, who tap into each other's expertise, information and skills and applies them to develop themselves and perform better in organizations. Knowledge sharing is very important in organizations and institutions including schools. This is so because, knowledge sharing can make colleagues and employees to connect, deepen their knowledge and help each other perform better, work efficiently, use, maintain and control resources and learn as fast as the organization develops (Spiro, 2023). As a practice that promotes the exchange and transfer of learning from one individual to another, mutual exchange of employees learning, ideas, skills, knowledge and experience (Bisportal, 2025), it creates room for internal development and mobility, workers are focused on learning and growth opportunities, improve remote teams performance and wellbeing, break down silos and democratize tacit skills and other learnings, increase employee engagement, build a learning culture and retain critical tacit knowledge (Goldstein, 2022; BisPortal, 2025).

Arising from the all-important nature of knowledge sharing, BisPortal (2025) identified 10 best practices and tools for utilization in knowledge sharing activities to benefit the organization. These include the establishment of knowledge sharing activities, enhancing onboarding and training practices, utilization of state of the act knowledge sharing tools, utilization of blogs, suggestion box and feedback, ask an expert and frequently ask questions (FAQ) internal communication platforms, document management, dedicated knowledge centre.

When knowledge is created and shared among organizational members, scholars, and researchers suggest that it can contribute to members retention and in the case of lecturers, it supports faculty retention. Teacher or faculty retention is a field in educational research that focuses on how factors such as schools characteristics and teacher demographic affect whether teachers stay in their schools, move to different schools or leave the profession before retirement (Ololube, 2024). For IGI Global (2024), it is simply the staying of a teacher or preferring to stay in a school for teaching instead of leaving. A lot of factors have been mentioned as having relationships with teachers' decision to stay. These factors are connected to the school, the teachers job characteristics and the environment of the school and the disposition of external stakeholders in the school system. These factors include push factors such as low salary, students behavior issues, lack of support from school administration, inability to participate in decision making, resistance to using the prescribed curriculum or a discouragement from modifying the school curriculum, teachers salary, student demographic and urban setting. Teachers' retention may also be influenced by pull factors like higher pay, mentoring, team teaching, collaboration, teachers age, experience, gender qualification, among other factors.

Reviews on knowledge creation and sharing in relation to faculty retention have been mostly theoretical, there is therefore the need for an empirical examination to establish whether a

relationship exist between the institution knowledge creation and sharing and teachers or faculties decision to stay.

### **Statement of the Problem**

Despite efforts by university leaders to promote knowledge creation and sharing among faculty members, reports of resignation, transfer and unwilling to stay persist. While institutional knowledge sharing is believed to influence retention. There are limited empirical evidences on its effectiveness in predicting faculty members' decision to remain in service. This study therefore, sought to investigate the extent to which knowledge creation and sharing contribute to faculty retention in public universities.

### **Aim and Objectives of the Study**

The study examined institutional knowledge creation and sharing as predictors of faculty retention in South-South Nigerian universities. In specific terms, the study sought to achieve the following objectives:

- Examine the extent to which institutional knowledge creation predicts faculty retention in South-South Nigerian universities.
- Determine the extent to which institutional knowledge sharing predicts faculty retention in South-South Nigerian universities.

### **Research Questions**

The following research questions were answered in the study:

- What is the extent of prediction of institutional knowledge creation on faculty retention in South-South Nigerian universities?
- What is the extent of prediction of institutional knowledge sharing on faculty retention in South-South Nigerian universities?

### **Hypotheses**

The following hypotheses were tested in the study at 0.5 level of statistical significance:

- HO<sub>1</sub>: There is no significant prediction of institutional knowledge creation on faculty retention in South-South Nigerian universities.
- HO<sub>2</sub>: There is no significant prediction of institutional sharing on faculty retention in South-South Nigerian universities.

### **METHODS**

The design for the study was correlational, the population was 7 federal universities in South-South Nigeria and sample was 1562 academic personnel, selected from a population of 15,620 personnel, using the stratified random sampling technique. Respondents of the study responded

to 2 instruments. These were the 18-item Institutional Knowledge Creation and Sharing Scale (IKCSS) and the 22-item Faculty Retention Scale (FRS), designed by the researcher in the modified 4-point Likert scale models of Very High Extent (VHE), High Extent (HE), Low Extent (LE) and Very Low Extent (VLE) and Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D) and Strongly Disagree (SD) for IKCSS and FRS, respectively with reliability indices of 0.92 for IKCSS and 0.92 for FRS, obtained using the Cronbach alpha procedure. Simple regression was used in answering the research questions while t-test associated with simple regression was used in testing the hypotheses at .05 level of statistical significance.

## RESULTS

**Research Questions 1:** What is the extent of prediction of institutional knowledge creation on faculty retention in South-South Nigerian Universities?

Table 1: Simple Regression Analysis on the Extent of Prediction of Institutional Knowledge Creation on Faculty Retention in South-South Nigerian Universities.

Model	R	R. Square	Adjusted R. Square	Decision
1	.82 <sup>a</sup>	.67	.66	High Extent

Scale of Measurement: 0.00–0.25 Very Low Extent, 0.26–0.50 Low Extent, 0.51–0.75 High Extent, 0.76–1.00 Very High Extent.

Data on Table 1 show simple regression analysis on the extent of prediction of institutional knowledge creation on faculty retention in South-South Nigerian Universities. With the model as 1, the regression score as .82<sup>a</sup>, regression square as .67 and Adjusted Regression Square of .66, the extent of prediction is determined from the co-efficient of determination, which is the multiplication of the regression score by 100% which resulted in 67%. From the foregoing observations and with reference to the scale of measurement, 67% co-efficient of determination is in between 0.51 and 0.75 (high extent), hence, the prediction of institutional knowledge creation on faculty retention in South-South Nigeria universities is to a high extent and that the variance of 33% on faculty retention cannot be accounted for by institutional knowledge creation.

**Research Questions 2:** What is the prediction of institutional knowledge sharing as faculty retention in South-South Nigerian Universities?

Table 2: Simple Regression Analysis on the Extent of Prediction of Institutional Knowledge Sharing on Faculty Retention in South-South Nigerian Universities

Model	R	R. Square	Adjusted R. Square	Decision
1	.89 <sup>a</sup>	.79	.77	High Extent

\* The Scale of Measurement for Table 1 applies.

Data on Table 2 show simple regression analysis on the extent of prediction of institutional knowledge sharing on faculty retention in South-South Nigerian Universities. With the model as 1, the regression score as .89<sup>a</sup>, regression square as .79 and Adjusted Regression Square of .77, the extent of prediction is determined from the coefficient of determination, which is the

multiplication of the regression score by 100% and which resulted in 79%. From the foregoing observation, 79% fall between 0.76 and 1.00 (very high extent), hence, the prediction of instructional knowledge sharing on faculty retention in South-South Nigerian universities is to a very high extent and that the variance of 21% on faculty retention cannot be accounted for by institutional knowledge sharing.

**H<sub>01</sub>:** There is no significant prediction of institutional knowledge creation on faculty retention in South-South Nigerian universities.

Table 3: Summary of the test Associated with Simple Regression on the Extent of Prediction of Institutional Knowledge creation on Faculty Retention in South -South Nigerian Universities

		Unstandardized coefficient		Standardized Coefficient		
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	19.681	1.56		18.16	.00
	Institutional Knowledge Creation	.72	.80	.82	10.32	.00

Data on Table 3 present the summary of t-test associated with simple regression on the prediction of institutional knowledge creation on faculty retention in South-South Nigerian Universities. The t-value calculated and used in testing the hypothesis came out as 10.32, the significant value stood at 0.00 and the alpha value at 0.05. At 0.05 alpha level and the observed t-value of 10.32, the significant value of 0.00 is less than the alpha value of 0.05. hence there is a significant prediction of the independent variable (institutional knowledge creation) on the dependent variable (faculty retention). Following from the observations, the researchers rejected the null hypothesis in favour of the alternative that there is a significant prediction of institutional knowledge creation on faculty retention in South-South Nigerian Universities.

**H<sub>02</sub>:** There is no significant prediction of institutional knowledge creation on faculty retention in South-South Nigerian universities.

Table 4: Summary of the t-test Associated with Simple Regression on the Extent of Prediction of Institutional Knowledge Sharing on Faculty Retention in South -South Nigerian Universities

		Unstandardized coefficient		Standardized Coefficient		
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	24.45	1.76		4.34	.00
	Institutional Knowledge Creation	.84	.02	.89	9.10	.00

Data on Table 4 present the summary of t-test associated with simple regression on the prediction of institutional knowledge sharing on faculty retention in South-South Nigerian Universities. The t-value calculated and used in testing the hypothesis resulted in 9.10, the significant value as 0.00 and the alpha value at 0.05. At 0.05 alpha value and the observed t-value of 9.10, the significant value of 0.00 is less than the alpha value of 0.05. Hence, there is a significant prediction of the independent variable (institutional knowledge sharing) on the dependent variable (faculty retention). Based on the foregoing observation, the researchers rejected the null hypothesis in



favour of the alternative that, there is a significant prediction of institutional knowledge sharing on faculty retention in South-South Nigerian Universities.

## **DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS**

### **Extent of Prediction of Institutional Knowledge Creation on Faculty Retention in South-South Nigerian Universities**

The first finding of the study is that, institutional knowledge creation predicts faculty retention in South-South Nigerian universities to a high extent. Also, a corresponding finding from test of hypothesis establishes that, there is a significant prediction of institutional knowledge creation on faculty retention in South-South Nigerian Universities. These findings are in agreement with the contributions from Ulrike (2024), HelpJuice (2024), Hajric (2024), Nonaka, Toyota and Konno in HelpJuice (2025) and Murugesan (2024). These scholars and researchers have in their various academic contributions harped on the various benefits of knowledge creation to faculties and which trigger their various decisions to stay. A possible explanation for the trend in the finding may be in the fact that, respondents of the study as Heads of Departments have organized such programmes for their staff and may have equally enjoyed their continuing decisions to stay on. These findings imply that, knowledge creation activities are strong determinants of faculties' decisions to stay on and that institutional where faculties stay on are on top of knowledge creation programmes.

### **Extent of Prediction of Institutional Knowledge Sharing on Faculty Retention in South-South Nigerian Universities**

The second finding of the study is that, institutional knowledge sharing predicts faculty retention in South-South Nigerian Universities to a very high extent. Also, a corresponding finding from test of hypothesis establishes a significant prediction of institutional knowledge sharing on faculty retention in South-South Nigeria universities. These findings are in tandem with Goldstein (2022), Spiro (2023) and Bisportal (2025), who in their presentations list the various benefits of knowledge sharing to faculties and their decisions to stay on in institutions. A possible explanation for the trend in the findings may be in the fact that the respondents as faculties have benefited from same programmes which also contribute to their decisions to stay. This findings imply that knowledge sharing programmes are strong determinants of faculties decisions to stay on and that where retention rate in high, knowledge sharing is given priority attention.

## **CONCLUSION**

Based on the findings of the study, it is concluded that, institutional knowledge creation and sharing activities are strong and viable predictors of continuing retention of faculties in South-South Nigerian Universities.

## Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusion of the study, it is recommended as follows:

- Stakeholders in institutional staff management should continue to mount knowledge creation programmes for academic personnel in their schools.
- There is a need for continuous staging of knowledge sharing programmes for academic staff to ensure ongoing academic development.

## REFERENCES

- Afangideh, S. T., & Aleru, G. E. (2014). Capacity building for Nigeria university teachers for quality education delivery in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. *African Journal of Higher Education Studies and Development*, 2, 63-74.
- Afangideh, S. T., & Alixi, M. E. (2016). External stakeholders participation in funding and personnel administration in secondary schools in Rivers State of Nigeria. *Trends in Educational Studies*, 9(1&2), 196-205.
- Afangideh, S. T., & Ewhrudjakpo, C. O. (2024). *Institutional administrative and curricular actions for poverty reduction in South-South Nigerian universities*. Unpublished Research paper.
- Afangideh, S. T., & Nwideeduh, S. B. (2010). Institutional impediments to quality research in higher education in South-South Nigeria. *Journal of Educational Review*, 3(4), 441 – 447.
- Anya, A. O. (2013). *The idea and uses of the university in the 21<sup>st</sup> century*. 29<sup>th</sup> Convocation Lecture, University of Port Harcourt.
- BisPortal (2025). 10 best practices and tools to enhance knowledge sharing within the organization. <https://www.bisportals365.com/blog/knowledge-sharing-best-practices/#2text=sharing>.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (2014). *National policy on education*. NERDC Press.
- Goldstein, N. (2022). What is knowledge sharing and why is it important. [https://www.togetherplatform.com/blog/knowledge\\_sharing#...](https://www.togetherplatform.com/blog/knowledge_sharing#...)
- Hajric, E. H. E. (2024). Knowledge creation. <https://knowledge-management-tools.net>.
- Helpjuice (2025). How do you create knowledge? <https://knowledge-managent.net>.
- IGI-Global (2024). Why teacher retention is often a result of school culture? <https://www.igi-global.com>teacher.....>
- Murugesan, S. (2024). How to create a knowledge base in 9 easy steps. <https://document360.com>.
- Nwideeduh, S. B. E. (2003). *Trend in the management of universities in Nigeria*. Springfield.
- Obamanu, B. G. (2008). Responsible conduct of researcher. Unpublish Manuscript, University of Port Harcourt.
- Okeke, B. S. (2007). *Teaching in Nigeria: The bureaucracy and professionalism*. Port Harcourt: Mercury Publishing.
- Ololube, N. P. (2024). *Institutional leadership: Laying the foundation for success*. Pearl Publishers.
- Richardson, C. & Nucci, R. (2024). How to create a knowledge base. <https://www.getguru.com/references/create-knowledge-base>.

Scholfield, H. (1990). *The philosophy of education: An introduction*. United Kingdom: George Allen & Unwin.

Spiro, K. (2023). Knowledge sharing: The ultimate guide.  
<https://www.easygenerator.com/en/guides/knowledge.sharing>.

Ulrike, C. (2025). Knowledge creation. Napla links. <https://www.isls.org...>



© JSRE