



Hamdipour, A., Zavareghi, R., & Moradi, S. (2019). A pathologic study of knowledge-based empowering challenges between university of Tabriz humanities faculty members. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies in the Humanities*, 11(2), 129-150. doi: 10.22035/isih.2019.2758.3125

Doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.22035/isih.2019.2758.3125> URL: http://www.isih.ir/article_310.html

2008-4641 / © The Authors. This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>).

A Pathologic Study of Knowledge-based Empowering Challenges between University of Tabriz Humanities Faculty Members

Afshin Hamdipour¹, Rasoul Zavaqai², Samira Moradi³

Received: Jul. 31, 2018; Accepted: Dec. 31, 2018

Extended Abstract

The aim of this study was exploratory factor analysis of the knowledge management implementation challenges from the perspective of the humanities, social and behavioral sciences faculty members of Tabriz University. The population of the study was 204 faculty members of humanities, the 78 members among them selected as a sample population. The present study performed random sampling, and a questionnaire used for the data collection. Cronbach's alpha was used to determine the reliability. In order to determine the validity of measurement tools, questions were performed using Factor analysis technique based on Principal Component Analysis. The finding showed that six factors (psychological barriers, interpersonal, communication, process, organizational, and technological and innovation) are the most important effective obstacles involved in the implementation of knowledge management in the colleges. The result of the Friedman test result showed that there is a significant difference between the mean of 6 factors. The findings also showed that identify and prioritize of the barriers of implementing knowledge management can lead to the identification of key aspects of knowledge management and various universities can be able to use from these findings before spending money for the implement of knowledge management.

Keywords: Humanities Faculty Members, Knowledge management, Evolution in the Humanities

1. Assistant Professor of Information Sciences and Knowledge Studies, Faculty of Education and Psychology, Tabriz University, Āzarbāyjān-e Šarqi, Iran.

✉ hamdipour@tabrizu.ac.ir

2. Associate Professor of Information Sciences and Knowledge Studies, Faculty of Education and Psychology, Tabriz University, Āzarbāyjān-e Šarqi, Iran.

✉ zavaqai@tabrizu.ac.ir

3. Associate MA Student of Information Sciences and Knowledge Studies, Faculty of Education and Psychology, Tabriz University, Āzarbāyjān-e Šarqi, Iran.

✉ s.moradi.429@gmail.com



INTRODUCTION

Evolution in humanities is one of the main challenges of a scientific system of the country. The main reason of this is that efficient humanities can monitor and conduct micro and macro actions of the society and no action out of humanities basics, approaches, achievements or methods cannot be done (Salimi Kochi, 2013 . 135). One of the crucial factors of humanities evolution is their professors. Thus we can name the professors as policy makers of policy-making which evolution in attitude and approach can evolve students, university, humanities, and the society. Thus one of the main steps of humanities evolution is upgrading humanities by emphasizing to professors and faculty members as human resource capitals.

Different approaches have been offered for human resource development. One of the most important approaches is knowledge-based development or Knowledge management (Ranjbar Fard et al 2013). In other words converting universities to learning organizations, reengineering creation and transmission of knowledge is one of the main reasons for implementing the knowledge-based approach in the universities.

PURPOSE

The projects want to answer the below questions:

- 1) Which challenges are the most important challenges of empowering human capitals of humanities field?
- 2) Which factors are the most important factors in knowledge-based empowering of humanities field?
- 3) Which personal factors are the most effective factors in knowledge-based empowering challenges of the humanities field?
- 4) Which psychological factors are the most effective in knowledge-based empowering of human capitals of humanities field challenges?
- 5) Which organizational effective factors are the most important in knowledge-based empowering of human capitals of humanities field challenges?
- 6) Which communicative effective factors are the most important in knowledge-based empowering of human capitals of humanities field challenges?
- 7) Which processing effective factors are the most important in knowledge-based empowering of human capitals of humanities field challenges?

- 8) Which innovative and technological effective factors are the most important in knowledge-based empowering of human capitals of humanities filed challenges?
- 9) Which challenges is the most important in knowledge-based empowering of human capitals of humanities filed challenges?

METHODOLOGY

The study is applied and survey-based research. The population of the research is Humanities, social science and behavioral faculties of University of Tabriz (204 professors). The sample of the research was 127 professors which 61 percent of them answered the questionnaire. The data gathering instrument was a questionnaire composed of 48 closed and one open question. The construct validity measured by separation and categorization of questions by factor analysis based on the PCA method. The reliability of the instrument measured by Cronbach' alpha and it's about .95. The questions designed in Likert Scale format

Descriptive statistics (average and standard deviation) used for investigating knowledge-based empowerment challenges and factor analysis used for categorization of the challenges. The differences between categories measure by Freedman test.

RESULT

The most important findings of the research are offered in table1.

Table 1. Factor analysis results related to questions of Challenges of empowering Humanities professors from University of Tabriz faculty members

Components	Items	Factor loading	eigenvalues	explained variance	explained variance (percent)
(1)	A huge amount of information without use in Information technology systems	.777	13.94	29.05	54.63
	Lack of efficient education for familiarizing faculty members with current systems and processes	.702			
	The danger of explicating knowledge for supplying or partner out of the organization	.676			
	Unnatural expectations of professor of technologies	.675			
	Delay in time of entrance of innovation to the organization	.601			
	Impact of speedy technology in not sharing of knowledge	.596			
	Indifference professors towards Information Technology systems	.548			



Interdisciplinary
Studies in the Humanities

Abstract



Components	Items	Factor loading	eigenvalues	explained variance	explained variance (percent)
(2)	Lack of formal option for innovative persons	.78	3.03	6.32	
	Lack of convenient reward (financial reward, lack of working time etc.) for active people who share their knowledge	.757			
	Existence of weak organizational culture for knowledge sharing	.633			
	Inconsistency between strategy, systems, policies and actions	.614			
	Lack of supportive technology for supporting necessities of knowledge management systems	.605			
	Lack of harmony between innovation and organizational beliefs and assumptions	.599			
	Lack of existence of helping records toward knowledge in previous experiences	.568			
(3)	Not emphasizing to knowledge management in outlook, mission and goals of the university	.527	2.55	5.33	
	Lack of harmony between knowledge and important goals of the university	.666			
	Lack of tendency of faculty members for allocating enough time for knowledge sharing because of lack or inefficient physical and intellectual supports	.664			
	Weak harmony because of educational style	.599			
	Lack of Chief Knowledge officer at the university	.571			
	Weak personal communicative skills	.562			
(4)	Lack of Chief Knowledge officer at the university	.556	2.45	5.11	
	Distant distance for knowledge sharing	.712			
	Exaggeration of professors about success and coverage of weakness	.634			
	Considering innovation as a threat	.625			
(5)	Lack of knowledge sharing because of personal differences	.596	1.99	4.15	
	Lack of knowledge absorption capacity	.622			
	Lack of trust to knowledge provider	.6			
	High level of stress/risk	.574			
	Lack of trust to knowledge recipient	.569			
(6)	Lack of motivation for knowledge sharing	.539	1.99	4.15	
	The tendency of preserving intellectual property and creating value for self	.63			
	Lack of tendency for working altogether in one group	.603			
	Fear of losing the ownership of knowledge	.592			
	Anxiety for endangering employment security	.528			

BTS=2469.335 kmo=.701 df=1128 sig=.000

1-innovation and technology 2-organizational 3-communicative 4-personal 5-managerial processes
6-psychological

As table 1 shows one of the challenges of knowledge-based empowering of faculty members of humanities fields, are psychological challenges. For measuring the variable, 4 questioned used which 4 score shows the absence of understanding the psychological challenge and 20 score shows understanding psychological challenges by faculty members. The average of the research is 10.33. The dimensions of the challenge are a tendency to preserving the intellectual property and creating value for themselves (2.28), the absence of a tendency to work with altogether in one group (2.37), fear of losing the ownership of knowledge (2.82), and anxiety for endangering employment security (2.85)

Process challenges are one of the challenges of knowledge-based empowering of professors in humanities. For measuring the challenge, 8 questions used. Score of 6 means absence of understanding the process challenges and 30 is an indicator for understanding process challenges for humanities faculty members completely. The average of the question is 16.58. The main challenges of knowledge-based empowerment are as below: Lack of capacity for knowledge keeping, Lack of knowledge absorption capacity, Lack of trust to knowledge provider, High level of stress/risk, Lack of trust to knowledge recipient, Lack of motivation for knowledge sharing.

Another challenge of knowledge-based empowering is personal challenges. For measuring the challenge 4 questions was used. 4 means absence of understanding of personal challenges and 20 means understanding the personal challenges of faculty members completely. The average is 12.09. Personal challenges are as below:

- 1) Distant distance for knowledge sharing (average 3.39)
- 2) Exaggeration of professors about success and coverage of weakness (average 2.79)
- 3) Considering innovation as a threat (average 2.98)
- 4) Lack of knowledge sharing because of personal differences (average 2.93)

Communicative obstacles are one of the other challenges of knowledge-based empowerment of humanities professors. For measuring the variable 5 questions used which 5 means lack of understanding communicative obstacles and 25 means understanding the communicative obstacles. The average of the research was 12.80. Dimensions of communicative challenges are:

- 1) Lack of harmony between knowledge and important goals of the university (average 2.63)



Interdisciplinary
Studies in the Humanities

Abstract



- 2) Lack of tendency of faculty members for allocating enough time for knowledge sharing because of lack or inefficient physical and intellectual supports (average 2.23)
- 3) Weak harmony because of educational style (average 2.71)
- 4) Lack of Chief Knowledge officer in the university (average 2.55)
- 5) Weak personal communicative skills (average 2.68)

One of other knowledge-based empowering of humanities professors is organizational challenges. For measuring the variable 8 questions used which 8 score means lack of understanding organizational challenges and 40 score means understanding the challenge. The average of the research was 18.31. The dimensions of organizational challenges are:

- 1) Lack of formal option for innovative persons (average 2.09)
- 2) Lack of convenient reward (financial reward, lack of working time etc.) for active people who share their knowledge (average 2.23)
- 3) The existence of weak organizational culture for knowledge sharing (average 2.24)
- 4) Inconsistency between strategy, systems, policies, and actions (average 2.2)
- 5) Lack of supportive technology for supporting necessities of knowledge management systems (average 2.36)
- 6) Lack of harmony between innovation and organizational beliefs and assumptions (average 2.49)
- 7) Lack of existence of helping records toward knowledge in previous experiences (average 2.45)
- 8) Not emphasizing to knowledge management in outlook, mission, and goals of the university (average 2.4)

One of the other challenges of knowledge-based empowering of humanities professors is innovative and technological challenges. For measuring the variable 7 questions used which score of 7 means lack of understanding the challenge and score of 35, means understanding the challenge. The average of the research was 19.23. The dimensions of the innovative and technological challenges are:

- 1) A huge amount of information without use in Information technology systems (average 2.65)

- 2) Lack of efficient education for familiarizing faculty members with current systems and processes (average 2.28)
- 3) The danger of explicating knowledge for supplying or partner out of the organization (average 3.18)
- 4) Unnatural expectations of professor of technologies (average 2.94)
- 5) Delay in time of entrance of innovation to the organization (average 2.67)
- 6) Impact of speedy technology in not sharing of knowledge (average 2.84)
- 7) Indifference professors towards Information Technology systems (average 2.66)

In Table2 challenges of empowering compared based on several statistical indicators.

Table2. Descriptive Statistics and rank of Challenges of knowledge-based empowering calculated by the Friedman Test

Challenges	Frequency	Average	Standard Deviation	Least	Most	Rank of Obstacles
Personal	78	12.12	3.26	4	20	2.44
Psychological	78	10.32	3.21	4	20	1.69
Organizational	78	18.41	5.91	8	40	4.83
Communicative	78	12.83	4.28	5	25	2.64
Process	78	16.56	4.14	6	30	4.31
Innovative and technologic	78	19.25	5.91	7	35	5.08

DISCUSSION

The research showed that psychological issues are the most important challenges of empowering knowledge-based empowering of professors in the humanities field. In other words, faculty members of humanities can upgrade humanities by knowledge basis by strengthening the attitude and insight toward a knowledge-based approach to the empowerment of humanities. The strengthening can improve the p

NOVELTY

In spite of several researches about empowerment and evolution in humanities, there is limited research that prescribes a practical solution. The research using a knowledge-based approach categorized the challenges and issues and present practical solution.



Interdisciplinary
Studies in the Humanities

Abstract

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abdullah, R., Selamat, M. H., Jaafar, A., Abdullah, S., & Sura, S. (2008). An empirical study of knowledge management system implementation in public higher learning institution. *IJCSNS International Journal of Computer Science and Network Security*, 8(1), 281-290.
- Adineh Qahramani, A., Hashempour, L., & Atapour, H. (2011). Motāle'e-ye vaz'iyat-e zirsāxthā-ye modiriyat-e dāneš dar Dānešgāh-e Tabriz az didgāh-e a'zā-ye hey'at elmi [An investigation of status of knowledge management infrastructures in Tabriz University as perceived by its faculty members]. *Journal of Academic Librarianship and Information Research*, 45(3), 63-85.
- Akhavan Kharazian, M., & Moghadasi, F. (2017). Barresi-ye ta'sir-e tavānmandsāzi bar tashim-e dāneš va tarrāhi-ye model-e čandsathi barāye tabyin-e ta'sir-e farhang-e sāzmāni mošārekati bar tashim-e dāneš [Studying the effect of empowerment on knowledge sharing and designing the multilevel models to explain the impact of participatory organizational culture on knowledge sharing]. *Journal of Organizational Culture Management*, 15(1), 207-223. doi: 10.22059/jomc.2017.58902
- Araste, H. R., & Memari, S. (2011). Barresi-ye avāmel-e bonyādi-ye modiriyat-e dāneš dar mohithā-ye dānešgāhi: Motāle'ei mowredi [An examination of knowledge management principal factors in the university setting: A case study]. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, 3(23), 1-13. doi: 10.7508/isih.2011.1011001
- Beikzadeh Marzbani, N., & Suri, H. (2006). Rahbari-ye sāzmāni va tavānmandsāzi-ye manābe'-e ensāni dar model-e rāhbordi-ye modiriyat-e dāneš [Organizational leadership and human resource empowerment in the strategic knowledge management model]. *4th Conference Beynalmelali-ye Modiriyat* [4th International Management Conference], Tehran, Iran.
- Carnicky, S., & Mesaros, P. (2006). Necessity of implementation of knowledge management in Slovak enterprises. *Ekonomický Časopis*, 54(4), 386-402.
- Fadaei, Gh. R. (2016). modiriyat-e dāneš va Eraeye modeli no. [Proposing a New Model in Knowledge Management]. *Journal of Research on Information Science and Public Libraries*, 22(1), 15-29.
- Feijoo, H. M. P., Ordaz, M. G., & López, F. J. M. (2015). Barriers for the implementation of knowledge management in employee portals. *Procedia Computer Science*, 64, 506-513. doi: 10.1016/j.procs.2015.08.551
- Ghafourian, J. (2014). An exploration study to detect important barriers for knowledge management. *Management Science Letters*, 4(1), 25-30. doi: 10.5267/j.msl.2013.12.003
- Hasanzadeh, M. (2007). *Modiriyat-e dāneš: Mafāhim va zirsāxthā* [Knowledge management: Concepts and infrastructures]. Tehran, Iran: Ketābdār Publishing.
- Hashemi, S. S. (2010). Arzyābi-ye sath-e modiriyat-e dāneš dar Dānešgāh-e Olum-e Entezāmi



[The assessment of knowledge management level in Police University]. *Journal of Military Management*, 5(2), 183-214.

Hashempour, L., Ghaebi, A., & Rezaei Sharifabadi, S. (2012). Barresi-ye zirsāxthā-ye modiriyat-e dāneš dar Sāzmān-e Asnād va Ketābxāne-ye Jomhuri-ye Eslāmi-ye Iran [An investigation of knowledge management infrastructures in the national library and archives of Iran]. *Journal of National Studies on Librarianship and Information Organization*, 23(1), 74-88.

Hosseingholizadeh, R., & Adham Hashemi, S. S. (2013). Šenāsāi-ye mavāne'-e piyādesāzi-ye modiriyat-e dāneš dar dānešgāh: Motāle'e-ye mowredi Dānešgāh-e Ferdowsi Mashhad [Identifying barriers to the implementation of knowledge management: A case study: Ferdowsi University of Mashhad]. *Higher Education Letter*, 6(21), 41-59.

Karimi, V., Navehebrahim, A., Arasteh, H. R., & Behrangī, M. R. (2015). Šenāsāi-ye ab'ād va mo'alfehā-ye modiriyat-e towse'e-ye olum-e ensāni: Erā'e-ye Yek model-e mafhumi [The identification of humanities development management dimensions and components and providing a conceptual model]. *Quarterly Journal of Research and Planning in Higher Education*, 21(3), 151-169.

Keshavarzi, A. H., & Akhondzadeh, E. (2012). Šenāsāi-ye mavāne'-e tashim-e dāneš dar Dānešgāh-e Shahed bā estefāde az teknikhā-ye āmāri va tasmimgiri [Identification of barriers to knowledge sharing at Shahed University using statistical techniques and decision making]. *Journal of Perspective for Public Administration*, 3(2), 35-57.

Khodae, F., & Abbasian, M. (2011). Šenāsāi-ye avāmel-e kelidi-ye movaffaqiyat dar piyādesāzi-ye system-e modiriyat-e dāneš dar dānešgāhhā [Study of critical success factors (CSFs) in implementation of knowledge management system (KMS) in universities]. *Journal of Military Management*, 10(40), 199-220.

Lilleoere, A. M., & Holme Hansen, E. (2011). Knowledge-sharing enablers and barriers in pharmaceutical research and development. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 15(1), 53-70. doi: 10.1108/13673271111108693

Nouri, R. (2008). Tabyin-e šāxeshā-ye šenāsāi-ye mavāne'-e ijād-e dāneš dar sāzmānhā-ye pažuheši [The explanation of indexes knowledge creation barriers in the research organizations]. *Journal of Organizational Culture Management*, 6(17), 131-156.

Pirkkalainen, H., & Pawlowski, J. M. (2014). Global social knowledge management - understanding barriers for global workers utilizing social software. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 30, 637-647. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2013.07.041

Pourserajian, D., Owlia, M. S., & Soltani Aliabadi, M. (2013). Ta'in va owlviyatbandi-ye mavāne'-e be ešterākgozāri-ye dāneš dar dānešgāhhā va marākez-e āmuzeš-e āli motāle'e-ye mowredi Mo'assese-ye Āmuzeš-e Āli-ye Imām Javad [Determination and prioritization of barriers to knowledge sharing at universities and HEIS; Case study: Imam Javad University College]. *Journal of Rošd-e Fanāvāri*, 9(34), 34-43.



Interdisciplinary
Studies in the Humanities

Abstract



- Ranjbar Fard, M., Aghdasi, M., Albadvi, A., & Hasanzadeh, M. (2013). Šenāsāi-ye mavāne'-e modiriyat-e dāneš barāye Čahār no' farāyand-e kasb-o-kār [Knowledge management barriers identification for the Four kinds of business processes]. *Journal of Information Technology Management*, 5(1), 61-88. doi: 10.22059/jitm.2013.30051
- Rego, A., Pinho, I., Pedrosa, J., Pina, E., & Cunha, M. (2009). Barriers and facilitators to knowledge management in university research centers: An exploratory study. *Management Research: Journal of the Iberoamerican Academy of Management*, 7(1), 33-47. doi: 10.2753/JMR1536-5433070103
- Richter, A., & Derballa, V. (2009). Barriers to successful knowledge management. *Encyclopedia of Information Science and Technology* (pp 315-321). London: IGI Global.
- Roknijo, S. M., Jafari, M. B., Yazdani, H. R., & Alvani, S. M. (2017). Vākāvi-ye mavāne'-e piyādesāzi-ye movaffaq-e modiriyat-e dāneš dar dānešgāhā [Study of barriers for the successful implementation of knowledge management in universities and providing guidelines]. *Journal of Organizational Culture Management*, 15(2), 445-464. doi: 10.22059/jomc.2017.62527
- Salimi Kochi, E. (2013). Tahavvol dar olum-e ensāni-ye mowjud va mazi-yathā-ye farāyandnegari [The evolution of the humanities and the advantages of process review]. *Journal of Cultural Engineering*, 8(76), 134-145.
- Salimi, Gh., Sabaghian, Z., Danaeifard, H., & Abolghasemi, M. (2011). Tashim-e dāneš beyn-e a'zā-ye hey'at elmi dar mohithā-ye dānešgāhi; Negāhi miyānreštei [Knowledge sharing among faculty members in academic contexts: An interdisciplinary view]. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, 3(23), 51-74. doi: 10.7508/isih.2011.1011.003
- Secretariat of the Supreme Council of the Cultural Revolution (2011). Country comprehensive scientific map.
- Shirin, A., Forouzandeh, L., Danaeifard, H., Khaefelahi, A. A. (2017). Vākāvi-ye tatavvor-e sāze-ye tavānmandsāzi dar Iran bā ruykard-e miyānreštei [Exploring the evolution of the empowerment construct in Iran with an interdisciplinary approach]. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, 10(1), 27-56. doi: 10.22631/isih.2017.2365.2813
- Taghipour, M., Mahboobi, M., & Gharagozlou, H. (2016). Barresi-ye ta'sir-e fanāvāri-ye ettelā'āt va erbebātāt bar mavāne'-e be ešterākgozāri-ye dāneš dar farāyand-e modiriyat-e dāneš (Be enzemām-e motāle'e-ye mowredi) [The impact of ICT on knowledge sharing obstacles in knowledge management process (Including case-study)]. *Journal of Information Processing and Management*, 31(4), 1049-1074.
- Tajmir Riyahi, H., & Esmaeili Atooei, S. (2012). Šenāsāyi va rotbebandi-ye mavāne' va avāmel-e tashilkonande-ye modiriyat-e dāneš dar dāneškadehā-ye hesābdāri va māli (Ruykard-e tahlil-e selselemarātebi-ye goruhi) [Identifying and ranking barriers and facilitators to knowledge management in accounting and finance faculties (GAHP approach)]. *Journal of Management Accounting and Auditing Knowledge*, 1(3), 129-141.

Vashishta R, Kumar R, Chandra A. (2010). Barriers and facilitators to knowledge management: Evidences from selected Indian universities. *The IUP Journal of Knowledge Management*. 2010; 8(4), 7-24.

Zawawi, A.A., Zakaria, Z., Kamarunzaman, N. Z., Noordin, N., Sawal, M. Z. H. M., Junos, N. M., & Najid, N. S. A. (2011). The study of barrier factors in knowledge sharing: A case study in public university. *Management Science and Engineering*, 5(1), 59-70.



Interdisciplinary
Studies in the Humanities

Abstract