DOES INTELLIGENT LEADERSHIP AFFECT KNOWLEDGE SHARING BEHAVIOR AMONG ACADEMIC STAFF IN KENYAN UNIVERSITIES?

[1*] **Bett Julie Chepkoech**

jtobit@gmail.com

[1] *School Of Business And Human Resource Development, Department of Human Resource, Tourism and Hospitality Management, Rongo University, Kenya*

Purpose: *The main objective of the paper was to investigate the role of leadership effectiveness in Kenyan universities on knowledge-sharing behavior.*

Approach/Methodology/Design: *The research was motivated by trait Theory. The explanatory research design was adopted with a positivism approach. The target population consisted of 6000 staff and a selection of 300 academic staff from Kenyan universities. The study used a stratified technique to select the academic staff of the universities representing each university in Nairobi County, Kenya, using simple random sampling. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used for analysis while hypotheses were tested using multiple regression.*

Findings: *The regression results indicated that leadership effectiveness contributes to ($\beta = 0.35$, $p<0.05$) Significance.*

Practical Implications: *In addition, this study recommends that leadership effectiveness in sharing knowledge is necessary for university leaders to consider leadership areas in the university.*

Originality/value: *The study concluded that a high percentage of leadership effectiveness results in improved behavior of sharing employee knowledge that is essential to transform Kenyan universities and drive the behavior of sharing knowledge.*

Keywords: *Leadership, Effectiveness, Knowledge Sharing Behavior*

Introduction

Credit Knowledge sharing is considered one of the most important aspects of knowledge management (Gupta *et al.,* 2000), and knowledge management systems rely on knowledge sharing to be successful (Wang *et al.,* 2010). Information management research argues that organizational knowledge and individual learning at the group level derive from collaboration, exchange, and sharing between colleagues. Transferring of knowledge, and knowledge sharing have their own place and importance in knowledge management (Özler, *et al.,* 2006).

In addition to promoting but also limiting the sharing of knowledge, many physical, technological, psychological, cultural, and personal factors have effective roles. Despite the many benefits of knowledge sharing, researchers and implementers often argue that people do not share their knowledge with others in many instances (Davenport, 2008). In addition, they say that knowledge sharing is unnatural and there are many reasons for individuals to refrain from sharing their knowledge with others.

According to Ikhsan and Ronald (2004), time is insufficient and motivation is not enough for sharing, and the culture of knowledge sharing is lacking. In addition, inadequacy in knowing what to share with a whom, restricted appreciation of sharing knowledge, and fear of gaining false knowledge can also impede acts of sharing knowledge (Majid *et al.,* 2009). Furthermore, a study of the literature on the activities of people sharing information reveals that the motivations and factors involved in activity, such as knowledge sharing, are still difficult to understand in-depth and examine in detail (Holste & Hou, 2015). Therefore, understanding what inspires people to share their knowledge and what prevents them from sharing it is important.

One of the factors that can play an important role in intelligent leadership can influence knowledge-sharing efforts. Knowledge sharing and organizational behavior are aspects of leadership and are linked to each other (Yadav, *et al.,* 2019). Higher education and smart leadership are considered essential components of each nation's education system, which could probably play a key role in achieving the objectives. In leadership theory, modern trends aim to interpret leadership through the lens of imaginative and intelligent phenomena. Intelligent leadership is a constructive dialogue between leaders and supporters that makes it easier to bring together their efforts to achieve a shared vision.

Making decisions with this "risk" mentality impacts the effectiveness of leadership and information sharing within the organization. In achieving leader effectiveness, trust and vision are at the forefront, and at the same time, employees should feel that there is an effective leader collaboratively promoting sustainability and other important steps to achieve set goals (Zhang et al., 2011). The perceived effectiveness of the leader is a criterion that is expressed through evaluations related to their leaders and aims to reveal how the leader affects an organization (Prati et al., 2003).

Theoretical framework

Trait theory

The trait model of leadership is based on the characteristics of many leaders both successful and unsuccessful and is used to predict leadership effectiveness. The resulting lists of traits are then compared to those of potential leaders to assess their likelihood of success or failure. Scholars taking the trait approach attempted to identify physiologically (appearance, height, and weight), demographic (age, education, on and socioeconomic background), personality, self-confidence, and aggressiveness), intellective (intelligence, decisiveness, judgment, and knowledge), task-related (achievement drive, initiative, and persistence), and social characteristics (sociability and cooperativeness) with leader emergence and leader effectiveness Cherry K (2016).

The trait theory gives constructive information about leadership. It can be applied by people at all levels in all types of organizations. Managers can utilize the information from the theory to evaluate their position in the organization and assess how their position can be made stronger in the organization. Cherry K, (2016). They can get an in-depth understanding of their identity and the way they will affect others in the organization. This theory makes the manager aware of their strengths and weaknesses and thus they get an understanding of how they can develop their leadership qualities. Cherry K, (2016).

Review of Literature (Hypothesis Development)

Leadership is essentially an emotional activity, whereby the emotional states of followers are perceived by leaders. As Mayer et al. (2000) indicates, a high degree of emotional intelligence allows a leader to be better able to control how members of the workgroup feel and to take appropriate action. People in leadership positions need to express and share positive emotions (Prati *et al.,* 2003) and a lack of emotional control is associated with leadership ineffectiveness (Prati *et al.,* 2003). (Goleman, 1998b). Managers with a high level of emotional intelligence may encourage employees to address the possible impacts of stress (Goleman, 2006).

The leader effectiveness organization ensures that individuals are more effectively and efficiently represented (Yorges *et al.,* 1999). Hence, the effectiveness of the leader is measured by different approaches in the context of subjective indicators, such as objective financial criteria, as well as sales, profit rates, return on investment, market share, or stakeholder comments (Prochazka & Smutny, 2011). As a result of these characteristics, which are owned by the concept of leader effectiveness, we examine the impacts of the knowledge sharing behavior within the organization on business performance as well as on the firm performance and strategy, and the relationships between them.

H_{O1}:   leadership effectiveness has no significant effect on knowledge sharing behavior   in Kenyan universities

Material/methods

This study emphasized positivism by providing a profile to explain relevant aspects of the phenomenon of interest from an individual, organization to industry to the researcher by using the explanatory analysis study to analyze the cause-effect relationship and describe the characteristics of the variables of interest in a case. The target population consisted of 6000 academic staff from Nairobi County's main campuses only and not satellite campuses and constituents of university colleges (Commission of University, 2018). A sample size of 300 academic employees was picked. After that, using simple random sampling, the respondents to the questionnaire were selected.

Using a questionnaire, primary data was obtained. The method for data collection was a questionnaire for this analysis. The questionnaires were used as a data collection method to enable the researcher, by answering specific research questions, to achieve the specified objectives in the collection of primary data based on the five-point Likert-type scales. In this analysis, the Intelligent Leadership Model by Keikha *et al* (2017). The reliability of this analysis was calculated by using previous studies and Cronbach's Alpha test validated scales (Saunders, et al., 2007), and those things with an alpha coefficient of 0.7 and above were accepted (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2000). The adoption of a highly accurate instrument was used and carried out using Cronbach alpha on the questionnaire objects. In the most relevant study, however, the appropriate threshold is 0.7 thresholds (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2000) and that influenced this research.

Analytical model

The field data collected was entered, cleaned, and inspected for preliminary assumptions in SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Scientists) version 22, and then subjected to statistical analysis using descriptive and inferential statistics. The study's research priorities and research theories inspired the data analysis. This included the conceptualization of the multiple regression model To analyze the effect of leadership effectiveness on knowledge sharing behavior. A prediction model was developed by this. Therefore, to analyze

data, multiple regression analysis was used for this report. The null hypotheses were either rejected at level $p<0.05$ or were not rejected at level $p>0.05$.

Findings and Discussion

The study was planned to collect data from 300 respondents, but data from 250 respondents were collected successfully. This reflects an 83.33 percent response rate for the entire survey, of which 50 were further discarded due to either lack of response or insufficient filling. This answer falls within the confines of Anderson et al. (2003), In addition, Babbie (2007) asserts that a 60 percent response rate is fine, 70 percent is very good, and a sample, above 80 percent is excellent. The effect of descriptive statistics indicates that no missing values have been recorded, so no deletion. This research used the Mahalanobis D2 measure to classify multivariate outliers and deal with them.

Sample characteristics

In the results, the profile of the respondents was 50.1 percent male, and 49.9 percent female. The findings show that both male and female workers are almost evenly distributed, while male employees form the majority. If both male and female individuals are allowed to share their experiences, the outcome of the company is likely to be greater. Workers have the skills needed to perform their duties efficiently. As such, the work experience of workers is part of the human capital of companies. The study showed that employees have the skills needed to perform their duties effectively. The implication is that the employees possess the required skills to give reliable information about the study problem.

Hypothesis Testing (Multiple Regressions)

To measure the coefficients of independent variables with knowledge-sharing behavior, a multiple linear regression analysis was performed. Approximately 66 percent of the overall variance in information sharing behavior ($R= .81$, $R2 = .66$) was the combined prediction of all the variables. The regression model showed that all the independent Variables were jointly expected, as shown in Table 4. Thus, using emotional leadership and spiritual leadership, the model was sufficient to predict information sharing behavior.

The hypothesis (HO_1 :) claimed that leadership effectiveness had no significant impact on the conduct of information sharing among academic staff in Kenyan universities. Leadership effectiveness had a positive and significant effect on knowledge sharing behavior ($\beta = 0.35$, $p<0.05$). Thus, the hypothesis was rejected. The implication is that, good leadership effectiveness enhances knowledge-sharing behavior among university staff. In regards to the effect of leadership effectiveness on employee knowledge sharing, the findings suggested that workers who have strong leadership are usually realistic in what they can and cannot do thus improving the quality of knowledge sharing. Self-aware workers are normally not self-critical or naively hopeful so they don't spend a lot of time criticizing themselves for being too ambitious.

Regression Coefficient of Study Variables

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	T	Sig.
(Constant)	0.37	0.16		2.39	0.02
Leadership effectiveness	0.36	0.04	0.37	9.37	0.00

Summary Statistics	
R	*0.81*
R Square	*0.66*

Adjusted R Square	*0.65*
Std. The error in the Estimate	*0.43*
Change Statistics	
F Change	*127.88*
df1	*5.00*
df2	*331.00*
Sig. F Change	*0.00*
Durbin-Watson	1.84

a Dependent Variable: KSB

Source: Research Data (2022)

Conclusion and Recommendations

Based on the findings, it is concluded that leadership effectiveness outcomes contribute to increasing sharing of employee information. In whatever decisions they make and in doing their job, staff that had good leadership effectiveness was realistic. From the results, there was a significant element of leadership effectiveness as a basis for self-reflection and thoughtfulness. Self-aware individuals usually find time to self-evaluate has had a major impact on success and information sharing, and the management of universities in Kenya needs to find a way to enable their workers to think about things rather than respond impulsively. Improving leadership effectiveness skills of employees leads to increased employee performance and sharing of expertise, which then contributes to achieving overall organizational performance. The study suggested that if they need better employee information sharing, universities in Kenya should support their employees to develop their leadership effectiveness. Universities need to concentrate on training employees to have good leadership effectiveness so that in whatever decisions they make and in doing their job, they can be practical. It is important to motivate self-aware workers to refrain from voicing themselves anyway and to be excessively self-critical or naively hopeful in doing their job. Leadership effectiveness can serve as a propensity for thoughtfulness and self-reflection. Leadership effectiveness needs to be supported and promoted so that workers are better able to judge their actions and make very informed decisions.

Further Research

The study focused only on a case of chartered Kenyan Universities which is insufficient to infer the impact of leadership effectiveness on knowledge sharing behavior. Further studies on the impact of emotional intelligence on knowledge-sharing behavior and transformative leadership on comparative study must also be carried out by using other moderators to compare the findings of various universities. To obtain precise results specific to a given university based on its existence or venue, a survey may also be performed. To obtain confirmatory or divergent views of outcomes, further study may be carried out on universities, technical schools, and polytechnics.

References

Allen T. J. (2013). Architecture and communication among product development engineers (Working Papers Nr. 165-97). Cambridge, MA: Sloan School of Management.

Bartol, Kathryn M. & Srivastava, Abhishek (2002). Encouraging knowledge sharing: the role of organizational reward systems. Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, summer, 9, 64-76.

Bock, G. W., & Kim, Y. G. (2002). Breaking the myths of rewards: An exploratory study of attitudes about knowledge sharing. Information Resources Management Journal.

Boland Jr, R. J., & Tenkasi, R. V. (1995). Perspective making and perspective taking in communities of knowing. Organization science.

Chen, X. P., Eberly, M. B., Chiang, T. J., Farh, J. L., & Cheng, B. S. (2014). Affective trust in Chinese leaders: Linking paternalistic leadership to employee performance. Journal of Management, 40(3), 796-819.

Cherry K (2016) What is the trait theory of leadership, Very Well, 9 May 2016.

Cummings, J. N. (2004). Workgroups, structural diversity, and knowledge sharing in a global organization. Management Science.

Davenport, T. (2008). Enterprise 2.0: the new, new knowledge management?. Harvard Business Online, 19.

Fraenkel, R. J., & Wallen, E. N. (2000). How to design and evaluate research in education (4th ed.). San Francisco McGraw-Hill.

George, G., & Sleeth, R. G. (2000). Leadership in computer-mediated communication: Implications and research directions. Journal of Business and Psychology, 15(2), 287-310.

George, J. M. (2000). Emotions and leadership: The role of emotional intelligence. Human relations.

Goleman, D. (2010). An EI-based theory of performance. In D. Goleman, & C. Cherniss (eds.), The Emotionally Intelligent Workplace: How to Select for, Measure, and Improve Emotional Intelligence in Individuals, Groups, and Organizations. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Goleman, D., (1998). Working with Emotional Intelligence. Bantam Books, New York.

Gupta, A. K., & Govindarajan, V. (2000). Knowledge management's social dimension: Lessons from Nucor Steel. MIT Sloan Management Review.

Hair J.F., Jr, & Celsi, Mary & Money, Arthur & Samouel, Phillip & Page, Michael. (2010). the essentials of business research methods

Humphrey, R. H. (2002). The many faces of emotional leadership. The leadership quarterly.

Hung S. Y., Lai H. M., and Chou Y. C. (2011). "The determinants of knowledge sharing intention in professional virtual communities: An integrative model", in The 14th Pacific Asia Conference in Information Systems, July 9-12, 2010, Taipei, Taiwan

Ikhsan, S., & Rowland, F. (2004). Knowledge management in a public organization: A study on the relationship between organizational elements and the performance of knowledge transfer. Journal of Knowledge Management, 8(2), 95-111.

Kankanhalli, A., Tan, B. C., & Wei, K. K. (2005). Contributing knowledge to electronic knowledge repositories: An empirical investigation. MIS Quarterly, 29(1).

Mahmud, S. & Bretag, T. (2013). Postgraduate research students and academic integrity: It"s about good research training. Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management\

Majid, S., & Kowtha, R. (2009). Utilizing Environment Knowledge for Competitive Advantage. In CONF-IRM 2008 Proceedings (p. 62).

Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., Caruso, D. R., & Sitarenios, G. (2010). Measuring emotional intelligence with the MSCEIT V2.0. Emotion, 3(1), 97–105.

Mazzarol, T., Soutar, G.N., and Thein, V. (2002). Critical Success Factors in the Marketing of an Education Institution - A Comparison of Institutional and Student Perspectives. Journal of Marketing for Higher Education 10(2): 39-57.

McKeen, J. D., & Smith, H. (2003). Making IT happen: critical issues in IT management (p. 366). Chichester: Wiley.

Mohayidin, M. G., Azirawani, M.N., Kamuriddin, N. & Idawati, M. M. (2016). The application of knowledge management in enhancing the performance of Malaysian universities. Electronic journal of knowledge management.

Özler, B. & Hoogeveen, J. G. (2006). Poverty and inequality in post-apartheid South Africa: 1995-2000. Poverty and policy in post-apartheid South Africa, 59-94.

Prati, L. M., Douglas, C., Ferris, G. R., Ammeter, A. P., & Buckley, M. R. (2003). Emotional intelligence, leadership effectiveness, and team outcomes. The International Journal of Organizational Analysis.

Prochazka, J., & Smutny, P. (2011). Four indicators of effective leadership.

Pugh, D. (1991). In E. Letovancova and & E. Vavrakova (Eds.), Psychology of work and organization. University Library in Bratislava Digital library.

Sallis E. and Jones G. (2006). Knowledge Management in Education: Enhancing Learning and Education, Kogan Page, London.

Saunders, M., Lewis, P., and Thornhill, A. (2007) Research Methods for Business Students. 4th Edition, Financial Times Prentice Hall, Edinburgh Gate, Harlow.

Schilling, D. R. (2013). Knowledge doubling every 12 months, soon to be every 12 hours.

Sharma A. (2010). Enabling knowledge management of organizational memory for groups through shared topic maps. [MBA Thesis], Iowa State University.

Singer P. and Hurley J. E. (2005). The importance of knowledge management today, ALA-APA Library Worklife Home, 2(6).

Tabachnick G.Barbara & Linda S. Fidell (2013). Using multivariate statistics, 6th edition California state university Northridge, Pearson.

Wambui Christine Njoroge (2017). Factors influencing effective strategy implementation in Sameer Africa limited. Unpublished Research Project USIU- Africa

Jun Wang, Sanjiv Kumar, and Shih-Fu Chang. 2010. Sequential projection learning for hashing with compact codes. In Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML'10). Omnipress, Madison, WI, USA, 1127–1134.

Wang, W., and Hou, Y. (2015), Motivations of employees' knowledge sharing behaviors: A self-determination perspective. Information & Organization, 25(1), 1–26.

Yang, M. Y., & Lai, H. F. (2012, January). *The relationships between psychological contract breach and counterproductive work behaviors. Academy of Management Proceedings.*

Yorges, S. L., Weiss, H. M., & Strickland, O. J. (1999). *The effect of leader outcomes on influence, attributions, and perceptions of charisma. Journal of Applied Psychology*

Zhang, C. P., Liu, W. X., & Liao, J. Q. (2011). *The affecting mechanism of charismatic leadership on employees' creativity: It is enough to be with psychological safety? Management World.*