

# International Journal of Strategic Management (IJSM)

**The Relationship between Knowledge Sharing Capability and Competitiveness of  
Chartered Public Universities in Kenya**

Joseph Gachanja, Dr. Jared Deya and Prof. Willy. M. Muturi



**The Relationship between Knowledge Sharing  
Capability and Competitiveness of Chartered Public  
Universities in Kenya**



<sup>1\*</sup>Joseph Gachanja

PhD Candidate, School of Business Administration,  
Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and  
Technology, Kenya



<sup>2</sup>Dr. Jared Deya and



<sup>3</sup>Prof. Willy. M. Muturi

School of Business and Entrepreneurship, Jomo Kenyatta  
University of Agriculture and Technology, Kenya

**Article History**

*Received 19<sup>th</sup> August 2024*

*Received in Revised Form 20<sup>th</sup> September 2024*

*Accepted 29<sup>th</sup> October 2024*



How to cite in APA format:

Gachanja, J., Deya, J., & Muturi, W. (2024). The Relationship between Knowledge Sharing Capability and Competitiveness of Chartered Public Universities in Kenya. *International Journal of Strategic Management*, 3(5), 41–54. <https://doi.org/10.47604/ijsm.3042>

**Abstract**

**Purpose:** The purpose of this study was to establish the relationship between knowledge sharing capability and competitiveness of chartered public universities in Kenya. Universities are knowledge intensive environments, and play a central role in the creation and dissemination of knowledge that they generate. Accordingly, it would be expected that such institutions would adopt proactive approaches to the incubation of knowledge management capability and strategies, and that they would have better insight on how to achieve and optimize the value of their knowledge assets. However, research has shown that this is not the case, and that the approaches adopted by universities are passive and inconsistent. In addition, although there is a strong body of research in the area of knowledge management in commercial environments, and growing interest in knowledge management in public sector organizations, there has been little research on knowledge management capability in universities.

**Methodology:** The study adopted a descriptive design. The population of the research consisted of 31 chartered public universities authorized to operate in Kenya as at December 2020. The study adopted a census methodology while purposeful and convenient sampling was adopted to select respondents amongst the middle level management staff. The study used both secondary and primary data. A self-administered questionnaire was used as the primary data collection instrument. Out of 155 questionnaires that were sent out, 123 were filled and returned. Statistical Package for Social Studies (SPSS) was used for data analysis. The study used regression model to estimate the level of significance which yielded a positive and significant influence of knowledge sharing capability on competitiveness of chartered public universities in Kenya.

**Findings:** The findings pointed out that knowledge sharing capability significantly influenced competitiveness of chartered public universities in Kenya. The public universities should therefore entrench knowledge management practices in their day to day operations in order to remain competitive.

**Unique Contribution to Theory, Practice and Policy:** The study recommended that public universities should embrace knowledge sharing practices in their operations as it enhances competitiveness. One of very important factor in knowledge sharing is that university stakeholders should be accorded with formal, informal and virtual space to interact with each other for knowledge exchange.

**Keywords:** *Knowledge Sharing, Knowledge Management, Competitiveness, Public Universities*

©2024 by the Authors. This Article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

## INTRODUCTION

Knowledge is a vital foundation for a business to attain competitive advantage in this age characterized by rapid advances in all fields. Any firm requires knowledge in order to make decisions, innovate and overcome challenges. The main distinctive features of this age are the voluminous amount of data and its easy accessibility at minimal cost. Nonetheless, amassing the right information is not enough for an organization to attain a competitive advantage over its competitors. In order to attain a favorable advantage, an organization would require knowledge on how to utilize data and place it in an appropriate context (Al-Khalili, 2006). Knowledge management is considered as one of the major challenges of the new century, as organizations seek to ascertain valued information and harness it to boost their operations (Al-Faris, 2010) and overcome rising challenges.

Fundamentally, knowledge management applies to the shared knowledge of the total work force in order to achieve definite goals. The purpose of knowledge management is to pool knowledge that is vital to the firm. This ensures that employees have access to the right knowledge, at the place they need it, and when they need it. In other words, it is the right knowledge, at the precise time and in the exact place (Servin & De Brún, 2005). Consequently, knowledge is a critical driver of organizational value chain. Thus, all efforts need to be focused on increasing the firm's knowledge repository, by generating new knowledge through innovation, learning from partners, workmates, and use of content from third parties. As noted by Bornemann et al.(2003), the above processes help firms to achieve a sustainable competitive advantage. As an integrating practice, knowledge management provides a structure for binding into one whole several approaches and technologies that add value. It assists management to address stakeholder interests across interconnected knowledge links thereby enabling individual workers, teams, processes and firms to display intellectual tendencies in several settings (Newman & Conrad, 2000).

Competitiveness refers to a firm's ability to outperform the competitors in terms of profits, sales volume and market share (Velev, 2004). Additionally, competitiveness is defined as a firm's market position in relation to its competitors and also as the ability to meet the needs of the consumers in a manner that is superior than the competitors. The measure of the level of competitiveness of a firm aims at outlining its competitive position in relation to the other players in the market in which it is trading.

Public universities conduct a lot of activity in the education market and knowledge management happens to be one of the key assets capable of improving their attractiveness and competitiveness. Competitiveness can be attained by offering a high quality product/service that satisfies both the consumer (student) and the consumer of the finished product (the labour market) where the students realize their potential (Yudina, 2006). Each university strives to manage the services to students, so that it is preferred over its competitors, by providing the following marketing mix to its customer: value, quality, price, image, reputation, value addition and location.

### Statement of the Problem

Universities are considered as knowledge-intensive environment because they play a vital role in knowledge creation, dissemination and sharing through publications. They play a major role in knowledge transfer via collaboration with business organizations to promote social-cultural development, innovation, and support learning, teaching, research and community service. Hence, universities are expected to assume an active approach to knowledge management and

that optimize their knowledge assets. Nonetheless, available evidence posits that universities have adopted inconsistent and passive strategies (Donate & Canales, 2012). Research has been done on knowledge management practices and firm performance. For instance; Qandah et al. (2020), Rafi et al. (2021) and Shaqrah and Alzighaibi (2021) emphasized that knowledge management capabilities enhance organizational performance and success. In the existing literature, there are different types of reviews on knowledge management capability and its connection to diverse organizational elements (Imran et al. (2018), Zaim et al. (2019)), but only few reviews with respect to knowledge management capability and competitiveness. Based on the knowledge-based view, knowledge management capabilities are the basic building blocks of knowledge management and need to be further investigated in the context of diverse organizational outcomes. This study sought to establish the relationship between knowledge sharing capability and competitiveness of chartered public universities in Kenya.

### **Objective of the Study**

- i. To determine the relationship between knowledge sharing capability and competitiveness of chartered public universities in Kenya

### **Research Hypothesis**

**H<sub>01</sub>:** There is no statistically significant relationship between knowledge sharing capability and competitiveness of chartered public universities in Kenya.

### **Justification of the Study**

The notion of knowledge application has become an important practical sphere after the understanding that attaining and sustaining a competitive edge is dependent on the presence of new ideas that emanate from use of available information and investment for knowledge creation. The above drives constant innovations resulting into new products or service and after service. Nevertheless, knowledge on its own has no value, but it becomes an asset when stimulated and utilized by an organization as a tool to wade off the competition (Mohammed, 2010). Knowledge management is essential in identification and accumulation of knowledge crucial for the business processes of a firm (Gold et al., 2001; Zahra & George, 2002). Further, knowledge management focuses on instilling a culture of partnership that augments organization's knowledge foundation. The practice of managing acquired knowledge is aimed at assisting an institution to achieve competitive advantage over the competitors. Competitive success is no longer based on the strategic alignment of the financial and physical resources, but on the management of its intellectual assets from the point of capture, coding and dissemination which leads to acquisition of new competencies and re-engineering of the business processes (Al-Khalili, 2006).

### **Scope of the Study**

The study focused on the relationship between knowledge sharing capability and competitiveness of chartered public universities in Kenya. Competitiveness was operationalized based on Porter's (2001) perspective as an organization's ability to successfully compete for business opportunities and perform better than its benchmark competitors in regard to sales, market share and overall profitability, hereby analysed in terms of new student enrollment, return on assets and number of innovations and patents. The study focused on 31 public universities accredited by the Commission for University Education in Kenya by December 2020. The universities are spread across twenty five (25) counties in Kenya. The study was carried out within Kenya in the year 2023.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **Theoretical Review**

Penrose (1959) championed the Resource Based (RB) theory that holds that an organization is an assembly of both human and physical capital resource embedded in an organizational structure. Proponents of this theory argue that the basis of competitive advantage is found inside of itself rather than within the competitive environment. The RB theory postulates that continual competitive advantage is easily attained through exploitation of internal factors instead of the external ones. According to RB theory proponents, it is possible for a firm to exploit its external opportunity through use of the already available assets for new processes instead of acquiring new skill for every opportunity. In the RB Theory, firm resources are critical in attainment of higher or optimal profits.

Ludwig and Pemberton (2011) demonstrated that any firm that is operational in the present volatile environment must focus on its survival, capabilities and competitiveness. In addition, a firm needs to exploit available opportunities for business by utilizing current assets and creating a new bundle of assets to bear its capacity to compete in a dynamic business environment; organizations need to engage themselves in resource and capability management so as to create sustainable competitive advantage.

Capability, which are bundles of skills and knowledge (Day 1994), can also be thought of as resources such as staff, machines, and processes that are available in support the value system of the organisation. An organisation that is in pursuit of excellence or intending to perform better than others in the market place needs to review its capabilities in tandem with its value systems. The capabilities of a firm are hinged on the extent to which its resources sets are deployed into its routines and processes. Unless the assets are in disposal of a firm's operational efficiencies (e.g. production of finished goods), customer delivery of goods and services, innovation of processes, and coordination of external suppliers and distributors, it is hard to achieve core competencies that drive competitiveness. So a key concept is to build capabilities to create organizational values, at the same time sustain the current values by building on capabilities and employing the resources into practices. The end result is a march towards gaining firm competitiveness.

The RB theory supports the dependent variable and is therefore appropriate for this study since it supports the notion that deployment of resources that are unique will yield superior firm performance and competitive advantage. For example, employees bring unique resources to an organization in the form of knowledge, skill, experience, access to stakeholders and legitimacy which are key ingredients of performance (Ludwig and Pemberton, 2011).

### **Empirical Review**

Knowledge sharing refers to the dissemination of knowledge in a firm to enable employees and other stakeholders to generate desired organizational advantages (I. Nonaka & Takeuchi, 2005). Li et al. (2009) investigated entrepreneurial orientation's moderating role on the effect of knowledge management and innovation and observed a positive relationship amongst knowledge sharing, knowledge application and entrepreneurial innovation. Al-obaidi et al., (2018) investigated how knowledge management processes affect the competitive advantage of universities in Iraq and established that knowledge sharing impacted their competitiveness. Also, in an exploration of determinants of knowledge sharing tendencies among academics in public universities in the United Arab Emirates, Skaik & Othman (2014) established that

knowledge sharing was key to the success of both individuals and organizations. Further, they noted the necessity for knowledge sharing by academicians due to their significant role in knowledge creation and sharing through scholarly work and research.

Al-obaidi et al., (2018) investigated key dimensions of knowledge sharing and revealed that employee motivation positively impacted productivity through innovation and positive feedback. Hence academic institutions need to promote a culture of knowledge sharing that is prevalent in the corporate sector to enhance their productivity. Elsewhere, Abbasi and Siddiqi (2005) explored the prevalence of knowledge management tendencies in a public university in Pakistan and established that through the application of knowledge creation and knowledge sharing strategy, the traditional teaching university was converted into a competitive learning university. Elsewhere, Byukusenge et al. (2016) investigated the moderating role of innovation on knowledge sharing and firm competitiveness and concluded that knowledge sharing amongst individuals contributed to development of new innovations in terms of products, processes and markets that aid the firm to attain superior performance.

## **METHODOLOGY**

This study adopted a descriptive survey design to examine the relationship between knowledge sharing capability and competitiveness of chartered public universities in Kenya. The target population for this research was 31 public universities which were chartered as at December 2020, and constituted the unit of analysis. The study targeted middle level managers as the unit of observation since as AL-Hakim & Hassan (2011) expounded, middle level managers are knowledge engineers accountable for combining tacit knowledge of the top management and shop-floor workers, and convert it into explicit knowledge. They also have ability to create a wave of new knowledge in the organizational structure, and across different functional areas. A sample size of 155 respondents was considered for this study. The study used both secondary data and primary sources of information. The primary data was gathered through a questionnaire, while secondary data was obtained using a secondary data collection sheet. The study used descriptive statistics and inferential statistics with the help of SPSS software to carry out data analysis. Descriptive statistics specifically frequencies, the mean, and standard deviation were computed. Descriptive statistics allowed the researcher to come up with meaningful scores that uses few indices. Inferential data analysis was conducted using regression analysis (multiple regression analysis). The coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) was used to establish if the model was significant and the extent to which each of the independent variables explained the changes in the dependent variable. F-statistic was determined at a confidence level of 95% to determine if a significant association existed between knowledge sharing capability and competitiveness of chartered public universities in Kenya. Analysed descriptive and inferential data were presented using tables and graphs.

**FINDINGS****Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for Knowledge Sharing**

<b>Knowledge Sharing</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>SA</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
The university has a system and policies in place which are intended to promote knowledge sharing	0.8%	13.0%	13.0%	44.8%	28.5%	3.87	1
The university encourages experienced workers to share their knowledge with new or in- experienced workers.	0%	5.7%	16.3%	48.8%	29.3%	4.016	0.83
The university conducts seminars, induction trainings, mentorship and Job shadowing to facilitate knowledge transfer	1.6%	4.1%	15.5%	42.28%	36.6%	4.081	0.911
Staff are promoted and rewarded based on their ability to share their knowledge and mentor others	6.5%	14.6%	26.8%	32.5%	19.5%	3.439	1.15
The university has an institutional point of contact for historical materials and documents about prior projects and programs	4.1%	12.2%	22.0%	40.7%	21.1%	3.626	1.07
The university encourages a culture of knowledge sharing as opposed to knowledge hoarding	0.8%	7.3%	17.1%	44.7%	30.1%	3.959	0.92
The university has adequate infrastructure for knowledge sharing	0.8%	4.9%	25.2%	47.2%	22.0%	3.846	0.85
<b>Knowledge Sharing</b>						<b>3.83</b>	<b>.75</b>

**KEY:**  $n = 123$ , SA=Strongly Agree, A= Agree, N= Neutral, D=Disagree, SD= Strongly Disagree, SD= Standard Deviation

Results from Table 1 shows that the respondents generally agreed that the university has a system and policies in place which are intended to promote knowledge sharing (mean=3.87,SD=1), the university encourages experienced workers to share their knowledge with new or in-experienced workers (mean=4.02,SD=0.83), the university conducts seminars, induction trainings, mentorship and job shadowing to facilitate knowledge transfer (mean=4.08,SD=0.91), the university has an institutional point of contact for historical materials and documents about prior projects and programs (mean=3.673,SD=1.07), the university encourages a culture of knowledge sharing as opposed to knowledge hoarding (mean=3.96,SD=0.92) and that the university has adequate infrastructure for knowledge sharing (mean=3.85,SD=0.85). However, the participants were not sure whether staff are

promoted and rewarded based on their ability to share their knowledge and mentor others (mean=3.44, SD=1.15).

The overall mean rating across all these aspects was 3.83 with a standard deviation of 0.75, demonstrating a prevalent agreement with the knowledge sharing practices within the university. The findings suggest that the university has established a favourable environment for knowledge sharing among its employees. The encouragement of experienced staff to share knowledge, the availability of facilitative mechanisms like seminars and mentorship, and the emphasis on a culture of sharing contribute to an environment conducive to knowledge exchange. These findings are consistent with the notion that knowledge sharing helps organizations improve their performance, as employees generate ideas that can propel innovations (Al Kashari, and Al Taheri, 2019). Knowledge sharing improves performance, among which creativity is most important (Lee, 2018). Other researchers derived similar findings. Liu et al. (2004) linked knowledge sharing to the competitiveness of organizations while Supar et al. (2005) pointed out that knowledge sharing affects significantly the performance of higher educational institutions. Elsewhere, Kuzu and Özilhan, (2014) found that knowledge sharing significantly influences employees' performance. Chang and Chung (2011) found significant influence of knowledge sharing on business strategy and organizational performance.

However, the relatively lower mean and higher standard deviation observed for the promotion and rewards aspect may indicate that respondents are unsure about the extent to which these incentives are linked to knowledge sharing and mentoring abilities. This could imply a potential area for understanding the value of knowledge management practices, management support at all levels, incentives for knowledge sharing, and encouragement of interaction for creation and sharing of knowledge.

The competitiveness of public universities was measured using the Return on Assets (ROA), New Student Enrolment, Number of Patents, and Number of Citations as recorded for 5 years from 2018 to 2022.

### Descriptive Statistics for ROA by Years

**Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for ROA by Years**

Variable	N	Mean	Std. Dev.
ROA 2018	26	0.0031	0.1411
ROA 2019	26	-0.0158	0.2159
ROA 2020	26	0.0666	0.4447
ROA 2021	26	-0.0816	0.8118
ROA 2022	26	0.0264	0.2238

In 2018, the universities had an average ROA of approximately 0.0031. This suggests that, on average, universities generated a positive return of 0.3% on their assets in that year. The standard deviation for ROA in 2018 was relatively low at 0.1411, indicating that the ROA values for universities in this year had relatively less variability. In contrast, 2019 saw a slight decrease in the average ROA, with a mean value of approximately -0.0158. This suggests that, on average, universities experienced a negative return of 0.1% on their assets in 2019. The standard deviation increased to 0.2159, signifying greater variability in ROA values across the universities in this year. The year 2020 witnessed a notable positive change in the mean ROA, which reached approximately 0.0666. On average, universities achieved a return of 6.7% on



their assets in 2020, indicating an improvement in profitability. However, it's important to note that the standard deviation for ROA in 2020 was relatively high at 0.445, demonstrating substantial variability in ROA values among universities.

In the year 2021, there was a notable negative change in the mean ROA, which reached approximately -0.0816. On average, universities achieved a negative return of 8.2% on their assets in 2021, indicating a decline in profitability. However, it's important to note that the standard deviation for ROA in 2021 was relatively high at 0.8118, showing substantial variability in ROA values among universities. In 2022 there was a slight improvement in the average ROA, with a mean value of approximately 0.0264. This suggests that, on average, universities experienced a negative return of 2.6% on their assets in 2022. The standard deviation reduced to 0.2238, signifying greater variability in ROA values across the universities in this year.

The analysis of ROA across the five years reveals a fluctuating trend. While 2018, 2020 and 2022 showed positive mean ROA values, 2019 and 2021 had a slightly negative mean. This suggests variations in the financial performance of universities over this period. The standard deviations for these years further indicate that the ROA values for universities were relatively stable in 2018, but became more dispersed in the rest of the years. This increased dispersion might be indicative of a wider range of financial performance among universities, requiring further investigation into the factors contributing to these variations.

The findings are in line with available literature that Return on Assets (ROA) is a crucial financial indicator that measures a university's ability to generate income and manage its assets efficiently (Gitman, 2015). In the context of higher education institution, a higher ROA suggests effective resource allocation and financial sustainability, which are essential for long-term competitiveness

### Descriptive Statistics for New Student Enrolment by Year

**Table 2: Descriptive Statistics for New Student Enrolment by Year**

Variable	N	Mean	Std. Dev.
Enrollment 2018	26	2426.7	2161.3
Enrollment 2019	26	2072.5	2004.7
Enrollment 2020	26	2312.4	2085.2
Enrollment 2021	26	2346.1	1586.4
Enrollment 2022	26	2716.8	1912.8

In 2018, the mean enrollment was approximately 2,427 students, suggesting that, on average, universities had around 2,427 students. However, the data displayed significant variability, with a standard deviation of approximately 2,161 students. This wide dispersion indicates that some universities had considerably higher enrollments, with the maximum reported enrollment reaching 10,839 students, while others had much smaller enrollments, with the minimum being 357 students.

In 2019, the mean enrollment slightly decreased to approximately 2,073 students. The standard deviation remained high at approximately 2,005 students, indicating that there was a substantial range in enrollments across universities. The data reflected a minimum enrollment of 438 students and a maximum enrollment of 10,143 students. These variations highlight the diversity in student populations at the sampled universities. In 2020, the mean enrollment increased to around 2,312 students, suggesting a rebound in enrollment numbers. The standard deviation,

approximately 2,085 students, indicated continued diversity in enrollments. The range of enrollments was broad, with a minimum of 540 students and a maximum of 11,373 students.

In 2021, the mean enrollment slightly increased to approximately 2,346 students. The standard deviation also declined to approximately 1,586 students, indicating that there was a substantial range in enrollments across universities. The data reflected a minimum enrollment of 630 students and a maximum enrollment of 8,064 students. These variations highlight the diversity in student populations at the sampled universities. In 2022, the mean enrollment increased to around 2,717 students, suggesting a rebound in enrollment numbers. The standard deviation, approximately 1,913 students, indicated continued diversity in enrollments. The range of enrollments was broad, with a minimum of 873 students and a maximum of 9,654 students.

### Number of Patents

**Table 4: Number of Patents**

Year	N	Mean	Std. Dev.
Number of Patents 2018	26	1.1	2.5
Number of Patents 2019	26	1.8	4.9
Number of Patents 2020	26	2.7	5.4
Number of Patents 2021	26	1.3	5.5
Number of Patents 2022	26	1.4	6.5

In 2018, the mean number of patents is 1.1 with a standard deviation of 2.5. This indicated that most universities had a low number of patents, but the high standard deviation indicates some universities had a much higher number of patents. In 2019, the mean increased to 1.8 and the standard deviation also increased to 4.9. The increase in both the mean and standard deviation indicates a trend towards more patents, but also greater variability in the number of patents across universities. In 2020, the mean further increased to 2.7, and the standard deviation remained relatively high at 5.4. This year shows a continuing upward trend in the average number of patents.

In 2021, the mean dropped to 1.3, while the standard deviation increases to 5.5. This indicated a significant decrease in average patents, but the variability remains high, suggesting that while some universities still had many patents, others had very few. The mean slightly increased to 1.4 in 2022, with an even higher standard deviation of 6.5. This suggests a slight recovery in the average number of patents, but the high standard deviation indicates that the number of patents was still very inconsistent across universities. Byukusenge et al. ( 2016) posited that knowledge sharing amongst individuals contributed to development of new innovations in terms of products, processes and markets that aid the firm to attain superior performance.

### Number of Citations

**Table 3: Descriptive Statistics for Number of Citations by Year**

Year	N	Mean	Std. Dev.
Number of Citations 2018	26	1468.1	2366.2
Number of Citations 2019	26	1837.6	3331.0
Number of Citations 2020	26	2385.5	4706.8
Number of Citations 2021	26	3034.2	6085.4
Number of Citations 2022	26	3293.6	6620.1

In 2018, the mean number of citations is 1,468 with a standard deviation of 2366.2. This indicates that while the average number of citations was relatively low, the high standard deviation suggests that some universities had a very high number of citations, creating significant variability. The mean increased to 1,837 in 2019 with a standard deviation of 3331. The upward trend in mean citations continues, along with increased variability, indicating some universities had exceptionally high citation counts. In 2020, the mean rose to 2,385 and the standard deviation increased to 4706.8.

This suggests that not only were citations increasing, but the range of citations was becoming even broader, with some universities likely receiving very high numbers of citations. In 2021, the mean further increased to 3,034, while the standard deviation jumped to 6,085. This year reflects a significant rise in average citations, but the high standard deviation indicates a wide disparity in citation counts. The mean citations increased slightly to 3,294 in 2022, and the standard deviation continued to rise to 6,620. The average number of citations remains high, but the variability suggests that some universities had extremely high citation counts compared to others.

The findings are in tandem with existing literature that highly-cited publications act as a criterion of university excellence, internationalization, and contribution to innovation. According to Bonaccorsi (2016), highly-cited publications indicate research excellence, which many universities see as their goal. In addition to excellence, a second goal that some universities embrace is to act as an absorber of global knowledge through international networks and co-publications

### Regression Analysis

The study sought to establish the relationship between knowledge sharing capability and competitiveness of chartered public universities in Kenya. From this, the hypothesis of the study was drawn:

*H<sub>01</sub> There is no statistically significant relationship between knowledge sharing capability and competitiveness of chartered public universities in Kenya.*

Regression analysis was used to calculate coefficient of determination in order to estimate the degree of influence that knowledge sharing capability had on competitiveness of public universities as shown in Table 6.

**Table 4: Model Summary on Regression Analysis of Knowledge Sharing Capability**

<b>Model Summary</b>				
<b>Model</b>	<b>R</b>	<b>R Square</b>	<b>Adjusted R Square</b>	<b>Std. Error of the Estimate</b>
1	.900a	0.810	0.809	0.43926

a Predictors: (Constant), Knowledge sharing

b Dependent Variable:

Competitiveness

**Table 5: ANOVA**

ANOVA						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	99.580	1	99.580	159.335	.000b
	Residual	23.347	121	0.193		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>122.927</b>	<b>122</b>			

a Dependent Variable: Competitiveness

b Predictors: (Constant), Knowledge sharing

**Table 6: Regression Coefficients**

Regression Coefficients						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	0.452	0.160		2.826	0.005
	Knowledge sharing	0.899	0.040	0.900	22.717	0.000

a Dependent Variable: Competitiveness

The results of the model indicated that R square=0.810 which implied that knowledge sharing was responsible for 81.0% of the variance in the competitiveness of Kenyan chartered public universities.

In addition, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was carried out to ascertain whether knowledge sharing capability influenced competitiveness of chartered public universities in Kenya. From the results it was clear that knowledge sharing explains a considerable amount of the variance in the competitiveness of chartered public universities in Kenya. The hypothesis that 'knowledge organization has no statistical significant relationship on competitiveness of chartered public universities in Kenya' was thus rejected because the model was statistically significant.

The regression coefficients were also computed. The findings showed that the coefficient for knowledge Sharing was 0.899. The model was thus presented as follows:  $Y=0.452+0.899X_1+\epsilon$

The findings indicated that a unit increase in knowledge sharing led to 0.899 increase in the competitiveness of public universities in Kenya. The p-value was found to be  $0.000 < 0.05$  which showed a significant relationship between knowledge sharing and the competitiveness of public universities in Kenya. Hence, the study rejected the null hypothesis that knowledge sharing has no statistical significant influence on competitiveness of chartered public universities in Kenya. We therefore conclude that knowledge sharing has a statistical significant influence on competitiveness of chartered public universities in Kenya.

## Discussion

The study found that public universities adopted various knowledge sharing practices. The findings revealed that the university had established a favourable environment for knowledge sharing among its employees. The encouragement of experienced staff to share knowledge, the availability of facilitative mechanisms like seminars and mentorship, and the emphasis on a

culture of sharing contribute to an environment conducive to knowledge exchange. This was supported by an aggregate mean score of 3.83 and standard deviation of 0.75 which shows the responses varied amongst respondents.

The ANOVA p-value was found to be  $0.000 < 0.05$  which showed a significant relationship between knowledge sharing and the competitiveness of public universities in Kenya. Hence, the study rejected the null hypothesis that knowledge sharing has no statistical significant influence on competitiveness of chartered public universities in Kenya. The computed regression coefficient for knowledge sharing was 0.899 which indicated that a unit increase in knowledge sharing led to 89.9 % increase in the competitiveness of public universities in Kenya. The study therefore concluded that knowledge sharing has a statistical significant influence on competitiveness of chartered public universities in Kenya.

### **Conclusion**

The study concluded that knowledge sharing capability influences competitiveness of chartered public universities in Kenya. Knowledge sharing capability contributed significantly to competitiveness of public universities. The public universities should therefore entrench knowledge sharing practices in their day to day operations in order to remain competitive.

The study recommended that public universities should embrace knowledge sharing practices in their operations as it enhances competitiveness. One of very important factor in knowledge sharing is that university stakeholders should be accorded with formal, informal and virtual space to interact with each other for knowledge exchange.

## REFERENCES

- Abbasi, E., & Siddiqi, A. (2005). Knowledge Management In Public Sector Universities of Pakistan. *2005 International Conference on Information and Communication Technologies*, 223–232.
- Al-Faris, S. (2010). The role of knowledge management in raising the efficiency of the performance of organizations: a field study on the manufacturing companies of Damascus. *Damascus University Journal of Economics, Legal*, 26(2), 19–35.
- AL-Hakim, L. A. Y., & Hassan, S. (2011). The Role of Middle Managers in Knowledge Management Implementation for Innovation Enhancement. *International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology*, 2(1), 86–94.
- Al-Khalili, S. M. T. (2006). *The role of knowledge management in the Ministry of Education of Jordan Aterbah: an analytical study*. Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan.
- Al-obaidi, A. H. K., Fahmi, A. M., & Al-hadrawi, H. K. (2018). *and Academic Review Advantage for Public universities*. 6(1), 44–53.
- Bonaccorsi, A. (2016). Addressing the disenchantment: universities and regional development in peripheral regions. *Journal of Economic Policy Reform*, (August 27), 1–28.
- Bornemann, M., Graggober, M., Hartieb, E., Hympl, B., Koronakis, P., Primus, A., & Wols. (2003). *An Illustrated Guide to Knowledge Management*. WissensManagement Forum
- Byukusenge, E., Munene, J., & Orobia, L. (2016). Knowledge Management and Business Performance: Mediating Effect of Innovation. *Journal of Business and Management Sciences*, 4(4), 82–92.
- Day, G. S. (1994) “The Capabilities of Market-Driven Organisations,” *Journal of Marketing*, 58 (4): 37-52.
- Donate, M. J., & Canales, J. I. (2012). A new approach to the concept of knowledge strategy. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 16(1), 22–44.
- Gold, A. H., Malhotra, A., & Segars, A. H. (2001). Knowledge Management: An Organizational Capabilities Perspective. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 18(1), 185–214.
- Imran, M.K., Ilyas, M., Aslam, U. and Tahreem, F. (2018), “Knowledge processes and firm performance: the mediating effect of employee creativity”, *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, Vol. 31 No. 3, pp. 512-531.
- Li, Yuan, Liu, X., Wang, L., & Li, M. (2009). How entrepreneurial orientation moderates the effect of knowledge management on innovation. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, 26(6), 645–660.
- Ludwig, G., & Pemberton, J. (2011). A managerial perspective of dynamic capabilities in emerging markets: The case of the Russian steel industry. *Journal of East European Management Studies*, 16(3), 215–236.
- Mohammed, F. (2010). Knowledge management processes and impact in achieving competitive advantage.

- Newman, B. D., & Conrad, K. W. (2000). The Framework for Characterizing Knowledge Management Methods, Practices, and Technologies. *Knowledge Management Journal*. U. Reimer (Ed.), *Proc. of the Third Int. Conf. on Practical Aspects of Knowledge Management (PAKM2000)* (Vol. 34).
- Penrose, E. T. (1959). *The Theory of the Growth of the Firm*. John Wiley.
- Qandah, R., Suifan, T.S., Masa'deh, R. and Obeidat, B.Y. (2020), "The impact of knowledge management capabilities on innovation in entrepreneurial companies in Jordan", *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, In Press
- Rafi, N., Ahmed, A., Shafique, I. and Kalyar, M.N. (2021), "Knowledge management capabilities and organizational agility as liaisons of business performance", *South Asian Journal of Business Studies*, In Press,
- Servin, G., & De Brún, C. (2005). *ABC of knowledge management, NHS National Library for Health: Knowledge Management Specialist Library*.
- Shaqrah, A. and Alzighaibi, A. (2021), "Linking knowledge management capabilities and the mediating role of the big data capabilities for enterprise value-adding processes", *VINE Journal of Information and Knowledge Management Systems*, In Press
- Skaik, H. A., & Othman, R. (2014). Determinants of knowledge sharing behaviour amongst academics in United Arab Emirates. *International Journal of Knowledge and Systems Science*, 5 (3), 54–70.
- Velev, M. (2004). Evaluation and analysis of company competitiveness. *Softreyd, S*.
- Yudina, A. (2006). Terminological aspects of university competitiveness. *Gaudeamus Igitur*, 4.
- Zahra, S. A., & George, G. (2002). Absorptive Capacity: A Review, Reconceptualization, and Extension. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(2), 185–203
- Zaim, H., Muhammed, S. & Tarim, M. (2019), "Relationship between knowledge management processes and performance: critical role of knowledge utilization in organizations", *Knowledge Management Research and Practice*, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 24-38.