Predicting Academic Staffs’ Behavioural Intention to Create Knowledge by Using Policies In Private Universities of Tanzania

Laurenti Sylvester Masui¹, Robert Arasa², Thadeus Mkamwa³

¹,³Faculty of Business Administration,
The Saint Augustine University of Tanzania, Tanzania
²School of Business and Economics, Machakos University, Kenya

ABSTRACT

Countless studies have been done to address knowledge issues despite its being still at nascence. Still a number of them do recommend policies usage in enhancing knowledge management and related issues. There lacks though an explained clear association between the aspects derived from policies and the intention to behaviour. Thus, this study investigates the association between policy aspects and the intention to engage in the knowledge creation behaviour by academic staffs in private universities. The study used an organized framework (theoretical or conceptual): the theory of planned behaviour (TPB) to explain for the interplay between the factors in the planned behaviour: knowledge creation. Academic staffs of selected private universities were obtained randomly from census population. 400 sets of questionnaires were given and 202 were returned (equivalent of 51% response rate) on surveyed on the influence of policy aspects on their likelihood to intend to engage in the behaviour. Data were factor analyzed before being logit regressed and estimated by maximum likelihood estimation (MLE). Overall, the study established significant association between availability of time, provision of space, rights and values and the intention to engage in knowledge creation behavior. The study also found no significant association between other policy aspects: finances and mentoring and the intention to engage in the behaviour. Recommendations include that offices and positions related to knowledge creation should be established, and more time should be made available for knowledge creators. Mentoring should be properly instituted in the universities.
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INTRODUCTION

Liberalization of economies in the world and more so in Tanzania has had an impact on the provision of higher education notwithstanding. Owing the expansion of the sector, numerous programmes and projects have been put in place to address the resultant needs in Tanzania for example. Worldwide, one of such needs is to have a robust system where universities fully engage in knowledge management. This has been recorded thus (Siadat, et. al, 2012; Tian, et. al. 2009). And like others, they are measured by their performance in this: knowledge creation (management) (Esposito et. al, 2013). However, this has not been an easy task though; countless studies have studied knowledge management and processes (Dulle, Majanja & Cloete, 2010; Migosi, 2009; Lwoga & Sifa, 2006). One common thing about all these and other related studies is that they recommend policy intervention to address the identified shortcomings and needs.

Dulle and others (2010) in their Tanzanian study of sharing knowledge in universities did recommend such policies. Migosi (2009), who had studied research productivity in Kenyan universities, had policies among the recommendations made by respondents. Lwoga and Sife (2006), who had found of there being no systematic knowledge management in Tanzania, did it also. Lastly, Esposito and others (2013) did
establish organizational policies’ influence on university employees’ (academic) performance in knowledge creation. Just to mention a few.

The purpose of this paper is to contribute to the understanding of whether and how different policy aspects help predicting the intention to resultant behavior: knowledge creation. This has been necessitated as a result of countless policy propositions towards knowledge creation (and management) (Dulle, Majanja & Cloete, 2010; Migosi, 2009; Lwoga & Sifa, 2006). It proposes the relationships between the different policy aspects and the intention to perform the targeted behavior. Thus the paper has the following main research objective: to determine whether policies (and their aspects) can influence the behavioural intention to perform knowledge creation in Tanzanian private universities.

The article is structured as follows: first, a theoretical framework is presented to show theoretical underpinnings of the study explaining the relationship between the key constructs in the study. The research model and hypotheses and their measurement and testing are described. Obtained results are presented and used in discussion. Conclusion and recommendations are presented last. It ends with the propositions for further studies.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Conceptual Definition

Behavioural Intention

In the theory of planned behavior (TPB) the behavior can be explained by intention to do it which in turn is explained by the following elements: attitude, social norm and perceived behavioural control. Intention to behave acts as a precursorial behavioural determinant (Schwartz et. al, 2009; Lin & Lee, 2004) and as such it remains a strong behavioural predictor (Karim, Razi & Mohamed, 2013). Such intention or otherwise is determined by person’s perception of the behavior in question (Ajzen, 1991). It is directly related to behavioural occurrence likelihood (Breslin et. al, 2001). It follows from motivational dimensions towards the behavior (Tohidinia & Mosakhani, 2010; Ajzen, 1991) and its valid proxy (Heuer & Kolvereid, 2014). Intention measures future behavior (George, 2004): want, intend, plan, expect and find about the behavior. The study proposes that there is an association between different policy aspects and the academic staffs’ behavioural intention to create knowledge.

Theoretical Framework

The Theory of Planned Behaviour

This work determines the prediction of academic staffs’ behavioural intention to perform knowledge creation behavior by using policies in Tanzanian private universities. The study therefore uses specifically the predictive theory of planned behavior (TPB). The theory, which is an extension of the theory of reasoned action (TRA), in turn has been variedly extended to suit respective needs. For instance, to explain the predictability of using new technology, it was extended to the theory of technological acceptance model (TAM) which has been widely used to explain technology acceptance (Chuttur, 2009), predicting entrepreneurial behaviours (Schwartz, Wdowiak, Almer-Jarz & Breiteneker, 2009), explaining knowledge management processes (Karim, et. al, 2013; Lin & Lee, 2004), in consumer attitudes (Noor, Yap, Liew & Rajah, 2014) as well as countless other situations (Vinogradov et. al, 2013) to say the least.

It is used here to predict the influence of policies on knowledge creation behavior. Different policy aspects have been grouped under the PBC construct of the TPB. Perceived behavioural control from the original TPB model encapsulates the capability aspects (Ajzen, 1991). And some other studies have found the direct effect of antecedents to PBC to any specific behavioural intention (Mtebe, 2014). As such there are established relationships between the capability antecedents and behavioural intention to perform knowledge creation behaviour. Capability is a prerequisite to knowledge creation in an organization. Such organizational capability has both contextual dynamics and factors: time, finances, mentoring, rights and values (Chong et. al, 2014). Organization’s members perception of their capability to control behavior in question impacts their intention to engage in such and related behaviours (Tohidinia & Mosakhani, 2010).
Empirical Literature
Aspects taken from related policy aspects include: availability of time, finances, mentoring, provision of spaces, and rights and values. They were grouped under the perceived behavioural control (PBC) of the theory of planned behavior (TPB). This formed a backbone of the research model. The following sections outline the relationship between such aspects and the said behavioural intention.

Availability of Time and Behavioural Intention to Create Knowledge
Countless remarks by academic staffs do lay claim of the need for time to engage in knowledge creation behavior. A number of studies conducted on this relationship attest to its existence (Thani & Mirkamali, 2018; Ramjeawon & Rowley, 2017; Cheng et. al, 2014; Gururajan & Fink, 2010). One common thing is that its existence or lack thereof impact performance of such behavior or not respectively. Gururajan and Fink (2010) had found the availability of time to academic staffs for knowledge activities to be a contributory factor in their involvement in such activities. Like them, Thani and Mirkamali (2018) established that time management was important in performance of knowledge management and related behavior. The other two studies showed differently: that the lack of time hampered the behaviour. Jain and others (2007) as reported by Cheng and others (2014) also found that lack of time was a barrier in knowledge creation behaviour. So also are Ramjeawon and Rowley (2017) who in their Mauritian higher education institutions’ study found lack of time to be a barrier in knowledge management and related behaviours.

This study therefore hypothesizes that:

\[ H_1: \text{The belief academic staffs have on the availability of time for knowledge creation and related activities influence their intention to create knowledge.} \]

Availability of Finance and Behavioural Intention to Create Knowledge
Like time the availability of finance has always been considered apparently important by academic staffs in activities related to knowledge creation. Finances could be had as a species of reward (Cheng et. al, 2014) and hence motivational or again for transactional purposes related to various activities (Wang et. al, 2006). Wang and others (2006) had found finances to have both effects: facilitator and inhibitor to knowledge creation depending on its availability or not. Availability of funds was also found to be influential in activities related to knowledge sharing among academics in Bowen University in Nigeria (Akosile & Olatokun, 2019). In a study of Mauritian universities lack of funds was found to be a barrier to knowledge management activities (Ramjeawon & Rowley, 2017). Such mixed signals shown by availability of finances indicate its relationship with the performance of knowledge management activities. Thus it is hypothesized that:

\[ H_2: \text{The belief academic staffs have on the availability of finances for knowledge creation and related activities influence their intention to create knowledge.} \]

Mentoring and Behavioural Intention to Create Knowledge
With career advancement in academic life there is attached to it mentoring system and mechanism; in fact, universities with different and newer cadre of academic staffs need it more. In most cases it is associated with career advancement and development of such staffs (Arokiasamy et. al, 2011; Crocitto et. al, 2005). Arokiasamy and others (2011) had established the projected influence of mentoring on knowledge creation and related activities in Malaysian universities. A somewhat similar finding were obtained by Crocitto and others (2005), who associated mentoring with career development and job satisfaction derived from knowledge creation behavior. Needless to say mentoring has remained important in introducing different junior staff into knowledge management dynamisms (Gururajan & Fink, 2010). In fact Akosile and Olutokum (2019) in their Nigerian study established its influence on knowledge sharing among academics. But its peculiar and personal nature makes its administration not an easy thing, as it remains driven by personal empathy, trust, respect etc. The study advances the following hypothesis in that regard:
H3: The belief academic staffs have on the possibility of being mentored for knowledge creation and related activities influence their intention to create knowledge.

**Provision of Spaces and Behavioural Intention to Create Knowledge**

Universities like any other organizations are designed: structuring, organizing and coordinating to provide spaces for knowledge creation. Structure emanates from an organizational policy (Prus, 2003). It involves bringing together different experiences and expertise in a particular relationship (Erhardt, 2011) that systematizes knowledge management and processes (Fielder & Welpe, 2010) through qualified interaction (Rossi, 2010). Different units in a university are structured to enable the processes of knowledge creation (Esposito et. al, 2013; White & Weathersby, 2005). The accessibility is made possible by organizing for knowledge creation, which is like providing it leadership (Song, Uhm & Yoon, 2011; Nonaka et. al, 2006). It provides strategic direction for it (Song et. al, 2011; Wang, Su & Yang, 2011). It is an organizational support (Muqadas et. al, 2017; Arokiasamy et. al, 2011). Academic staffs and related activities they perform in it are coordinated. Coordination, like specialization and centralization also enables departmentation (Erhardt, 2011; Ljoria, 2007; Beardwell, 2003) as it enables synergy and cohesiveness. It also enables proximity of members diverse and heterogeneous as they are (Erhardt, 2011).

The above relationships are supported by a number of works. Kolomiari and others (2016) found organization structure to enable communication amongst members in academic libraries. When it is in a form of organizational routines it becomes a critical component in creation of knowledge as found in Chinese firms (Wang et. al, 2011). Structuring, coordination and organizing in an organization equal organizational support that has been found to facilitate knowledge sharing among academic staffs (Muqadas et. al, 2017) and also in career development of staffs (Arokiasamy et. al, 2011). Others found such social interaction of academic staffs derived from all these (Cheng et. al, 2014; Siadat et. al, 2012). Such interaction enables different dynamics: temporal, spatial and relational in an organization during knowledge creation processes (Balestrin et.al, 2008). Thus, it is hypothesized that:

\[ H_4: \text{The belief academic staffs have on the provision of spaces for knowledge creation and related activities influence their intention to create knowledge.} \]

**Rights and Values and Behavioural Intention to Create Knowledge**

Knowledge creation involves a number of legal and proprietary issues both as a means and an end. As such there is derived from this rights and values that are considered important. They include intellectual property rights and academic freedom and integrity; the latter group belongs to the cultural setup of respective organizations (Fullwood et. al, 2013; Siadat et. al, 2012). The rights associated with created knowledge as a property and commodity assures academics of their assigned rights to knowledge created, hence readiness or not to share it (Chong et. al, 2014; Gururajan & Fink, 2010). In their Australian study, the latter had found that academic staffs were willing to share their knowledge with others provided their rights to such knowledge were guaranteed. Chong and others (2014) on other hand found that fear of knowledge being misused by others kept them from readily sharing it with others. Ramachandran and others (2013) in their Malaysian study did find organizational values (culture) to be both an enabler and supportive of knowledge management relationship. Intellectual property rights are considered a value too. Academic freedom enables academics to do whatever they feel important and adequate to create knowledge: Fullwood and others (2013) had found out that the feeling of autonomy or freedom amongst academics in dealing with matters related to knowledge management contributed to their readiness to share knowledge. Academic integrity on its part ensures that academic staffs do whatever is necessary to safeguard the integrity of knowledge created. The two are also part of organizational cultural values, which like any other values, and are associated with knowledge creation (Ramachandran et. al, 2013; Siadat et. al, 2012). Thus it seems that such values and rights do have an influence on academic staffs’ knowledge creation behaviour. The study hypothesizes thus:

\[ H_5: \text{The belief academic staffs have on the safeguarding of rights derived from knowledge creation and related activities influence their intention to create knowledge.} \]
$H_0$: The belief academic staffs have on the upholding of values for knowledge creation and related activities influence their intention to create knowledge.

**RESEARCH METHODS**

**Population and Sampling**

Seven private universities in Tanzania with an estimated academic staff population of 800+ were surveyed. They included the Saint Augustine University of Tanzania (SAUT), University of Arusha (UoA), Saint John University of Tanzania (SJUT), Mount Meru University (MMU), University of Iringa (UoI), Mwenge Catholic University (MWECAU) and Ruaha Catholic University (RUCU). The unit of analysis was the universities’ academic staffs. The table 1 summarizes the demographic profiles of the sample.

Since all the academic staffs were eligible for the study census population was used and they were obtained by the use of convenience sampling.

**Table 1. Demographic characteristics of the respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>20 – 29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 – 49</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 – 59</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60+ above</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>Bachelor degree (BAs)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master degree (Mas)</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral degree (PhD)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Rank</td>
<td>Tutorial Assistant (TA)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant Lecturer</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience (years)</td>
<td>0 – 5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 – 10</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 – 15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Collection Procedures**

Data collection instrument: questionnaire was pretested with fifty (50) volunteering academics from two universities: SAUT and SJUT. For ethical purposes and adherence permission to conduct research and consent sought from the respondents were obtained. No incentives were used in this study. The questionnaire was then distributed to members of academic staff who had volunteered to fill them in. The researcher did distribute them with the help of some focal people from the respective universities. They made follow up of questionnaires and after a month or so they were picked up by the researcher. Such data collection was undertaken from November 2016 to mostly December 2016; some questionnaires were returned even in March 2017.
Questionnaires were given randomly to all those willing to participate in the study. In total 400 sets of questionnaire were distributed out of which 202, equivalent of more than fifty percentage (50%) were returned; this has been said to be an acceptable proportion for analysis (Baruch & Holtom, 2008). Besides for any logistic regression a minimum response rate of ten percent (10%) from the total population is acceptable for analysis (Peng, Lee & Ingersoll, 2002). A stable analysis for logistic regression is had when there is a minimum of about 100 to 150 units for analysis (Arokiasamy et. al, 2011); in this study there are 202 units. Data collected was analyzed using STATA 14.0 statistical package.

Variables and their Measurement
The study constructed its own instruments from both, literature and documentary reviews. Aspects extracted were then used to construct Likert scaled statements with observations ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Such statements for perceived knowledge creation capability (PKCC) were:
- It enhances my accessibility to different resources (time) needed in knowledge creation activities;
- It enhances my accessibility to different resources (finance) needed in knowledge creation activities;
- It enhances my capacity through mentoring (ment), coaching and supervision;
- It provides me with different spaces through which to articulate (my) knowledge;
- It guarantees my rights to (my) articulated knowledge;
- It enables me to draw values from the processes involved.

As for the intention towards knowledge creation (INT) as a dependent variable the following statements were used:
- I intend to constantly engage in knowledge creation behaviour;
- I find it a good thing to engage in knowledge creation behaviour;
- I expect to engage in knowledge creation behaviour;
- I plan to engage in knowledge creation behaviour;
- I want to engage in knowledge creation behaviour.

As the dependent variable for a logistic regression has only two values: 1 and 0, then scores 1 to 3 were regarded 0 and the rest: 4 to 7 regarded as 1 (Kupek, 2006; Zhao, Chen & Schaffner, 2001) to be able to dichotomize the range of observations 1 – 7 representing the strength or not of intending and performing the behavior.

Consultations amongst peers and piloting of questionnaires were done to establish both their face and content validity (Bryman, 2008; Saunders et. al, 2007). Cronbach’s alpha value of 0.8792 was obtained for internal consistency of the instruments and it was judged acceptable (Ramayah, 2014). Table 2 indicates the Cronbach’s values of each of the measure as used in the study.

RESULTS
Model Estimation and Data Analysis
The following estimated model guided the data analysis to test study’s different hypothesis:

\[ Y_{1\text{ (find)}} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{time} + \beta_2 \text{fina} + \beta_3 \text{ment} + \beta_4 \text{space} + \beta_5 \text{rights} + \beta_6 \text{value} \ldots (1) \]

First, the decency of the model was established: \( r^2 = 0.5432; r^2 > 0.25 \). The model explains 54% of the variations in academics’ behavioural intention to create knowledge.

Second, as usual the assumptions to data were tested as per requirement (Siddiqi, 2014). Such assumptions were as related to the sources of such data, means of getting such data and the end use of such data. Normality, correlation and multicollinearity were tested respectively. For normality, skewness/kurtosis test were done with the following results obtained respectively: 0.0000-0.0315 and 0.000 – 0.9892 and they are within -2.58 to +2.58; hence data was considered to be obtained from a source with normally distributed population. Table 1 provides such sample characteristics. For the means, the obtained data in the correlation matrix did not go beyond 0.7236 that is below the decision threshold of 0.8; hence independent variables are not highly correlated (Siddiqi, 2014; Saunders, 2009). Lastly, to test multicollinearity assumption the study used Variable Inflation Factor (VIF) and Tolerance Value (TV). The highest VIF recorded was 2.19 and 0.4568 for TV. With the acceptance decision criteria:
Variable Inflation Factor (VIF) (not being greater than 10) and Tolerance Value (not being less than 0.1) data was found to be not highly multicollinear.

Third, factor analysis was conducted to identify the factor structure and obtained the following matrix as tabulated below in table 2. This is advisable when new and untested scales are used in the study. The use of such scales, likert scales, though is littered with opposing arguments both in favour and against it especially in the areas of validity and reliability (Pearse, 2011). The seven point scales used are to ensure their predictive validity (Warmbrod, 2014; Dolnicar, Grun, Leisch & Rosslier, 2011). Data estimation was conducted to establish their variances and other related relationships (Hinkin, Tracey & Enz, 1997). The most common and useful approach is by determining their usefulness (Mtebe, 2014; Warmbrod, 2014; Pearse, 2011) through their reliability and internal consistency before anything else. The Cronbach’s alpha data for the used items (constructs) are as tabulated in table 2. The results indicated all of them to be positive and above .7 well above the accepted threshold of .5 (Mtebe, 2014; Warmbrod, 2014; Pearse, 2011). Then, the adequacy of sampling was determined by using the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of Sampling (KMO) and the results are as tabulated in table 2 and were well above the proposed .5 acceptable minimum for acceptability (Mtebe, 2014). Before conducting factor analysis Bartlett’s test of sphericity was conducted to establish whether correlations between the items were sufficiently large enough for performing principal component analysis (PCA). Obtained statistic: (x^2(15), 554.313, p < .000; det = .061) indicated that such correlations were sufficiently large enough for the said analysis: principal component. Factor analysis was conducted using principal component method rotation orthogonal varimax.

Fourth, logistic regression analysis (Maximum Likelihood Estimation - MLE) was conducted and obtained the following results as tabulated in table 3 below. Data collected was analyzed using STATA 14.0 statistical package.

### Table 2: Items Loadings on the Constructs Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor 1 Loading</th>
<th>Factor 2 Loading</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha (α)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Knowledge Creation Capability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.8792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>.6704</td>
<td>.8478</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fina</td>
<td>.5798</td>
<td>.8703</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ment</td>
<td>.7465</td>
<td>.8464</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spaces</td>
<td>.7741</td>
<td>.8409</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights</td>
<td>.7214</td>
<td>.8548</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>value</td>
<td>.7135</td>
<td>.8538</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural Intention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.9255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intend</td>
<td>.6592</td>
<td></td>
<td>9223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find</td>
<td>.8312</td>
<td></td>
<td>9140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expe2</td>
<td>.6952</td>
<td></td>
<td>9015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>.8609</td>
<td></td>
<td>9000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want</td>
<td>.8670</td>
<td></td>
<td>9039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>4.07521</td>
<td>3.34839</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td>7.86529</td>
<td>2.14396</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reporting the Results of Hypotheses Tests

The logistic regression analysis by the MLE was conducted to test the different hypotheses on the relationship between perceived knowledge creation capability and the behavioural intention to perform knowledge creation behavior. The following table 3 represents a summary of such findings.

The first hypothesis on the relationship between the availability of time and the likelihood to behavioural intention obtained the following results: (β = 1.21; S.E = 0.4552; OR = 2.4558; p = 0.000). The test showed significant results. The study failed to reject the null hypothesis:
H1: The belief academic staffs have on the availability of time for knowledge creation and related activities would likely influence their intention to create knowledge.

This confirms what is attested in different works reviewed though variedly: that there is a relationship between the availability or not of time and the behavioural intention to perform knowledge creation behaviour. Its lack was found to be barrier in knowledge sharing behaviour by academics in Malaysian private universities’ staff (Chong et. al, 2014) and in Mauritian higher education institutions (Ramjeawon & Rowley, 2017). On their part, Thani and Mirkamali (2018) in an Iranian study found time management to be contributing towards enhancing the behaviour. Teaching load has always been associated with time availability. The above two studies (Thani and Mirkamali, 2018; Ramjeawon & Rowley, 2017) had found it to be hindering knowledge activities in their respective areas of knowledge management.

Table 3: Results Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient (β)</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>OR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Knowledge Creation Capability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time</td>
<td>1.21 (0.0000)</td>
<td>.4552</td>
<td>2.4558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fina</td>
<td>.1438 (0.715)</td>
<td>.3936</td>
<td>1.4388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ment</td>
<td>-.2173 (0.496)</td>
<td>.3189</td>
<td>.6354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spaces</td>
<td>1.043 (0.010)</td>
<td>.4031</td>
<td>2.4671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rights</td>
<td>-1.3013 (0.005)</td>
<td>.4636</td>
<td>.2661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>value</td>
<td>.8601 (0.023)</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>2.131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intention to Engage in Knowledge Creation behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Find (1 = Yes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2- statistics (p – value)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second hypothesis tested the relationship between availability of finance and the likelihood to intend to perform the behavior in question. It obtained the following results: (β = 0.1438; S.E = 0.3936; OR= 1.4388; p= 0.715). From these insignificant results the study rejects the null hypothesis that:

H2: The belief academic staffs have on the availability of finances for knowledge creation and related activities would likely influence their intention to create knowledge.

Contrary to what was expected finances do not have an influence on the behavioural intention to perform knowledge creation behavior. Literatures have been indicating otherwise: that money causes the behaviour to be done. Chong and others (2014) had established its positive influence on knowledge sharing among staffs in Malaysian universities academic staffs. Yang and Chan (2007) too had associated funds with incentives and motivational aspects in knowledge sharing. Yet again the lack of funds was found to be barrier that hindered knowledge management in Mauritian universities by Ramjeawon and Rowley (2017). On the same note availability of funds was found to influence knowledge related behavior concomitantly in Bowen University academics (Akosile & Olatokun (2019).
Another hypothesis was meant to test the relationship between mentoring and the intention to engage in knowledge creation behavior. Since it obtained the following results: ($\beta = -0.2173; \text{S.E} = 0.3189; \text{OR} = 0.6354; p = 0.496$) the hypothesis that:

$H_3$: The belief academic staffs have on the possibility of being mentored for knowledge creation and related activities would likely influence their intention to create knowledge.

was rejected because of its insignificant statistical results; these were contrary to the literature. Mentoring had been projected to influence knowledge and related behavior (Arokiasamy et al., 2011). Gururajan and Fink (2010) in their Australian study had established the need for mentoring junior staffs in knowledge management. Akosile and Olatokun (2019) had found mentoring to have an influence on knowledge sharing among academics in a Nigerian university; likewise are Tian and others (2009) in their Japanese study. Like Arokiasamy and others (2011), Crocitto and others (2005) had found mentoring to have an influence on career development of knowledge workers especially. The relationship between the structuring, organizing and coordinating (provision of space) of knowledge creation and its behavioural intention was measured in the fourth hypothesis:

$H_4$: The belief academic staffs have on the provision of spaces for knowledge creation and related activities would likely influence their intention to create knowledge.

The hypothesis obtained the following results: ($\beta = 1.043; \text{S.E} = 0.4031; \text{OR} = 2.4671; p = 0.010$) and was accepted (failure to be rejected) by the study. As expected the study results confirmed study’s hypothesis and wider literature reviewed. For example, collaboration among academic staffs in knowledge creation had been established as an enabler in Malaysian universities (Ramachandran et al., 2013). Likewise such attribution has been put to their cooperation in knowledge creation through teamwork (Tian et al., 2009); they had also identified leadership and managerial style to contribute towards this. This kind of management support also was found to affect knowledge-sharing behavior in Taiwanese firms (Yang & Chan, 2007). Again Ramachandran and others (2013) found strategy and leadership to be supportive of knowledge management. Yet again proper organization and planning were found to contribute to enhancing knowledge creation (Tian et al., 2009). These boil down to leadership: structuring, organizing and coordinating; under these come aspects like collaboration, cooperation, organization, planning etc just to mention a few.

The fifth study hypothesis:

$H_5$: The belief academic staffs have on the safeguarding of rights derived from knowledge creation and related activities would likely influence their intention to create knowledge.

was to establish the relationship between perception of rights and their safeguarding and the behavioural intention. The test obtained the following results: ($\beta = -1.3013; \text{S.E} = 0.4636; \text{OR} = 0.2661; p = 0.005$). The study therefore failed to reject the hypothesis. The results confirm to what is explained in the literature. For example Chong and others (2014) did establish fear of misuse of one’s knowledge by others to be a barrier in sharing knowledge amongst themselves in Malaysian universities. The sense of autonomy and freedom in knowledge related activities was also found to affect intention to share knowledge amongst academic staffs (Fullwood et al., 2013).

The last study hypothesis wanted to establish the relationship between perception on related values to knowledge creation by academic staffs and their related behavioural intention

$H_6$: The belief academic staffs have on the upholding of values for knowledge creation and related activities would likely influence their intention to create knowledge.

The results: ($\beta = 0.8601; \text{S.E} = 0.378; \text{OR} = 2.131; p = 0.023$) obtained led to failure to reject the study’s hypothesis. Such results correspond to the literature reviewed. Knowledge creation entities have specific values: academic freedom and integrity (Ramirez et al., 2012; White & Weathersby, 2005) enabling cooperation and collaboration to start with. Ramachandran and others (2013) had established collaboration to be instrumental in knowledge management in a Malaysian university. So also are Tian and others (2009) who found cooperation to do so in a Japanese research institution. On their part, Fullwood and others (2013) did find intention to share knowledge being affected by relationship among such academics.
DISCUSSIONS OF RESULTS
This study investigated the predictive role of related policy aspects on the behavioural intention of the academic staffs of selected private universities in Tanzania to engage in (performing) knowledge creation behavior. No work known to this study shows whether and how knowledge creation policies can help the performance of the behaviours they are expected to cause. This study demonstrates the predictive impact of policies and their aspects on such behavior: knowledge creation behaviour.

Generally the results of the study indicate that most of the policy aspects do influence the likelihood of the academic staffs to engage in performance of the behavior: knowledge creation. Such findings are in line with a number of previous related studies; others are also contrary to such previous studies.

In general results of the study indicate that the relationship between availability of time and knowledge creation behavioural intention is significant. This is in line with some other previous studies that established such relationship (Thani & Mirkamali, 2018; Ramjeawon & Rowley, 2017; Chong et. al, 2014).

Availability of finances has been found not to have statistical significance in its relationship with intention to perform the behavior: knowledge creation behavior. This is contrary to general expectation and literature reviewed indicating the existence of such relationship (Akosile & Olatokun, 2019; Ramjeawon & Rowley, 2017; Chong et. al, 2014; Yang and Chan, 2007). The reason for such statistical insignificance could be that finances have nothing to do with knowledge creation per se despite their motivational power. Whenever used they do not directly affect the behavior and its performance.

There is also recorded an insignificant relationship between mentoring and intention to perform the knowledge creation behavior. Surprisingly this is contrary to the literature (Akosile & Olatokun, 2019; Arokiesamy et. al, 2011; Gururajan & Fink, 2010; Tian et. al, 2009; Crocitto et. al, 2005). With respect to the insignificant relationship between mentoring and the behavioural intention, such could be explained by the fact that mentoring is not well developed within the universities. Besides, low level of supervisory activities compounds the situation.

The relationship between the structuring, organizing and coordinating (provision of space) of knowledge creation and its behavioural intention has been found to be statistically significant. Such provision of space would include multiple aspects under such three dimensions. However, the most salient would include strategy and leadership that remain essential in knowledge management (Ramachandran et. al, 2013). It also enables collaboration among academics (Ramachandran et. al, 2013,) as it enhances their cooperation in the processes (Tian et. al, 2009). Organizing and planning for knowledge creation (Tian et. al, 2009) has been instrumental in enabling the performance of the behavior. Management support has also been influential in such endeavour: knowledge creation (Yang & Chan, 2007). All these form a combination of aspects making spaces for knowledge creation. When they provide space for the performance of the behavior then academic staffs find performing such behavior to be possible.

With respect to safeguarding related rights as accrued in knowledge creation there is a significant relationship recorded. The belief they have on their rights in this regard: autonomy, academic freedom and intellectual property rights ensure them of the safeguards in and of the knowledge created. The negative directionality would mean that this is considered important by the academic staffs besides being not properly administered. There are cases where academic freedom has been perceived to be compromised. Intellectual property rights system is still underdeveloped or non-existent; it is such fears that influence related decisions (Chong et. al, 2014). The sense of autonomy and academic freedom enhance the intention (Fullwood et. al, 2013).

Related to the above aspect are values. Values associated here include academic freedom and integrity. When such values are upheld then academic staffs would find it easier to engage in the behavior. This influences their likelihood to intend to engage in knowledge creation behaviour. Cooperation amongst them is only possible when they are free to do so (Tian et. al, 2009) and on the assumption that their encounter will be worthwhile as a result of academic integrity (Ramirez et al, 2012; White & Weathersby, 2005). The resultant collaboration will be instrumental in the process (Ramachandran et. al, 2013). So also are Tian and others (2009) who found cooperation to do so in a Japanese research institution. On
their part, Fullwood and others (2013) did find intention to share knowledge being affected by relationship: collaboration, cooperation etc. among such academics.

RECOMMENDATIONS
Implications: Managerial, Policy and Practice
This study has indicated the relationship between different policy aspects: availability of time and finance, mentoring, provision of space, rights and value and their influence on the likelihood to cause behavioural intention.

The study provides strong empirical support for the availability of time, provision of space and values (academic freedom) as enablers of knowledge creation for academic staffs. They should be exploited. However, it did not support the relationship between finances and mentoring with such behavioural intention.

Universities should, consequently, de-emphasize the importance attributed to finances in knowledge creation at a personal level. They should also institute in place systems and mechanisms that enable mentoring to take place in universities so that junior staffs benefit from it to turn seasoned knowledge creators.

On the whole, universities should establish positions, offices and oversight committees responsible for teaching, research and community services. They should also provide for ample time to academic staffs for knowledge creation activities.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research
Data used were collected by a questionnaire that was used to measure all the constructs; normally this lends to the problem of common method bias. Measurements for the constructs of this study were constructed for the study: there is a need to refine the measurement for such. Again, other data collection methods may be used to see whether they bring the same results at least at the very level of analysis: individual.

Another issue is of a design nature. Since the tested aspects were drawn from common policy aspects, there might be instances where other aspects not included here may be relevant for inclusion in measurements. Besides aspects considered here may be further considered singly in detail to see how they influence the said behaviour.
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