

The Effect of Managerial Leadership Behaviors and Transparent Internal Communication on Knowledge Sharing Behavior

Gaith Al Tounsi, Ammar Gadallah, Serene Dalati

Management Department, Faculty of Business Administration, Arab International University, Syrian Arab Republic

s-dalati@aiu.edu.sy

Abstract. This research paper examines the effect of leadership behaviors and transparent internal communication on knowledge sharing. The previous theories report a positive association between managerial leadership behaviors, transparent internal communication, and knowledge sharing. Methodology scrutinizes academics by applying a survey on private universities from the higher education sector in Syria. A convenience sample is considered from private universities in Syria. The regression analysis indicates a positive effect of leadership production emphasis and internal transparent communication on knowledge sharing behavior. The sample size is the main limitation. Future studies should explore larger samples and geographical locations. The institutional policy implication advocates emphasis on conducting training workshops to enhance academic competencies and skills.

Keywords: leadership behaviors; transparent internal communication; knowledge sharing; higher education.

1. Introduction

Instructive organizations are an essential tool in human social orders simply because schooling is the section that highlights far-reaching advancement, and it is the secure defense that social orders resort to on the off chance that they are presented with challenges and adversities. Suppose instructive establishments are the crucial device in the public arena. In that case, the instructive organization is the key and beginning stage during the time spent transforming schooling and creating it to address the issues of society (Thomas and Davenport, 2015; Jean, Dalati, and Al Bich, 2021). Since effective organizations are an imperative tool in the human social order, instructive administrations in these establishments are viewed as the unique component in accomplishing the objectives and destinations they have identified with the ideal productivity and adequacy (Ourfali, Mardam, Dalati, 2021). These forces give extraordinary abilities and necessities to have the option to confront contemporary changes and manage them productively (Dalati et al., 2020).

Furthermore, colleges are among the main educational establishments, and college organizations have an extraordinary duty to accomplish educational administration to stay up with the stunning logical insurgency (Dalati 2021b). The college organization should focus on selecting its employees with the skills and capacity, and logical capabilities to be the acceptable good examples contributing to the college mission and have the capacity to communicate positive criticism with individual personnel, organization, and understudies. Concerning managerial authority, the instructive pioneer impacts the course of undertakings in any association, little or enormous. The administration is an essential reason for any association, beginning with the family and finishing with the state. Exploring the essentials that make an individual a pioneer (Chiang et al., 2011) is critical. When there are several factors in the composition of the organization's managers, they are the pure interest of the employees. They have a high impact on the performance of their behaviors that reflect many factors of productivity, persuasion ability, and organizational structure. Also, they are strict at times and have transparent internal communication, which positively impacts knowledge-sharing behavior (Kalogiannidis et al., 2022). Hence, these effects are reflected in the productivity of the organization, the effectiveness of the organization, and the profit point, which leads to a true picture that reflects the effective performance of the organization.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Leadership Behavior

The behavioral theories of managerial leadership mainly studied two dimensions of leadership: task and relationship approaches (Stogdill and Coons, 1957; House, 1971; House and Mitchell, 1974).

Management is directed towards tasks by focusing on productivity, unlike relationship management. From here, we see the relationship between task-oriented

management has a positive relationship with the structure that defines the tasks of each employee separately and assigns tasks based on the structural structure built from accepting the task-oriented manager that dictates that the employee performs the tasks at the appointed time (Littrell, 2018).

The relationship-oriented manager is interested in first place in the process of persuading the employee and staying on the job for the employee. From here, we see that the relationship-oriented manager's first priority is employee satisfaction at the establishment's or organization's expense; alternatively, the employee's indifference to the tasks assigned to him (Zeb et al., 2019).

2.2. Knowledge Sharing

KM comprises information reception, information coding, information stockpiling, information sharing, and information use; information sharing is the most significant. Adequate information sharing makes association individuals accumulate information advantageously and quickly, and association individuals reproduce and use information by sharing information to upgrade KM execution. Information sharing can encourage authoritative advancement, center ability, and the upper hand. Information creation regularly happens through the trade and combination of information components. When the quality and speed of trade and the mix of information components are higher, the quality and amount of information created are higher (Dwivedi, Chaturvedi, and Vashist, 2020). When associations give fitting consolation that encourages information and insight sharing, it can make a huge development of information. Hence, information, particularly inferred information, the main hierarchical asset, can become the essential wellspring of the upper hand since information is hard to emulate. Notwithstanding, implicit information is stored in people, not in an association. The significance of worker information-sharing conduct can be additionally explained by utilizing the accompanying viewpoints. To start with, because implicit information is, by and large, encapsulated in people, sending such information through formalization is troublesome. Intuited information, such as psychological and experienced aptitudes, is hard to communicate orally. Along these lines, associations face challenges when endeavoring to overwhelm worker information-sharing conduct. As the measure of inferred information builds, the level of information deviation expands, uncovering information to be the main resource in the period of the information economy. Workers can either code and store significant information in authoritative data sets or offer information to others, and such sharing can cause an inside clash between an association and workers. The circulation of individual information decreases the uncommonness of information that impacts worker advantages in an association. Then again, which isn't the idea of devaluation, it won't deteriorate subsequent to utilizing or sharing; despite what might be expected, information can be broadened unfathomably (Lin, Huang, and Huang 2020).

All in all, information can create cooperative energy and be broadened unfathomably with endless potential through persistent learning and connection. To sum up, information, which is theoretical and inferred, is viewed as an essential

resource for looking after force, status, and upper hand; in this manner, associations should additionally recognize the components that impact representative information-sharing conduct. Numerous examinations verified that factors could anticipate representative information-sharing conduct, for example, hierarchical equity, trust, authoritative responsibility and HRM (Chiang, Han, and Chuang 2011).

2.3. Transparent internal communication

Lee et al. (2020) argue straightforward authoritative correspondence alludes an organization's correspondence to make accessible all lawfully releasable data to workers, whether positive or negative in nature – in a way that is precise, convenient, adjusted, and unequivocal, to improve the thinking capacity of representatives and to consider associations responsible for their activities, approaches, and practices. Three explicit correspondence endeavors should be guaranteed when associations practice straightforward inner correspondence, including responsible, participative, and considerable straightforwardness. The reliable straightforwardness rule expects associations to give total and comprehensive data, paying little mind to the data valence, to their representatives. The complete data that incorporates the two sides of information could help lessen workers' misconceptions, bits of gossip, or saw vulnerability toward the association. Participative straightforwardness shows that associations ought to urge their workers to effectively take an interest in data chasing, procuring, and sending measures. Through a particularly participatory cycle, associations may unmistakably distinguish and convey fitting, valuable and pertinent data to their representatives.

At last, generous straightforwardness proposes that associations ought to give critical, valid, honest, and considerable data to their workers. The specific data can assist workers with decreasing disarray and vulnerability, improving the correspondence cycle inside the associations. Direct inside correspondence has been exhibited to apply positive effects on a few representative results, incorporating worker trust in associations and their commitment and support of hierarchical practices during an emergency (Akhavan, Rahimi, and Mehralian 2013). The considerable advantages of straightforward inward correspondence make the topic of what or how to execute such correspondence rehearses a focal point of inside correspondence research. Among numerous variables that may add to straightforward inside correspondence practice by associations, initiative style or capacities have earned a lot of consideration from researchers. For instance, legitimate authority, a way to deal with the initiative that advances receptiveness, genuineness, and authenticity, has been perceived as a determinant of straightforward inside correspondence practice in associations. Alongside the writing that shows the significance of initiative style in molding hierarchical correspondence rehearses, this examination expects that various arranged administrations may apply comparative impacts as a credible authority on straightforward inside correspondence practice (Dwivedi, Chaturvedi, and Vashist, 2020). Organizations with different organized initiative practices give steady correspondence and preparation concerning variety.

The preparation ensures administrators' comprehension of the estimation of type and proper circulations of assets paying little heed to worker contracts. This administration style requires a lot of tuning in and correspondence, which implies that directors should be open and receptive to their subordinates' thoughts and assessments and be worth the subordinates' commitments to the association. This conduct permits representatives to accept that the data and the assets in the organizations are straightforward and genuinely conveyed. Subsequently, this examination assumes that organizations utilize a variety of situated authorities (Littrell et al., 2018).

2.4. Leadership, Knowledge Sharing, and Transparent Internal Communication

Information is moved in associations if it is an overseen cycle since ordinary information is a vital piece of authoritative life. Finding the best master to share their insight in a particular matter could be hard, particularly in more significant associations. Consequently, an organized procedure for information moving is needed for the association to thrive (Kirby, Paradise, and King 1992). Larger organizations are more inclined to contribute more on information the executives' measures, albeit serious advantages are acquired, paying little heed to association size. In an authoritative setting, implied information alludes to information that individuals create through the experience they acquire over the years. The representatives' experience and information can be viewed as the most significant source associations need to protect. Knowledge comprises a significant, elusive resource for making and supporting upper hands inside organizations. Several factors influence information partaking in associations, like hierarchical culture, trust, motivators, and technology. In an association, five particular states of the hierarchical culture positively affect information sharing: correspondence and coordination between gatherings, trust, top administration uphold, the prize framework, and openness. Concerning the correspondence and coordination between bunches condition, the associations brought together with a regulatory administration style can frustrate the production of new information through an adaptable decentralized authoritative construction that empowers information sharing. Additionally, internationalization is significant for consistency or congruity. It says that internationalization accepts that the "conduct directed by the standard is really the privilege and legitimate approach to behave" (Vandavasi et al. 2020). If the standard is to convey and work together between groups, it will be a lot simpler for individuals from the gathering to disguise these qualities and act in a like manner. Information-sharing exercises are generally upheld by information-the-board frameworks, a type of data innovation (IT) that encourages and coordinates data inside an organization or association. Hence, we know that the main factor in knowledge sharing is the leader's behavior. It depends on transparent internal communication through which he shares knowledge without any monopoly over any information, even if it is small, especially during the Corona starvation, which made the globe acquiesce and forced all financial, non-financial, profit and

non-profit organizations and institutions to make communication the largest part of the business. This requires us to study these variables and understand the relationship between the leader's conduct and transparent internal communication and their impact on knowledge sharing (Lee et al., 2020).

3. Research Conceptual Framework and Hypotheses

This research examines the relationship between leadership behaviors, transparent internal communication, and knowledge sharing. The conceptual framework predicts a positive relationship between leadership behaviors and knowledge sharing behavior. The study also predicts a positive relationship between transparent internal communication and knowledge sharing.

In this study, these research questions were formulated:

Q1. Is there a significant relationship between leadership and knowledge sharing behavior?

Q2. Is there a significant relationship between transparent internal communication and knowledge sharing behavior?

Q3. Is there a significant effect of managerial leadership and internal transparent communication on knowledge sharing behavior?

The objectives of the study and research hypotheses are linked to the following hypotheses, which examine the relationship between leadership and transparent internal communication and the effect of leadership on knowledge sharing. Finally, the study examines the effect of transparent internal communication on knowledge sharing. Previous studies report positive relationships between leadership, internal communication, and knowledge sharing (Lee et al., 2020). Based on previous studies, we proposed these research hypotheses:

H1. Leadership production emphasis is positively associated with knowledge sharing behavior.

H2. Leadership consideration is positively associated with knowledge sharing behavior.

H3. Leadership initiation of structure is positively associated with knowledge sharing behavior.

H4. Leadership persuasive behavior is positively associated with knowledge sharing behavior.

H5. Transparent internal communication is positively associated with and knowledge sharing behavior.

H6. Managerial leadership behaviors and transparent internal communication have a significant effect on knowledge sharing behavior.

Table 1: Research proposition and hypotheses

Statement	Test
-----------	------

H1. Leadership production emphasis is positively associated with knowledge sharing behavior.	Pearson Correlation
H2. Leadership consideration is positively associated with knowledge sharing behavior.	Pearson Correlation
H3. Leadership initiation of structure is positively associated with knowledge sharing behavior.	Pearson Correlation
H4. Leadership persuasive behavior is positively associated with knowledge sharing behavior.	Pearson Correlation
H5. Transparent internal communication is positively associated with and knowledge sharing behavior.	Pearson Correlation
H6. Managerial leadership behaviors and transparent internal communication have significant effect on knowledge sharing behavior.	Multiple regression

Leadership persuasive behavior. Reflects a leader's ability to argue persuasively for his/her point of view; he/she is a very persuasive talker and backs down when he/she ought to stand firm; this behavior comprises the following subscales illustrated in Table 2 (Shirvington, 1980).

Leadership production behavior. Reflects the leader's ability to mobilize the work at a rapid pace. He/she is production oriented and drives hard when there is work to be done (Littrell et al. 2018) urges the group this behavior comprise the following subscales illustrated in Table 3.

Table 2: Leadership persuasive behaviors sample question

1. His/her arguments are convincing
2. Argues persuasively for his/her point of view
3. Is a very persuasive talker
4. Is very skillful in an argument
5. Backs down when he/she ought to stand firm

Table 3: Leadership production orientation sample question

1. Keeps the work moving at a rapid pace
2. Pushes for increased production
3. Drives hard when there is a job to be done
4. Urges the group to beat its previous record
5. Keeps the group working up to capacity

Leadership consideration behavior. Reflects the leader's ability to treat group members with equity, fairness, and consideration. He/she puts suggestions made by the group into operation. This behavior comprises the following subscales illustrated in Table 4.

Table 4: Leadership consideration behavior sample question

1. Puts suggestions made by the group into operation
--

2. Treats all group members as his/her equals
3. Gives advance notice of changes
4. Is willing to make changes

Leadership initiation structure behavior. Reflects the leader's ability to assign group members to work tasks, schedule the work to be done (Zárraga and Bonache 2003), and ask that group members follow standard rules and regulations; this behavior comprises the following subscales illustrated in Table 5.

Table 5. Leadership initiation structure behavior sample questions

1. Assigns group members to particular tasks
2. Schedules the work to be done
3. Maintains definite standards of performance
4. Asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations

Transparent internal communication. This variable reflects internal communications practices and demonstrates the organization's ability to provide information in a relevant, easy, complete, and accurate approach to its members; this variable dimension comprises the following subscales in Table 6 (Lee et al. 2020).

Knowledge sharing behavior. This variable construct reflects organization members' tendency to share their knowledge and expertise with co-workers. Knowledge sharing behavior subscale comprises the following (Wang and Noe 2010).

Table 6: Transparent internal communication

1. Provided information that is relevant to academic staff
1. Provided information that is easy for academic staff to understand
2. Provided information that is complete
3. Provided accurate information to academic staff
4. Provided reliable information to academic staff
5. Provided information in a timely fashion to academic staff
7. Asked for feedback from academic staff about the quality of its information
8. Work to identify scientific needs for academic staff
9. Took responsibility when mistakes happen
10. Provides information that can be compared to higher education standards

Table 7: Knowledge sharing behavior

1. The university organized a plan regarding sharing information associated with the teaching process

The university emphasized sharing work-related knowledge and experience among work colleges
The university encouraged academics and co-workers to share new ideas related to work

The conceptual research framework examines the positive effect of a set of leadership behaviors and transparent internal communication dimensions on knowledge sharing behavior within the organization.

This research examines higher education institutions. In this scope, the above-mentioned dimensions are explored in higher education institutions. This research assumes that production-oriented leadership, consideration leadership, initiation of structure, and persuasive leadership behaviors positively impact knowledge-sharing behavior within the organization. In addition, this research also predicts the positive impact of transparent internal communication on knowledge sharing. Leadership behaviors and transparent internal communications are manipulated as independent variables, as knowledge sharing behavior is the dependent variable. Figure 1 illustrates the research variables of the study.




Fig. 1: Theory of leadership and transparent internal communication on knowledge sharing

4. Methodology

The methodology section comprises explanation types of variables applied in this research study and the research approach. The Independent variable is the variable that is changed or controlled in a scientific experiment to test the effects on the dependent variable. Finding may be a frame of examination where the analyst deducts speculation that must be subjected to experimental testing (Dalati 2021a). The sample examines a number of privet and public universities. The sample size is 30. This size is not considered small; however, it does not represent the population. The

questionnaire has been translated double way. First, the questionnaire was translated from English to Arabic by a research expert; consequently, the questionnaire was translated from Arabic to English, and later, the English copies were compared for examination (Warner-Soderholm, Minelgaite, and Littrell 2019).

5. Research Descriptive Analysis

The descriptive analysis illustrates the demographical profile. The demographical analysis includes university, faculty, age, gender, education level, and managerial level of respondents. The sample characteristics demonstrate that AIU, DU, HIBA, and YU have been selected. Tables 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 illustrate the demographic analysis.

Table 8: University

University	Frequency	Percent (%)
AIU	18	60%
DU	7	23.3
HIBA	4	13.3
YU	1	3.3
Total	30	100%

Table 9: Faculty (n=30)

Faculty	Frequency	Percent (%)
BA	12	40
Pharmacy	4	13.3
Civil Engineering	1	3.3
Law	5	16.7
Architecture	2	6.7
It	3	10
Dentistry	3	10
Total	30	100%

Table 10: Destructive data analysis of demographic profile (n=30)

Demographic profile	N	M	SD
Age	30	42.83	4.91
Work Experience	30	7.86	4.91

Table 11: Distribution of gender (n=30)

Gender	Frequency	Percent (%)
Male	18	60
Female	12	40
Total	30	100

Table 12: Distribution of education level (n=30)

Education level	Frequency	Percent (%)
Master	6	20

PhD	24	80
Total	30	100

Table 13: Academic level (n=30)

Academic level	Frequency	Percent (%)
Lecturer	5	16.7
Instructor	16	53.3
Associate professor	6	20
Professor	3	10
Total	30	100

Table 14: Administration position (n=30)

Administration position	Frequency	Percent (%)
Head of a department	9	30
Dean	1	3.3
Not applicable	20	66.7
TOTAL	30	100

Reliability analysis. The research performed Cronbach alpha analysis. The results indicated good to optimal reliability results ranging from 0.73 to 0.88. Table 15 presents the results of the reliability.

Table 15: Reliability analysis, Cronbach alpha (n=30)

Variable Component	Number of Items	Alpha (α) without deleting any items
Persuasive leadership	4	0.81
Production oriented leadership	5	0.83
Consideration leadership	4	0.73
Initiation structure leadership	4	0.79
Knowledge sharing behavior	4	0.77
Transparent internal communication	10	0.88

Descriptive analysis. The descriptive analysis illustrates 6 section comprising means and standard divisions of research scales. Tables 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22 illustrate the descriptive analysis of research scales. Table 16 illustrates five items measuring leadership superior orientation. The highest score is for item 4, and the lowest is for items 3 and 5.

Table 16: Leadership persuasive behavior

Leadership persuasive behavior	M	SD
1. His/her arguments are convincing	3.67	0.802

2. Argues persuasively for his/her point of view	3.73	0.868
3. Is a very persuasive talker	3.67	0.922
4. Is very skillful in an argument	3.73	1.015

Table 17: Leadership production emphasis behavior

Leadership production emphasis behavior	M	SD
1. Keeps the work moving at a rapid pace	3.47	1.196
2. Pushes for increased production	3.87	0.900
3. Drives hard when there is a job to be done	3.73	1.081
4. Urges the group to beat its previous record	3.57	0.971
5. Keeps the group working up to capacity	3.93	0.980

Table 18: Leadership consideration behavior

Leadership consideration behavior	M	SD
1. Puts suggestions made by the group into operation	3.53	0.973
2. Treats all group members as his/her equals	3.57	1.006
3. Gives advance notice of changes	3.40	1.003
4. Is willing to make changes	3.57	0.898

Table 19: Leadership initiation of structure behavior

Leadership initiation of structure behavior	M	SD
1. Assigns group members to particular tasks	3.70	0.952
2. Schedules the work to be done	4	0.947
3. Maintains definite standards of performance	3.77	1.073
4. Asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations	3.50	1.075

Table 20: Knowledge sharing

Knowledge Sharing	M	SD
1. The university organized a plan regarding sharing information associated with the teaching process	3.57	1.006
2. The university emphasized sharing work-related knowledge and experience among work colleges	3.63	0.928
3. The university encouraged academics and co-workers to share new ideas related to work	3.77	0.858
4. There was cooperation among academics at the faculty to share knowledge about work-related tasks	3.70	0.750

Table 21: Transparent internal communication

Transparent internal communication	M	SD
1. Provided information that is relevant to academic staff	3.53	0.860

2. Provided information that is easy for academic staff to understand	3.83	0.699
3. Provided information that is complete	3.70	0.877
4. Provided accurate information to academic staff	3.63	0.765
5. Provided reliable information to academic staff	3.80	0.805
6. Provided information in a timely fashion to academic staff	3.67	0.711
7. Asked for feedback from academic staff about the quality of its information	3.40	0.932
8. Work to identify scientific needs for academic staff	3.63	1.066
9. Took responsibility when mistakes happen	3.53	0.973
10. Provides information that can be compared to higher education standards	3.63	1.129

Table 22 illustrates descriptive data analysis for research variables. Grand means and standard division values are presented. Leadership integration behavior received the highest score ($M=3.74$), was as tolerance of freedom received the lowest score ($M=3.51$).

Knowledge sharing behavior has a Mean score of 3.66, and transparent internal communication has a score of 3.63. All research variables' grand means have above average (Al-Ahmad Chaar and Easa, 2020).

Table 22: Descriptive analysis of research variables grand means (n=30)

Research Variables Grand Means	M	SD
1. Leadership persuasive behavior	3.70	0.726
2. Leadership production behavior	3.71	0.802
3. Leadership consideration behavior	3.51	0.724
4. Leadership initiation behavior	3.74	0.800
5. Knowledge sharing	3.66	0.689
6. Transparent internal communication	3.63	0.625

6. Correlation Analysis

Bivariate correlation analysis is deployed to measure the relationship between managerial leadership behaviors and knowledge sharing behavior. The correlation analysis, in general, shows strongly positive relationships between leadership behaviors and knowledge sharing behavior. The association between persuasive leadership behavior and knowledge sharing behavior indicates a positive correlation where $r= .534^{**}$, $n= 30$, $p= .002$. The relationship between leadership production emphasis and knowledge sharing suggests a positive and strong relationship where $r= .659^{**}$, $n=30$, $p=.000$. The association between leadership consideration behavior and knowledge sharing indicates a positive and significant relationship where $r= .430^*$, $n=30$, $p= .018$. The association between leadership initiation of structure and knowledge sharing behavior suggests positive, strong, and significant correlation where $r= .663^{**}$, $n=30$, $p=.000$. The association between internal communication and

knowledge sharing behavior indicates a positive correlation between where $r = .681^{**}$, $n = 30$, $p = .000$.

7. Regression Analysis

A linear regression is performed to explore the effect of leadership behaviors and transparent internal communication on knowledge sharing behavior at target universities. Leadership behaviors and transparent internal communication are manipulated as predictors variables and knowledge sharing behavior as the outcome variable. A step-wise regression analysis produced two models. In the first model, multiple regression analysis indicates a significant relationship between transparent internal communication and knowledge sharing behavior, where multiple regression produces a standardized beta of 0.681, $p = 0.000$, accounting for 44.4% of the variability in knowledge sharing behavior. The regression analysis confirms transparent internal communication is a predictor of knowledge sharing behavior. In the second model, the regression analysis indicates that transparent internal communication is a predictor of knowledge sharing behavior, where multiple regression produced a standardized beta of 0.443, $p = 0.011$. In the second model, the regression analysis indicates that production emphasis is a predictor of knowledge sharing behavior, whereas multiple regression produced a standardized beta of 0.386, $p = 0.025$. Overall, transparent internal communication and production emphasis leadership accounts for 52.3% of the variability in knowledge sharing behavior. The rest of the leadership variables did not significantly affect knowledge sharing behavior. The result of the regression analysis support hypotheses 6, confirming production emphasis and transparent internal communication are predictors of knowledge sharing behavior. Table 23 illustrate multiple regression analysis.

Table 23: Mean standard divisions and correlations between leadership behaviors and transparent internal communication

Variables	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6
Persuasive	3.70	0.72	1					
2. Production emphasis	3.71	0.80	.640** .000	1				
3. Consideration	3.51	0.72	.697** .000	.515** .004	1			
4. Initiation of structure	3.74	0.80	.515** .004	.871** .000	.402* .028	1		
5. Transparent internal communication	3.63	0.62	.499** .005	.616** .000	.312 .093	.721** .000	1	
6. Knowledge sharing behavior	3.66	0.689	.534** .002	.659** .000	.430* .018	.663** .000	.681** .000	1

Table 24: Multiple regression analysis of leadership and internal transparent communication on knowledge sharing

Variable	B	B SE	β	t	Sig
----------	---	------	---------	---	-----

First model					
Constant	.938	.563		1.666	.107
Internal transparent communication	.750	.153	.681	4.917	.000
Second model					
Constant	.660	.534		1.235	.228
Internal transparent communication	.488	.179	.443	2.719	.011
Production emphasis leadership	.332	.140	.386	2.373	.025
Notes: For the first model Multiple R = .681, $R^2 = .463$, Adjusted $R^2 = .444$ For the second model Multiple R = .746, $R^2 = .556$, Adjusted $R^2 = .523^*$, $p < .05$					

According to the research analysis that we conducted in this research, we found that the results obtained are similar to the previous results, and despite the fact that the research results were attributed in favor of transparent internal communication by a greater percentage than leadership, this means that initiatives can be taken to increase the percentage further through universities carry out administrative development work with awareness workshops to enhance leadership. Training workshops can also be designed to enhance capabilities and skills. The percentage of transparent internal communication is greater.

The recommendation for future research is to examine larger samples for different geographical locations, not only Damascus but also to study samples for all parts of Syria and the Arab world, such as Jordan, Lebanon, etc. And the introduction of more variables, for example, to study the impact of the Corona pandemic (COVID-19) and its effect on administrative systems.

Fig. 3: Leadership production orientation and transparent internal communication on knowledge sharing behavior




Table 25: Hypothesis testing results

Statement	Findings	Results
H1. Leadership production emphasis is positively associated with knowledge sharing behavior.	r= .659**, n=30,p=.000	Accepted
H2. Leadership consideration is positively associated with knowledge sharing behavior.	r= .430, n=30, p= .018	Accepted
H3. Leadership initiation of structure is positively associated with knowledge sharing behavior.	r=.663**,n=30,p=.000	Accepted
H4. Leadership persuasive behavior is positively associated with knowledge sharing behavior.	r=.534**, n=30,p=.002	Accepted
H5. Transparent internal communication is positively associated with and knowledge sharing behavior.	r= .681** , n= 30, p= .000	Accepted
H6. Managerial leadership behaviors and transparent internal communication have significant effect on knowledge sharing behavior.	Multiple R= .746, R ² = .556, Adjusted R ² = .523* , p< .05	Accepted

8. Conclusions

This research examined the relationship between directed leadership behavior and transparent internal communication and the effect of these two variables on participatory knowledge. After research and previous readings, conducting analysis, and studying the variables and administrative factors, the following is revealed: a positive relationship between directed leadership behavior and transparent internal communication, and there is a positive effect. Strong and significant for transparent internal communication on participatory knowledge within the sample, its number is (30). The sample includes a number of private and public universities and specializes in academic staff.

The initial research limitations are related to the sample size, and the research results cannot be generalized due to the lack of a sample. The second limitation associated with the research method is the survey questionnaire, and the data were collected through self-management and distributed to the respondents. There is a possibility that research participants did not provide authentic responses due to the sensitivity of the topic.

References

Akhavan, P., Rahimi, A. and Mehralian, G. (2013). Developing a model for knowledge sharing in research centers, *VINE*, 43(3), 357-393.

Al-Ahmad Char, S. and Easa, N.F. (2021). Does transformational leadership matter for innovation in banks? The mediating role of knowledge sharing, *International Journal of Disruptive Innovation in Government*, 1(1), 36-57.

Chiang, H., Han, T. and Chuang, J. (2011). The relationship between high-commitment HRM and knowledge-sharing behavior and its mediators, *International Journal of Manpower*, 32(5/6), 604-622.

Dalati, S., Hala, A. (2018). The effect of leader trust and knowledge sharing on staff satisfaction at work: Investigation of universities in Syria. *Business, Management and Education*, 16 (0),190-205.

Dalati, S. (2021a). Factors affecting Syrian female researchers' experience during crisis: inductive approach. *Business, Management and Economics Engineering*, 19(1), 91-110.

Dalati, S. (2021b). Peculiarities on sustainability at higher education sector: A case study. *Journal of Service, Innovation and Sustainable Development*, 2(2) 114-121.

Jean, J., Dalati, S., Al Bich, M. (2021). Investigating the perceived comparison of work from office vs. work from home during Covid-19: An empirical study. *Journal of Service, Innovation and Sustainable Development*, 2(2), 53-69.

Kalogiannidis, S., Chatzitheodoridis, F., Savvidou, S., Kagioglou, F. (2022). The impact of online communications on different users' social, emotional, and moral competence as a potential business communication too. *Journal of System and Management Sciences*, 12(5), 359-373.

Ourfali, L., Mardam Bek, A., Dalati, S. (2021). The socio-cultural context in Syria gender-role stereotypes and attitudes towards female academics career advancement, *Journal of Service, Innovation and Sustainable Development*, 2(1), 33-49.

Dalati, S., Raudeliuniene, J., & Davidaviciene, V. (2020). Innovations in the management of higher education: situation analysis of Syrian female students empowerment, *Marketing and Management of Innovations*, 4, 245-254.

Dwivedi, P., Chaturvedi, V., Vashist, J.K. (2020). Transformational leadership and employee efficiency: knowledge sharing as mediator, *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 27(4), 1571-1590.

Kirby, Peggy C., Louis V. Paradise, and Margaret I. King. (1992). Extraordinary leaders in education: Understanding transformational leadership. *Journal of Educational Research*, 85 (5), 303-11.

House, R. J. (1971). A Path-Goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science*, 16, 321-339.

House, R & Mitchell, T. (1974). The Path-Goal theory of Leadership, *Journal of Contemporary Business*, 3, 81-97.

Lee, Y., Tao, W., Li, J.-Y.Q., Sun, R. (2021). Enhancing employees' knowledge sharing through diversity-oriented leadership and strategic internal communication during the COVID-19 outbreak, *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 25(6), 1526-1549.

Lin, C.-P., Huang, H.-T., Huang, T.Y. (2020). The effects of responsible leadership and knowledge sharing on job performance among knowledge workers, *Personnel Review*, 49(9),1879-1896.

Littrell, R.F., Warner-Soderholm, G., Minelgaite, I., Ahmadi, Y., Dalati, S., Bertsch, A. and Kuskova, V. (2018). Explicit preferred leader behaviours across cultures: Instrument development and validation, *Journal of Management Development*, 37(3), 243-257.

Shirvington, P. J. (1980). 238U/234U Disequilibria as a Measure of Uranium Migration in Clay over the Past 250 000 Years. *Underground Disposal of Radioactive Wastes II (Proc. Symp. Otaniemi, Finland, July 1979)*, (International Atomic Energy Agency) 0282 (Morrison 2000), 239-52.

Stogdill, R.M., Coons, A. E. (1957). *Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement*. Columbus: Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University.

Davenport, T.O. (2015). How HR plays its role in leadership development, *Strategic HR Review*, 14(3), 89-93.

Vandavasi, R.K.K., McConville, D.C., Uen, J.-F., Yepuru, P. (2020). Knowledge sharing, shared leadership and innovative behaviour: a cross-level analysis, *International Journal of Manpower*, 41(8), 1221-1233.

Wang, S., Raymond A. Noe. (2010). Knowledge sharing: A review and directions for future research. *Human Resource Management Review*, 20(2), 115-131.

Warner-Soderholm, G., Minelgaite, I., Littrell, R.F. (2020). From LBDQXII to LBDQ50: preferred leader behavior measurement across cultures, *Journal of Management Development*, 39(1), 68-81.

Zárraga, C., Bonache, J. (2003). Assessing the team environment for knowledge sharing: An empirical analysis. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 14 (7), 1227-45.

Zeb, A., Abdullah, N.H., Hussain, A., Safi, A. (2020). Authentic leadership, knowledge sharing, and employees' creativity, *Management Research Review*, 43(6), 669-690.