Received: 15 APR 2024 | Accepted: 10 MAR 2025 | Published Online: 30 APR 2025
Recoletos Multidisciplinary Research Journal Vol. 13 no. 1 (June 2025)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.32871/rmrj2513.01.04

Original Article

Knowledge Sharing among Educators in the Philippines

Mae Flor G. Posadas[1] and Jony V. Berjes[2*]

[1] College of Agriculture and Forestry, Central Philippines State University, Kabankalan City, Negros Occidental, Philippines

[2] Division of Business Administration, College of Management Engineering, The University of Suwon, Hwaseong, South Korea

*Correspondence: jberjes@suwon.ac.kr

Abstract

Background: *Knowledge sharing is crucial for managing knowledge and the success of knowledge management programs. While extensively studied in business organizations, research in academic institutions remains limited, particularly in the Philippines. This study examines knowledge-sharing behaviors among educators in the Philippines and its determinants.*

Methods: *The study employed a descriptive-correlational design using a survey questionnaire developed. Respondent-educators were selected through simple random sampling from elementary, secondary, and higher education institutions in Negros Island in central Philippines. The association between the knowledge-sharing behavior and its determinants was determined using Pearson Product Moment Correlation.*

Results: *254 educators participated in the study. These educators regularly engage in knowledge-sharing behaviors and promote the dissemination of ideas. These behaviors are determined by different factors and an organizational climate that nurtures idea exchange. There is a significant association between knowledge-sharing behavior and its determinants.*

Conclusion: *Institutions are encouraged to foster broader knowledge-sharing practices by leveraging the positive organizational climate, addressing barriers, and promoting collaboration across institutions.*

Keywords

knowledge sharing, knowledge-sharing behavior, Theory of Reasoned Action, educators, education, teachers, Negros Island, Philippines

INTRODUCTION

In a knowledge-based economy, organizations acknowledge the significant function knowledge plays in driving business success. Efficiently managed organizational knowledge is considered a source of competitive advantage (Bello & Oyekunle, 2014; Ramayah et al., 2013). Knowledge can come in different forms, such as company documents or reports, routine procedures, business norms, and practices. In harnessing its benefits, knowledge must be shared throughout the organization and exemplified in corporate systems, products, and services. In the past two decades, business organizations have benefitted from creating and managing knowledge and using it for successful innovation (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995; Davenport & Prusak, 1998).

Knowledge management (KM) refers to creating, obtaining, sharing, and effectively utilizing knowledge to achieve organizational goals. It encompasses strategies and practices to identify and leverage intellectual assets for competitive advantage (Dalkir, 2017). Knowledge sharing is the process of transferring both explicit

knowledge (documented information) and implicit knowledge (tacit expertise) among individuals or groups to foster learning, innovation, and productivity within an organization (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995). Knowledge sharing is vital to successfully implementing KM in all types of organizations. It is deemed the most critical phase in all stages of KM (Bock & Kim, 2002). Knowledge sharing focuses on communicating and transferring explicit and implicit knowledge to an individual, team, or within or across the organization (Ipe, 2003). Yi (2009) believed that employees must possess knowledge-sharing behavior, imparting work-related know-how and skills to other organizational members. In doing so, organizations can utilize the intellectual assets of their workers, creating a pool of resources essential for organizational success.

While knowledge management (KM) has long proven valuable in business organizations, it remains a gray area in academic institutions. The primary function of any educational institution is to generate and disseminate knowledge. Academic institutions, much like business organizations, should not just develop, obtain, or keep knowledge; they should also know how to efficiently and effectively share it. The successful implementation of knowledge management through effective knowledge sharing is crucial for academic institutions to achieve their organizational goals and thrive in the knowledge-based economy (Rowley, 2000; Senge, 1990).

In academic institutions, the primary function of knowledge sharing rests on the shoulders of educators. As primary knowledge workers, educators are instrumental in creating, curating, and transferring knowledge to ensure the effective dissemination and application of intellectual resources (Bacuño, 2020). Knowledge-sharing behaviors are manifested in various forms. It can be in written contribution whereby educators impart knowledge, such as insights, concepts, and skills, through written format instead of verbal discourse (Yi, 2009). It comprises journal publications, online postings of ideas on department discussion boards, and report submissions, benefitting colleagues, the institution, and the community. These individual-to-record transmissions are explicit knowledge, publicizing collected and organized knowledge for public use (Landry et al., 2010).

Knowledge-sharing behavior can also be manifested in organizational communication through group collaborations in an individual-to-societal medium (Yi, 2009). Educators participate in brainstorming gatherings to generate thoughts, viewpoints, and answers among their peers. Brainstorming and group thinking are the most popular methods of knowledge sharing, while training and seminars are the least popular techniques (Wickramasinghe & Widyaratne, 2012).

Personal interactions are knowledge-sharing behaviors done through informal group communication. Educators discuss in their offices, during breaks, on the phone, or through social media. These activities are usually performed by educators willingly and instinctively to aid fellow educators in their difficulties, resulting in efficiency in performing their duties (Yi, 2009). These casual, unintentional, spontaneous encounters allow educators to impart knowledge unsuitable for communicating in a formal setup (Antal & Richebé, 2009).

Knowledge-sharing in communities of practice happens voluntarily and naturally in a network of educators bound by similar interests in a particular subject. These happen casually and one-on-one, while personal interactions occur between individuals and groups. This is also called social exchange relationship-based behavior because it is anchored based on mutuality (Kaser & Miles, 2001). People impart their knowledge based on the assumption that others will do the same as both participants have the same pursuits, similar desires, and, more importantly, similar difficulties.

Knowledge-sharing behavior thus defines the organizational climate that exists in institutions, and vice-versa. This is because knowledge sharing thrives in a trusting, receptive, and liberal atmosphere, with standards that promote communal beliefs and accept failure (Hinds & Pfeffer, 2002). Organizational climate is defined by the work environment, and influences employees' behavior and motivation (Kaya et al., 2010). It reflects workers' mindset, emotions, and conduct, particularly their willingness to share knowledge (Bock et al., 2005), thus having the following dimensions—fairness, innovativeness, and affiliation. Fairness fosters trust and motivates knowledge-sharing when employees perceive equitable treatment from superiors (Kim & Mauborgne, 2003). Innovativeness emphasizes rewarding creativity and collaboration, encouraging knowledge sharing (Jung et al., 2003; Kim & Lee, 1995). Affiliation reflects a sense of association and mutual altruism, driving pro-social knowledge-sharing behaviors (Bock et al., 2005).

Despite the increasing recognition of knowledge sharing's importance, the literature reveals significant

gaps in understanding the specific factors influencing educators' knowledge-sharing behaviors, especially in the Philippine context. Existing studies often focus on business organizations, with limited attention given to the nuanced dynamics within academic institutions (Fullwood, Rowley, & Delbridge, 2013; Tan, 2016). Since knowledge-sharing in academia depends largely on educators as they are the key conduits of knowledge-sharing inside and outside the academic community (Bacuño, 2020), it is imperative to know what factors affect their various knowledge-sharing activities. Thus, this study aims to understand the knowledge-sharing behavior of educators and its determinants.

METHODS

Study Design, Setting, and Population

This study employed a descriptive-correlational research design, utilizing a survey method conducted among elementary, secondary, and tertiary educators from public institutions in Negros Island in central Philippines. Respondents are selected using simple random sampling.

Study Variables, Instrument, and Data Collection

The study focused on four dimensions of knowledge-sharing behavior (written contributions, organizational communications, personal interactions, and communities of practice) and the seven determinants of knowledge-sharing (anticipated extrinsic rewards, anticipated reciprocal relationships, sense of self-worth, organizational climate, perceived behavioral control, subjective norm, and attitude towards knowledge sharing (5 items). These were adapted from the works of Ajzen and Fishbein (1980), Bock et al. (2005), Fishbein and Ajzen (1975, 1980), Tohidinia and Mosakhani (2010), and Yi (2009).

Knowledge-sharing behavior was assessed on an incremental Likert scale ranging from 1=never to 7=always as shown by Table 1.

Table 1. *7-point Likert Scale in the Assessment of the Frequency of Knowledge-Sharing Behavior*

Scale	Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
7	6.51-7.00	Always	In all chances
6	5.51-6.50	Usually	In about 90% of the chances
5	4.51-5.50	Frequently	In about 70% of the chances
4	3.51-4.50	Sometimes	In about 50% of the chances
3	2.51-3.50	Occasionally	In about 30% of the chances
2	1.51-2.50	Rarely	In about 10% of the chances
1	1.00-1.50	Never	Not at all chances

Determinants of knowledge-sharing factors were assessed using a 7-point Likert scale on an incremental gauge ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree as shown by Table 2.

Table 2. *7-point Likert Scale in the Assessment of the Determinants of Knowledge-Sharing*

Scale	Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
7	6.51-7.00	Strongly Agree	Qualitative Interpretation
6	5.51-6.50	Agree	Very Highly Positive
5	4.51-5.50	Slightly Agree	Highly Positive
4	3.51-4.50	Neutral	Positive
3	2.51-3.50	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Positive
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree	Negative
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Highly Negative

A survey questionnaire was developed for the above dimensions. Dimensions were tested for reliability and validity, passing the minimum Cronbach alpha values required (similar to the study of Ramayah et al. 2014). The questionnaire items were in English and never translated into the local language.

In gathering pertinent data, the researchers passed through the institution's ethical review. After the review, the researchers wrote a letter of request to conduct the survey addressed to the head of the institution. When the request was approved, the researchers asked for the assistance of the Office of the Vice President for Research of the study site in administering the survey questionnaires to the research participants. The educators were given ample time to fill out the instrument, ensuring completeness and accuracy. They were also assured that their answers would be treated with utmost confidentiality. After retrieving the questionnaires, data were tallied, statistically analyzed, and interpreted.

Statistical Analysis

In presenting the results and analyses of the study, selected statistical techniques were employed. Descriptive statistics such as frequency counts, percentages, and means were used in describing the educators' knowledge-sharing behavior and knowledge-sharing determinants. The Pearson Product Moment Correlation was employed to explain the association between educators' knowledge-sharing behavior and its determinants and dependent variables. SPSS was used to analyze the relationship between the variables

Ethical Considerations

This study adhered to the highest ethical standards to ensure the protection of all participants and the integrity of the research process. Before data collection, informed consent was obtained from all participants, ensuring they were fully aware of the study's objectives, procedures, and their rights as respondents. Participation in the survey was voluntary, with assurances that participants could withdraw at any point without penalty.

The researchers strictly maintained the anonymity and confidentiality of participants. Only authorized personnel securely stored and accessed the data of this study. No identifying information was included in the analysis or presentation of findings. The researchers also reviewed the research instruments and methodology to ensure cultural appropriateness and alignment with ethical guidelines. This study complied with all relevant institutional ethical standards for research involving human participants.

RESULTS

Profile of Respondents

Table 3 presents the demographic and professional characteristics of 254 respondents, with the majority (43.3%) aged 25-35 years and predominantly female (69.7%). Most participants (65.4%) are Basic Education Academicians, while 52.4% have less than five years of service. Regarding education, 54.3% hold a master's degree, followed by 23.6% with a Ph.D. or doctorate. The respondents are fairly divided between the Arts (55.5%) and Sciences (44.5%) fields. This distribution highlights a workforce composed mainly of young, highly educated professionals primarily engaged in basic education.

Table 3. *Profile of the Respondents*

Profile	Frequency	Percentage
Age		
Below 25 Years	70	27.6
25-35 Years	110	43.3
36-45 Years	41	16.1
46-55 Years	26	10.2
Above 55 Years	7	2.8

Table 3. *continued*

Profile	Frequency	Percentage
Sex		
Male	77	30.3
Female	177	69.7
Position		
University/College Professor	1	.4
Professor	17	6.7
Associate Professor	2	.8
Assistant Professor	1	.4
Instructor	67	26.4
Basic Education Academicians	166	65.4
Length of Service		
Less than 5 years	133	52.4
5-10 years	70	27.6
11-20 years	37	14.6
More than 20 years	14	5.5
Highest Level of Education		
Ph. D./doctorate	60	23.6
Masters	138	54.3
Bachelor	56	22.0
Area Stream		
Arts	141	55.5
Sciences	113	44.5
TOTAL	254	100

Knowledge-Sharing Behavior of Educators

Table 4 presents the assessment results of the respondents' knowledge-sharing behavior across the four areas. Exceptionally, among all other indicators on Written Contribution, the indicator "Submit documents and reports" (6.16) has the highest mean with a descriptive rating of "usually." Conversely, the indicator "Article publication in university journals" (3.94) has the lowest mean rating of all indicators in this variable with a descriptive rating of "sometimes." Overall, the mean for this variable is 4.96 (frequently), the lowest among the variables under knowledge-sharing behavior.

Regarding Organizational Communication, data show that five out of eight indicators have the same descriptive rating of "frequently," while three are rated "usually." The indicator "Participate fully in brainstorming sessions" has the highest mean (5.65). In contrast, the lowest means are indicators "Answer questions in team meetings" and "Asking questions that make others think and discuss in meetings," with the same mean ratings (5.42). The variable's overall mean is 5.41. These results mean that in most instances, most educators share their perspectives and viewpoints in official departmental gatherings, which will benefit the department and the organization.

For Personal Interactions, six out of eight indicators have a descriptive rating of "frequently," while the other two have a rating of "usually." The indicator "Sharing excitement with others through personal conversation" has the highest mean (5.51), while the lowest indicator is "Engaging in long-term coaching relationships with junior educators" (5.08).

Communities of Practice has the second-lowest rating of all variables, with an overall mean of 5.11 and a descriptive rating of "frequently." All indicators under this variable are rated "frequently."

Table 4. *Knowledge-Sharing Behavior of Educators*

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Written Contributions (WC)		
WC1: Submit documents and reports.	6.16	1.13
WC2: Publish articles in university journals, magazines, or newsletters.	3.94	2.11
WC3: Share documentation from personal files related to current work.	5.06	1.58
WC4: Contribute ideas and thoughts to department online databases.	4.80	1.67
WC5: Keep others updated with important university information through online discussion boards.	4.82	1.74
Mean for Written Contributions	4.96	1.21
Organizational Communications (OC)		
OC1: Express ideas and thoughts in department meetings.	5.60	1.32
OC2: Participate fully in brainstorming sessions.	5.65	1.23
OC3: Propose problem-solving suggestions in team meetings.	5.54	1.19
OC4: Answer questions from others in team meetings.	5.42	1.30
OC5: Ask good questions that elicit others' thinking and discussion in team meetings.	5.42	1.28
OC6: Share success stories that may benefit the university in department meetings.	5.33	1.44
OC7: Reveal past personal work-related failures or mistakes in department meetings to help others avoid repeating these mistakes.	5.13	1.37
OC8: Make presentations in department meetings.	5.19	1.45
Mean of Organizational Communications	5.41	1.10
Personal Interactions (PI)		
PI1: Support less-experienced colleagues with time from personal schedule.	5.28	1.34
PI2: Engage in long-term coaching relationships with junior academicians.	5.08	1.44
PI3: Spend time in personal conversation (e.g., discussion in the hallway, over lunch, through telephone) with others to help them with their work-related problems.	5.25	1.51
PI4: Keep others updated with important department information through personal conversation.	5.46	1.30
PI5: Share passion and excitement on some specific subjects with others through personal conversation.	5.57	1.29
PI6: Share experiences that may help others avoid risks and trouble through personal conversation.	5.51	1.34
PI7: Have online chats with others to help them with their work-related problems.	5.49	1.28
PI8: Spend time in e-mail communication with others to help them with work-related problems.	5.05	1.47
Mean of Personal Interactions (PI)	5.34	1.10
Communities of Practice (CP)		
CP1: Meet with community members to create innovative solutions for problems that occur at work.	5.07	1.42
CP2: Meet with community members to share their experiences and practice on specific topics with common interests.	5.13	1.45
CP3: Meet with community members to share success and failure stories on specific topics with common interests.	5.10	1.37
CP4: Meet with community members to work to encourage excellence in the community's practice.	5.24	1.37
CP5: Support the personal development of new community members.	5.33	1.33
CP6: Send related information to members through the community e-mail list.	4.93	1.53
CP7: Share ideas and thoughts on specific topics through a university-supported online community-of-practice system.	4.93	1.67
Mean of Communities of Practice (CP)	5.11	1.31

Determinants of Knowledge-Sharing Behavior of Educators

Table 5 shows the assessment of the determinants of knowledge-sharing of the respondents across the seven identified domains. Regarding Anticipated Extrinsic Rewards, the indicators in this variable have the lowest mean ratings among other indicators. EX1 is "moderately positive," while EX2 is "positive," with mean ratings of 3.94 and 4.69, respectively. The overall mean is at 4.32, interpreted as "moderately positive."

In terms of Anticipated Reciprocal Relationships, REC4 attains the highest mean of 6.15. Both indicators, REC1 and REC2, have the lowest mean ratings of 6.12. All five indicators can be qualitatively interpreted as "highly positive." This sub-variable has an overall mean of 6.13, the highest among all other variables under knowledge-sharing factors. These results imply that educators believe sharing their knowledge with colleagues will foster improved associations.

Regarding the respondents' Sense of Self-Worth, data reveal that the indicator SELF4 has the highest mean of 6.13, while the indicator SELF2 has the lowest mean (5.81). These indicators suggest educators have a "highly positive" sense of self-worth. Additionally, the educators' sense of self-worth has an overall mean of 6.04 (highly positive). The results reveal that educators believe their knowledge-sharing contributions are highly beneficial to the success of their institutions and their members.

As to the educators' Organizational Climate, the indicator "affiliation" has the highest mean (5.84), then followed by "innovativeness" (5.83), and with the lowest mean rating, "fairness" (5.73). The overall mean for the organizational climate is 5.80, which means a "highly positive" experience for educators. The highest mean (5.84) for the "affiliation" dimension indicates that educators strongly feel a sense of belonging and camaraderie within their teams. The results suggest that interpersonal relationships in the workplace act as a catalyst for fostering open communication and trust among colleagues. The mean of the "innovativeness" dimension suggests that educators view their workplace as encouraging creativity and risk-taking. Encouraging innovation creates opportunities for sharing new ideas and methods. The lowest mean (5.73) for "fairness" suggests it is slightly less pronounced than affiliation and innovativeness, possibly reflecting challenges in ensuring perceived equity in evaluations. On the whole, these results mean that the working environment of educators has a strong sense of camaraderie, is conducive to innovative mindsets, and is immune to prejudice.

In terms of Perceived Behavioral Control, all indicators are rated "highly positive," with an average mean of 5.94. These results mean that educators perceive it as easy to share knowledge when they have the skills and opportunities to perform it.

Like Perceived Behavioral Control, Subjective Norms indicators are rated as "highly positive," with an average mean of 5.76. These results mean that educators perceive the pressure to share knowledge as expected by their bosses or colleagues.

Lastly, the educators' Attitudes Toward Knowledge Sharing are all rated as "highly positive," with an average mean of 5.80. The indicator ATT3 has the highest rating of 5.94. These results mean that educators experience positive feelings about sharing their knowledge with the members of their organization.

Relationship between Knowledge-Sharing Behavior of Educators and its Determinants

Table 6 presents the correlation analysis between the selected knowledge-sharing determinants (anticipated extrinsic rewards, anticipated reciprocal relationships, sense of self-worth, organizational climate, perceived behavioral control, subjective norm, attitude towards knowledge sharing) and the knowledge-sharing behaviors of educators in Negros, Island. The Pearson correlation coefficient (r=0.448) indicates a moderate positive correlation between selected knowledge-sharing factors and knowledge-sharing behavior. This means that as the quality of these factors improves, educators are more likely to engage in knowledge-sharing behaviors. The p-value (0.000) is less than 0.05, indicating that the relationship is statistically significant and unlikely to have occurred by chance.

Table 5. *Determinants of Knowledge-Sharing Behavior of Educators*

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Anticipated Extrinsic Rewards (EX)		
EX1: I will receive monetary rewards in return for my knowledge sharing.	3.94	2.05
EX2: I will receive additional points for promotion in return for my knowledge sharing.	4.69	1.92
Mean of Anticipated Extrinsic Rewards (EX)	4.32	1.87
Anticipated Reciprocal Relationships (REC)		
REC1: My knowledge sharing would strengthen the ties between existing members of the organization and myself.	6.12	0.92
REC2: My knowledge sharing would help me become well-acquainted with new organization members.	6.12	0.87
REC3: My knowledge sharing would expand the scope of my association with other organization members.	6.13	0.89
REC4: My knowledge sharing would draw smooth cooperation from outstanding members in the future.	6.15	0.89
REC5: My knowledge sharing would create strong relationships with members with common interests in the organization.	6.13	0.90
Mean of Anticipated Reciprocal Relationships	6.13	0.75
Sense of Self-Worth (SELF)		
SELF1: My knowledge sharing would help other members in the organization solve problems.	6.05	0.85
SELF2: My knowledge sharing would create new business opportunities for the organization.	5.81	1.05
SELF3: My knowledge sharing would improve work processes in the organization.	6.09	0.89
SELF4: My knowledge sharing would increase productivity in the organization.	6.13	0.86
SELF5: My knowledge sharing would help the organization achieve its performance objectives.	6.14	0.79
Mean of Sense of Self-Worth	6.04	0.78
Organizational Climate (OC)		
Affiliation (OCA)		
OCA1: Members in my department keep close ties with each other	5.80	1.00
OCA2: Members in my department consider other members' standpoints highly.	5.73	1.02
OCA3: Members in my department have a strong feeling of "one team."	5.89	1.00
OCA4: Members in my department cooperate well with each other.	5.92	1.01
Mean of Organizational Climate (Affiliation)	5.84	0.90
Innovativeness (OCI)		
OCI1: My department encourages suggesting ideas for new opportunities.	6.00	0.90
OC2: My department puts much value on taking risks, even if they are failures.	5.59	1.07
OCI3: My department encourages finding new methods to perform a task.	5.90	1.03
Mean Organizational Climate Innovativeness	5.83	0.82
Fairness (OCF)		
OCF1: I can trust my boss's evaluation to be good.	5.81	1.05
OCF2: The objectives given to me are reasonable.	5.82	0.93
OCF3: My boss doesn't show favoritism to anyone.	5.56	1.36
Mean Fairness (OCF)	5.73	0.97
Organizational Climate	5.80	0.80

Table 5. *continued*

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Perceived Behavioral Control (CONT)		
CONT1: I am expected (e.g., by my boss or colleagues) to share my knowledge.	5.80	0.96
CONT2: It is possible for me to share my knowledge.	6.02	0.90
CONT3: If I wanted to, I could share my knowledge.	6.00	1.02
Mean Perceived Behavioral Control (CONT)	5.94	0.82
Subjective Norm (NORM)		
NORM1: People who influence my behavior (e.g., boss or colleagues) think I should share my knowledge.	5.77	0.98
NORM2: People who are important to me (boss or colleagues) think that I should share my knowledge.	5.83	0.98
NORM3: People whose opinions I value (boss or colleagues) would approve of my knowledge sharing.	5.69	1.01
Mean of Subjective Norm (NORM)	5.76	0.91
Attitudes Towards Knowledge Sharing (ATT)		
ATT1: My knowledge sharing with other organizational members is good.	5.71	1.04
ATT2: My knowledge sharing with other organizational members is an enjoyable experience.	5.80	1.10
ATT3: My knowledge sharing with other organizational members is valuable to me.	5.94	0.88
ATT4: My knowledge sharing with other organizational members is a wise move.	5.76	0.92
Mean of Attitudes Towards Knowledge Sharing (ATT)	5.80	0.76

Table 6. *Relationship between Knowledge-Sharing Behavior of Educators and its Determinants*

Knowledge-Sharing Behavior VS	Pearson's R Coefficient	p-Value
Knowledge-Sharing Factors	0.448	0.000

DISCUSSION

Knowledge-Sharing Behavior of Educators

The findings of this study highlight the various ways educators engage in knowledge-sharing, particularly in written contributions, personal interactions, and organizational communications. In Philippine public institutions, knowledge-sharing is often externally driven, with educators submitting periodic reports and documents. This aligns with Kaser and Miles (2001), who assert that extrinsic motivation plays a significant role in knowledge dissemination. Educators who produce exceptional research are rewarded by their institutions and the government (Ramachandran et al., 2009), yet research publication remains a low priority. The Philippines lags in research output compared to countries like Malaysia, Singapore, and Indonesia (Sukoco et al., 2023). As noted by Kim and Ju (2008), this disparity suggests that stronger institutional support and incentives are needed to encourage more active engagement in research and publication.

Educators' commitment to their institution also influences their willingness to share knowledge. Past studies (Hislop, 2003; MacNeil, 2003) suggest that the more educators believe their contributions benefit their institutions, the more likely they are to share their expertise. However, cultural norms in the Philippines discourage openly discussing personal mistakes, making some educators reluctant to share learning experiences that might benefit their peers. Despite this, informal and spontaneous knowledge-sharing through personal interactions remains prevalent. Conversations and face-to-face exchanges play a crucial role in knowledge transfer, allowing educators to communicate insights that may not be easily conveyed in formal settings (Antal & Richebé, 2009). In contrast, email communication is less frequently used, with many educators preferring direct discussions over digital correspondence.

While educators participate in communities of practice, their engagement levels suggest that these platforms are not fully optimized for consistent knowledge-sharing. According to Social Exchange Theory (Kaser & Miles, 2001), trust and reciprocity influence sharing behaviors, and hesitancy may stem from institutional and peer influences. To address this, public educational institutions in Negros should invest in online training, structured workshops, and incentive-based programs. Strengthening these platforms can enhance interactions, foster collaboration, and improve overall knowledge dissemination, particularly in dispersed educational settings.

Determinants of Knowledge-Sharing Behavior of Educators

The study highlights several key determinants of educators' knowledge-sharing behavior, including anticipated extrinsic rewards, reciprocal relationships, sense of self-worth, organizational climate, perceived behavioral control, subjective norms, and attitudes toward knowledge-sharing. While previous studies (Bock et al., 2005; Ramayah et al., 2013; Yiu & Law, 2013) suggest that perceived extrinsic benefits significantly drive knowledge-sharing behavior, educators in Negros Island remain uncertain whether their efforts will result in tangible rewards. This uncertainty may stem from the inconsistent implementation of monetary reward systems across academic institutions in the Philippines, where incentive structures vary significantly. As a result, external rewards may not be a strong motivator for knowledge-sharing among educators in this region.

On the other hand, the study affirms the Social Exchange Theory (Homans, 1961), which posits that individuals engage in knowledge-sharing based on expected intrinsic rewards, such as reciprocal relationships. Educators recognize that collaboration is essential for professional growth, provided the benefits outweigh the costs of maintaining such exchanges. Prior research (Bock et al., 2005; Hsu et al., 2007; Ramayah et al., 2013) also supports the idea that educators are more likely to reciprocate knowledge-sharing if they have previously benefited from such interactions. However, institutional factors, cultural norms, and individual perceptions of reciprocity influence how educators actively participate in knowledge exchange.

The findings also align with the Theory of Reasoned Action (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975), emphasizing the role of perceived self-worth in shaping behavior. Educators in Philippine public institutions undergo annual performance evaluations that assess their contributions to their departments and institutions. Previous studies (Bock et al., 2005; Ramayah et al., 2013) suggest that educators who believe their knowledge-sharing efforts contribute to institutional success are more inclined to engage in these activities. Additionally, career progression in the academic sector is often tied to active participation in knowledge-sharing and collaborative efforts, reinforcing the motivation to contribute.

Organizational climate plays a crucial role in fostering knowledge-sharing behaviors. Strong institutional support, team-building activities, and a culture of mutual respect can enhance social ties and encourage collaboration. This aligns with Jung et al.'s (2003) assertion that an innovative organizational climate promotes knowledge-sharing, as employees feel more empowered to contribute ideas without fear of failure. To maximize these benefits, academic leaders should establish structured platforms for brainstorming, innovation-driven workshops, and mentorship programs to sustain a dynamic and inclusive knowledge-sharing environment.

Finally, perceived behavioral control, subjective norms, and attitudes toward knowledge-sharing significantly influence educators' willingness to share knowledge. Educators who feel confident in their expertise and have access to necessary resources are more likely to engage in knowledge-sharing (Ramayah et al., 2013). Additionally, perceived social pressure from superiors and peers plays a role in shaping behavioral intentions (Taylor & Todd, 1995). Institutions can enhance knowledge-sharing behaviors by reinforcing positive attitudes, promoting shared values, and implementing reward systems that acknowledge educators' contributions. Establishing a culture that recognizes and values knowledge-sharing can lead to sustained engagement and long-term academic development.

Relationship Between Knowledge-Sharing Behavior of Educators and its Determinants

The findings highlight the critical role of selected knowledge-sharing factors in shaping educators' behavior, aligning with Ramayah et al. (2013), who identified these factors as key variables influencing

knowledge-sharing among academics in Malaysian public institutions. The moderate positive relationship observed underscores the importance of a supportive work environment that fosters collaboration, fairness, and innovation. A conducive organizational climate significantly impacts educators' willingness to share knowledge, consistent with studies by Bock et al. (2005) and Kaya et al. (2010). This study further confirms the association between knowledge-sharing factors and educators' behaviors in Negros Island, Philippines, reinforcing the importance of a supportive and inclusive organizational climate for promoting knowledge-sharing practices.

Interestingly, the moderately positive correlation suggests that organizational interventions aimed at improving climate, such as but not limited to implementing transparent communication practices or recognizing employees' contributions through monetary and non-monetary means, could substantially enhance knowledge-sharing activities. These results align with the Theory of Reasoned Action, which posits that external factors like the work environment influence behavioral intentions, such as knowledge sharing. Future studies could further explore how specific dimensions of organizational climate (e.g., trust or innovativeness) independently contribute to knowledge-sharing behavior. Additionally, qualitative insights might provide a deeper understanding of the mechanisms driving this relationship.

This study has its limitations, just like any other research. Primarily, data collection was limited to educators from public academic institutions in Negros Island, excluding private ones. Consequently, the study results may be prone to bias and must not be generalized to represent other public educational institutions in the various parts of the country. Finally, this study excluded other variables that may impede knowledge sharing, such as the availability of time and the amount of educators' work assignments.

CONCLUSION

The educators in Negros Island in the Philippines have positive knowledge-sharing based on selected factors, such as anticipated extrinsic rewards, anticipated reciprocal relationships, sense of self-worth, organizational climate, perceived behavioral control, subjective norm, attitude towards knowledge-sharing, and believe that their knowledge-sharing activities create a highly positive impact on themselves and the work relationships they maintain. In addition, the educators experience a highly positive organizational climate that creates a nurturing environment in which to exchange ideas and viewpoints freely. Additionally, educators regularly exhibit knowledge-sharing behaviors, paving the way for the spontaneous dissemination of novel ideas. Finally, selected knowledge-sharing factors are closely associated with knowledge-sharing behavior. These elements are essential in sharing knowledge within and beyond the academic community.

For researchers specializing in knowledge sharing or knowledge management, future studies may include a larger sample of public academic institutions. Researchers focusing on knowledge sharing can also replicate this study to focus on private educational institutions, which comprise a significant number in the country compared to public ones. Lastly, future studies should also consider examining knowledge-sharing barriers, as they are equally crucial as the factors that promote knowledge-sharing.

Author Contributions

Posadas: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Resources, Supervision, Validation, Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing; **Berjes:** Conceptualization, Formal analysis, Methodology, Project administration, Resources, Validation, Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Ethical Approval

Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

Competing interest
The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Data Availability
Data will be made available by the corresponding author on request.

Declaration of Artificial Intelligence Use
In this work, the authors did not use generative AI and AI-assisted technologies in the writing process nor utilize artificial intelligence (AI) tools and methodologies.

REFERENCES

Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1980). Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior. Prentice Hall.
Antal, A. B., & Richebe´, N. (2009). A passion for giving, a passion for sharing: Understanding knowledge sharing as gift exchange in academia. Journal of Management Inquiry, 18(1), 78–95. https://doi.org/10.1177/1056492608321882
Bacuño, M. D. (2020). Knowledge sharing as communication via James W. Carey's communication as culture. Recoletos Multidisciplinary Research Journal, 8(1), 31–42. https://doi.org/10.32871/rmrj2008.01.03
Bello, O. W. & Oyekunle, R. A. (2014). Attitude, perceptions and motivation towards knowledge sharing: Views from universities in Kwara State, Nigeria. African Journal of Library, Archives & Information Science, 24(2), pp. 123-134. https://www.ajol.info/index.php/ajlais/article/view/135067
Bock, G., & Kim, Y. G. (2002). Breaking the myths of rewards: An exploratory study of attitudes about knowledge sharing. Information Resources Management Journal 15(2), 14–21. http://dx.doi.org/10.4018/irmj.2002040102
Bock, G. W., Zmud, R., Kim, Y. G., & Lee, J. N. (2005). Behavioral intention formation in knowledge sharing: Examining the roles of extrinsic motivators, social-psychological forces, and organizational climate. MIS Quarterly 29(1), 87–111. https://doi.org/10.2307/25148669
Dalkir, K. (2017). Knowledge management in theory and practice (3rd ed.). MIT Press.
Davenport, T. H. & Prusak, L. (1998). Working knowledge: How organizations manage what they know. Harvard Business School Press.
Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). Beliefs, attitude, intention and behavior: An introduction to theory and research. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1980). On construct validity: A critique of Miniard and Cohen's paper. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology 17(3): 340–350. https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031(81)90032-9
Fullwood, R., Rowley, J., & Delbridge, R. (2013). Knowledge sharing amongst academics in UK universities. Journal of Knowledge Management, 17(1), 123–136. https://doi.org/10.1108/13673271311300831
Hinds, P. J. & Pfeffer, J. (2002). Why organizations don't 'know what they know': cognitive and motivational factors affecting the transfer of expertise. In M. Ackerman, V. Pipek, V. Wulf (Eds.). Sharing expertise: Beyond knowledge management. MIT Press. pp. 3–26. https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/6208.003.0004
Hislop, D. (2003). Linking human resource management and knowledge management via commitment: A review and research agenda. Employee Relations, 25(2), 182–202. https://doi.org/10.1108/01425450310456479
Homans, G. C. (1961). Social behavior: Its elementary forms. Harcourt, Brace. https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1962-06277-000
Hsu, M., Ju, T., Yen, G. and Chang, C. (2007). Knowledge sharing behavior in virtual communities: The relationship between trust, self-efficacy, and outcome expectations. International Journal of Human-Computer Studies, 65(2), pp. 153-169. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhcs.2006.09.003
Ipe, M. (2003). The praxis of knowledge sharing in organizations: A case study [Doctoral dissertation], University of Minnesota. https://www.proquest.com/openview/d803be86d18b1c0503a7e7022f5fa771/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y
Jung, D. I. Chow, C., & Wu, A. (2003). The role of transformational leadership in enhancing organizational innovation: Hypotheses and some preliminary findings. Leadership Quarterly 14 (4–5), 525–544. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(03)00050-X
Kaser, P. A., & Miles, R. E. (2001). Knowledge activists: The cultivation of motivation and trust properties of knowledge sharing relationships. Academy of Management Proceedings, 2001(1), D1–D6. https://doi.org/10.5465/apbpp.2001.6133693
Kaya, N., Koc, E., Topcu, D. (2010). An exploratory analysis of the influence of human resource management activities and organizational climate on job satisfaction in Turkish banks. The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 21(11), 2031–2051. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2010.505104
Kim, S, & Ju, B. (2008). An analysis of faculty perceptions: Attitudes toward knowledge sharing and collaboration in an academic institution. Library & Information Science Research 30(4): 282–290. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lisr.2008.04.003
Kim, W. C. and Mauborgne, R. (2003). Fair process: managing in the knowledge economy. Harvard Business Review, 75(4), 65–75. https://hbr.org/2003/01/fair-process-managing-in-the-knowledge-economy

Kim, Y. B. and Lee, B. H. (1995). R&D project team climate and team performance in Korea. R&D Management, 25(2), pp. 179-96. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9310.1995.tb00910.x

Landry, R., Saihi, M., Amara, N., & Ouimet, M. (2010). Evidence on how academics manage their portfolio of knowledge transfer activities. Research Policy, 39(10), 1387–1403. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2010.08.003

MacNeil, C. M. (2003). Line managers: Facilitators of knowledge sharing in teams. Employee Relations, 25(3), 294–307. https://doi.org/10.1108/01425450310475874

Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). The knowledge-creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation. Oxford University Press.

Ramachandran, S. D., Chong, S. C., & Ismail, H. (2009). The practice of knowledge management processes: A comparative study of public and private higher education institutions in Malaysia. VINE: The Journal of Information and Knowledge Management Systems, 39(3), 203–222. https://doi.org/10.1108/03055720911003978

Ramayah, T., Yeap, J. A. L., & Ignatius, J. (2013). An Empirical Inquiry on Knowledge Sharing Among Academicians in Higher Learning Institutions. Minerva, 51(2), 131–154. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11024-013-9229-7

Ramayah, T., Yeap, J. A. L., & Ignatius, J. (2014). Assessing knowledge sharing among academics. Evaluation Review, 38(2), 160–187. https://doi.org/10.1177/0193841X14539685

Rowley, J. (2000). Is higher education ready for knowledge management? The International Journal of Educational Management, 14(7), 325–333. https://doi.org/10.1108/09513540010378978

Senge, P. M. (1990). The fifth discipline: The art & practice of the learning organization. Currency Doubleday.

Sukoco, B. M., Putra, R. A., Muqaffi, H. N., Lutfian, M. V., & Wicaksono, H. (2023). Comparative study of ASEAN research productivity. Sage Open, 13(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221145157

Tan, C. N. (2016). Enhancing knowledge sharing and research collaboration among academics: The role of knowledge management. Higher Education, 71(4), 525–556. https://doi:10.1007/s10734-015-9922-6

Taylor, S., & Todd, P. A. (1995). Understanding information technology usage: A test of competing models. Information Systems Research, 6(2), 144–176. https://www.jstor.org/stable/23011007

Tohidinia, Z., & Mosakhani, M. (2010). Knowledge sharing behaviour and its predictors. Industrial Management & Data Systems, 110(4), 611–631. https://doi.org/10.1108/02635571011039052

Wickramasinghe, V., & Widyaratne, R. (2012). Effects of interpersonal trust, team leader support, rewards, and knowledge sharing mechanisms on knowledge sharing in project teams. VINE: The Journal of Information and Knowledge Management Systems, 42, 214–236. https://doi.org/10.1108/03055721211227255

Yi, J. (2009). A measure of knowledge sharing behavior: Scale development and validation. Knowledge Management Research & Practice 7(1): 65–81. https://doi.org/10.1057/kmrp.2008.36

Yiu, M., & Law, R. (2013). Review and application of knowledge management and knowledge sharing in tourism. Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research, 19(7), 737-759. https://doi.org/10.1080/10941665.2013.812128

How to cite this article:
Posadas, M.G. & Berjes, J. (2025). Knowledge Sharing among Educators in the Philippines. Recoletos Multidisciplinary Research Journal 13(1), 45-57. https://doi.org/10.32871/rmrj2513.01.04