

The Effect of Knowledge-Sharing Intention on Knowledge-Sharing Behaviour among TVET Academicians in Malaysia

Wan Zuhaila Wan Abd. Rahman*, Siti Fatimah Mardiah
Hamzah, Suzila Mat Salleh

Faculty of Business and Management, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Terengganu, Malaysia

*Corresponding Author Email: wzuhaila@uitm.edu.my

DOI Link: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARPED/v15-i4/29208>

Published Online: 29 October 2026

Abstract

Knowledge sharing plays a vital role in enhancing institutional performance, teaching quality, and innovation in educational institutions. Grounded in the Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB), this study examines the effect of knowledge-sharing intention on knowledge-sharing behaviour among Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET) academicians in Malaysia. A quantitative, cross-sectional survey was conducted involving 141 academicians, and the data were analysed using Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modelling (PLS-SEM) with SmartPLS 4. The findings reveal a positive and significant relationship between knowledge-sharing intention and knowledge-sharing behaviour ($\beta = 0.763$, $p < 0.001$), supporting the proposed hypothesis. The model explains 58.3% of the variance in knowledge-sharing behaviour, indicating that knowledge-sharing intention is an important predictor within the proposed model. Theoretically, this study provides context-specific empirical support for the central proposition of TPB that behavioural intention predicts behaviour within the relatively underexplored Malaysian TVET context. Practically, the findings highlight the importance of fostering academicians' willingness to share knowledge through collaborative initiatives, peer mentoring, recognition, and supportive institutional environments. This study offers insights for educational institutional leaders and policymakers seeking to strengthen knowledge-sharing practices and support continuous improvement in TVET institutions.

Keywords: Knowledge-Sharing Intention, Knowledge-Sharing Behaviour, TVET, Theory of Planned Behaviour, PLS-SEM

Introduction

Knowledge sharing is widely recognised as an important process for enhancing organisational learning, innovation, and overall performance, particularly in knowledge-intensive environments such as educational institutions (Cabrera & Cabrera, 2005; Wang & Noe, 2010). In academic settings, the exchange of knowledge among academicians supports effective teaching, research productivity, and institutional development (Fullwood et al., 2013). However, knowledge sharing does not occur automatically; rather, it involves deliberate behaviour influenced by individuals' cognitive, motivational, and contextual factors.

Although knowledge-sharing behaviour has been extensively examined in higher education institutions and corporate organisations (Bock et al., 2005; Lin, 2007), further investigation is warranted within technical and vocational education and training (TVET) institutions. TVET institutions have a distinctive educational orientation characterised by applied knowledge, skills-based learning, and alignment with industry needs (UNESCO, 2016). Consequently, knowledge sharing in these institutions may involve the exchange of teaching practices, technical expertise, practical skills, and industry-related knowledge. Empirical studies of TVET instructors have also identified individual, organisational, collaborative, content-related, and technological considerations in knowledge-sharing practices (Hashim et al., 2016; Mohamad Judi et al., 2018). These findings highlight the importance of understanding knowledge sharing within the specific educational and professional context of TVET.

The Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB) provides a theoretical foundation for examining the relationship between behavioural intention and behaviour. According to Ajzen (1991), behavioural intention is the most immediate antecedent of behaviour, reflecting an individual's readiness to perform a particular action. TPB has been applied in knowledge-sharing research, in which intention is recognised as an important construct for explaining knowledge-sharing behaviour (Chen et al., 2009; Ryu et al., 2003). Nevertheless, the intention to perform a behaviour does not necessarily guarantee that the behaviour will occur. Although previous studies have reported positive relationships between knowledge-sharing intention (KSI) and knowledge-sharing behaviour (KSB) (Bock et al., 2005; Lin, 2007), contextual, organisational, and situational circumstances may influence whether intention translates into behaviour (van den Hooff & de Ridder, 2004; Wang & Noe, 2010). This highlights the value of examining the intention–behaviour relationship within specific institutional contexts.

Relevant empirical evidence is available from studies conducted among Malaysian academics. Hosen et al. (2023), for example, examined the relationship between knowledge-sharing intention (KSI) and knowledge-sharing behaviour (KSB) among academics in Malaysia. In addition, previous research involving Malaysian TVET academicians has examined factors associated with knowledge-sharing behaviour (Wan Abd. Rahman et al., 2024). These studies provide an important foundation for understanding knowledge sharing among academics. However, the TVET context warrants specific consideration because of its emphasis on integrating theoretical knowledge with practical skills, technical expertise, and occupational competencies. Against this background, the present study focuses specifically on the direct relationship between KSI and KSB among Malaysian TVET academicians. Rather than claiming a new theoretical relationship, the study seeks to provide a context-specific examination of this established relationship within a vocationally oriented higher education setting.

Guided by the Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB), this study examines the direct relationship between KSI and KSB among academicians in Malaysian TVET institutions. Rather than testing the full TPB model, the study focuses on the proposition that behavioural intention is an important predictor of behaviour. This focused examination provides an opportunity to assess the relevance of this proposition to knowledge-sharing behaviour in a vocationally oriented higher education context.

Practically, understanding the relationship between KSI and KSB may inform institutional leaders and policymakers seeking to encourage knowledge sharing among TVET academicians. The findings may provide insights into the role of intention in knowledge-sharing behaviour and help inform institutional efforts to support the exchange of academic, technical, and industry-related knowledge.

Literature Review

Knowledge-Sharing Behaviour

Knowledge-sharing behaviour (KSB) refers to the actions through which individuals make their knowledge, expertise, experiences, and work-related information available to others. Among academicians, such behaviour may include discussing teaching practices, exchanging instructional materials, sharing research insights, mentoring colleagues, and collaborating on academic projects. These activities matter in higher education because teaching, research, and institutional development depend partly on the circulation and collective use of knowledge.

Recent scholarship continues to identify knowledge sharing as an important process in higher education, while also showing that it is not automatic. Fan and Beh (2024), in a systematic literature review of 50 studies on academics' knowledge sharing, grouped influential factors into individual, organisational, and technological categories. Their review also identified uneven research attention across these areas and highlighted that the academic knowledge-sharing literature remains fragmented. This suggests that knowledge sharing should be examined not only as an organisational aspiration but also as an individual behaviour that requires explanation.

Empirical studies reinforce the relevance of knowledge sharing in academic environments. Hosen et al. (2023) examined academics in Malaysian private universities and found that knowledge-sharing behaviour was associated with behavioural and organisational factors, including knowledge-sharing intention, attitude, subjective norms, perceived behavioural control, trust, and organisational climate. Ahmad et al. (2023), studying academicians in Indian higher education institutions, likewise applied an extended Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) framework to explain knowledge-sharing behaviour. Together, these studies support the continued relevance of behavioural explanations while demonstrating that the knowledge-sharing process is influenced by the context in which academics work.

For technical and vocational education and training (TVET), knowledge sharing has particular practical significance because academicians connect disciplinary knowledge with applied skills, workplace practices, and industry expectations. Sharing teaching resources, technical experience, and practice-based expertise can support curriculum development and more consistent learning experiences. However, evidence drawn from conventional universities or other occupational settings cannot automatically be assumed to apply to Malaysian TVET institutions. This makes it useful to test the intention–behaviour relationship directly in this specific context.

Knowledge-Sharing Intention

Knowledge-sharing intention (KSI) refers to an individual's readiness or conscious willingness to share knowledge with others. It captures a motivational state that precedes the act itself

and can be expressed through plans or willingness to exchange information, provide assistance, and contribute expertise. In the TPB, intention is a proximal predictor of behaviour, although its translation into action may depend on whether individuals have sufficient control and opportunity to perform the behaviour (Ajzen, 1991, 2020).

Recent evidence supports the importance of intention in explaining knowledge sharing. Afshar Jalili and Ghaleh (2020) synthesised 47 studies involving 15,528 participants in a meta-analysis of TPB and knowledge-sharing behaviour. Their findings indicated that KSI and perceived behavioural control jointly predict knowledge-sharing behaviour, while intention is associated with attitude, subjective norms, and perceived behavioural control. This synthesis is particularly relevant because it consolidates evidence across studies rather than relying on a single organisational sample.

Research in higher education also continues to place KSI at the centre of behavioural models. Hosen et al. (2023) found that KSI was directly related to academics' knowledge-sharing behaviour and mediated several relationships between TPB-related antecedents and behaviour. Ahmad et al. (2023) similarly used an extended TPB model to investigate why academicians share knowledge. These findings suggest that intention remains an important explanatory construct in academic settings, although studies that include several predictors and mediators do not always isolate the direct intention–behaviour relationship as their sole focus.

It is important, however, to distinguish intention from behaviour. A person may report willingness to share knowledge but not consistently enact that willingness because of workload, limited opportunities for interaction, lack of time, or insufficient organisational support. Consequently, intention should be understood as a strong motivational indicator rather than as an assurance that the behaviour will occur in every situation. Examining the direct relationship empirically is therefore important, particularly in work settings with distinctive demands and routines.

Theory of Planned Behaviour and Knowledge Sharing

The Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) provides the theoretical foundation for this study. Ajzen (1991) proposed that behavioural intention is the most immediate antecedent of behaviour, while intention is shaped by attitude toward the behaviour, subjective norms, and perceived behavioural control. Ajzen (2020) later clarified frequently raised questions about the theory, reaffirming the importance of defining the behaviour of interest and considering the conditions under which intention is expected to predict action.

The TPB has been applied to knowledge sharing because the decision to share expertise often involves an individual's evaluation of the activity, perceptions of others' expectations, and assessment of whether sharing is feasible. The meta-analysis by Afshar Jalili and Ghaleh (2020) provides broad support for applying TPB to knowledge-sharing behaviour: across the reviewed studies, intention and perceived behavioural control both contributed to the prediction of behaviour. This result also cautions against treating intention as the only possible determinant of behaviour in every context.

Recent academic studies have further demonstrated the value of TPB-based explanations. Hosen et al. (2023) investigated knowledge-sharing behaviour among academics using TPB alongside perceived trust and organisational climate. Their findings showed that intention was directly associated with behaviour, while other TPB constructs also had direct relationships with behaviour and helped explain intention. Ahmad et al. (2023) extended TPB with motivation and opportunity-related factors in a study of academicians in India. These studies indicate that TPB remains useful for knowledge-sharing research, while also showing that the strength and structure of relationships may vary with the model and context.

The present study does not seek to test every component of TPB or to reproduce a more elaborate explanatory model. Instead, it focuses on one central proposition: whether knowledge-sharing intention is associated with knowledge-sharing behaviour among Malaysian TVET academicians. This focused approach provides a direct test of a core theoretical relationship in a setting that has received less attention than general higher education and corporate environments.

Knowledge-Sharing Intention and Knowledge-Sharing Behaviour

The relationship between KSI and KSB is central to the behavioural explanation advanced in this study. TPB proposes that the stronger an individual's intention to perform a behaviour, the more likely the individual is to enact it, provided that the behaviour remains sufficiently under the person's control (Ajzen, 1991, 2020). Applied to academic work, this proposition suggests that academicians who intend to share knowledge should be more likely to exchange teaching materials, offer professional advice, discuss practice-based experience, and collaborate with colleagues.

Recent evidence is broadly consistent with this expectation. Afshar Jalili and Ghaleh (2020), based on a meta-analysis of 47 studies, identified KSI as one of the two principal predictors of knowledge-sharing behaviour, alongside perceived behavioural control. In a Malaysian higher education context, Hosen et al. (2023) also reported a direct relationship between KSI and KSB among academics. These findings offer contemporary support for the proposition that intention is an important predictor of knowledge-sharing action.

Nevertheless, the intention–behaviour relationship should not be interpreted as inevitable. Afshar Jalili and Ghaleh (2020) noted the risk of cooperation bias in knowledge-sharing research, whereby respondents may overstate both their intention and their behaviour, and recommended that future work consider stronger measures of actual behaviour. In addition, Fan and Beh's (2024) review highlights the range of individual, organisational, and technological conditions associated with academic knowledge sharing. These observations imply that intention is important, but its observed relationship with behaviour may depend on measurement and context.

There remains a contextual need to examine this relationship among Malaysian TVET academicians. Studies of university academics provide relevant evidence, but TVET institutions have a distinct emphasis on applied and occupational knowledge. A direct test in this setting can help establish whether the intention–behaviour association reported in broader higher education research is also evident among academicians working in vocational

and technical education. The present study addresses this need by testing the following hypothesis.

Hypothesis Development

Drawing on TPB and recent evidence on knowledge sharing, this study proposes that academicians with stronger intentions to share knowledge will be more likely to engage in knowledge-sharing behaviour. The meta-analytic findings of Afshar Jalili and Ghaleh (2020) and the academic evidence reported by Hosen et al. (2023) provide support for expecting a positive relationship. Accordingly, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H1: Knowledge-sharing intention has a positive and significant relationship with knowledge-sharing behaviour among TVET academicians.

Methodology

Research Design

This study employed a quantitative, cross-sectional research design to examine the effect of knowledge-sharing intention on knowledge-sharing behaviour among TVET academicians. A survey-based approach was used, which is suitable for capturing individual perceptions, intentions, and behaviours at a single point in time (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The research design allowed for the application of Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modelling (PLS-SEM) using SmartPLS 4, a robust method for testing predictive relationships and handling small-to-medium sample sizes (Hair et al., 2022).

Population and Sample

The population of this study comprised academicians employed at Malaysian TVET institutions. A purposive sampling technique was applied to select participants who were actively involved in knowledge-sharing activities, ensuring that respondents could provide meaningful information (Etikan et al., 2016).

Following PLS-SEM guidelines, which recommend a minimum sample size of ten times the number of structural paths directed at a construct, a target sample of 141 TVET academicians was selected to achieve adequate statistical power and generalisability (Hair et al., 2022).

Instrumentation

Data were collected using a structured questionnaire consisting of two main constructs:

1. Knowledge-Sharing Intention (Independent Variable):
Measured using a scale adapted from Bock et al. (2005) and Lin (2007), which assesses an individual's readiness and willingness to share knowledge with colleagues and participate in knowledge-sharing activities.
2. Knowledge-Sharing Behaviour (Dependent Variable):
Measured using a scale adapted from Fullwood et al. (2013) and Wang and Noe (2010), which captures the frequency and quality of actual knowledge-sharing actions, including sharing teaching materials, providing assistance, and collaborating on research projects.

All items were rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). A pilot study involving 30 academicians from a separate TVET institution was conducted to assess the clarity, reliability, and validity of the instrument, leading to minor refinements in item wording.

Data Collection Procedure

After obtaining approval from institutional authorities, the questionnaire was distributed electronically via email and online survey platforms. Participation was voluntary, and respondents were assured of anonymity and confidentiality. Data collection occurred over four weeks, with two reminder emails sent to enhance response rates.

Data Analysis

The collected data were analysed using SmartPLS 4 following the standard two-stage PLS-SEM procedure (Hair et al., 2022; Ringle et al., 2015): The data were analysed using Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modelling (PLS-SEM) in SmartPLS 4. The analysis involved two stages: measurement model (outer model) assessment and structural model (inner model) assessment. First, the measurement model was evaluated to establish the reliability and validity of the constructs. Internal consistency reliability was assessed using Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability (CR), with values of 0.70 or above considered acceptable. Convergent validity was examined using the average variance extracted (AVE), with a threshold of 0.50 or above. Discriminant validity was assessed using the heterotrait-monotrait ratio (HTMT), with values below 0.85 indicating adequate discriminant validity.

The structural model was assessed to examine the relationship between knowledge-sharing intention and knowledge-sharing behaviour. The path coefficient was examined to determine the direction and strength of the relationship, while significance was evaluated using bootstrapping with 5,000 resamples to obtain t-values, p-values, and confidence intervals. In addition, the effect size (f^2) was assessed to determine the contribution of knowledge-sharing intention to knowledge-sharing behaviour, while predictive relevance (Q^2) was examined to evaluate the model's predictive relevance, using an appropriate assessment procedure.

Ethical Considerations

This study adhered to ethical guidelines for research involving human participants. Participation was voluntary, and informed consent was obtained prior to data collection. Respondents were assured that their responses would remain anonymous and confidential, and data were used solely for research purposes. The study received approval from the institutional research ethics committee before commencing data collection.

Thus, the methodology ensures a reliable, valid, and ethically sound examination of the effect of knowledge-sharing intention on knowledge-sharing behaviour. By applying SmartPLS for PLS-SEM analysis, the study provides a focused and rigorous test of the proposed hypothesis within the underexplored context of Malaysian TVET institutions.

Results

Respondent Profile

A total of 141 academicians participated, with 80.9% females 19.1% males. Most were aged 31–40 years (42.6%), followed by 41–50 years (48.2%). Academic ranks included 65.3% lecturers, 32.6% senior lecturers, and 2.1% head of department. Average teaching experience was 11–15 years.

Measurement Model Assessment

Table 1

Measurement Model Results

Construct	Item	Loading	Cronbach's α	Composite Reliability (CR)	AVE
Knowledge-Sharing Intention	KSI1	0.864	0.918	0.926	0.754
	KSI2	0.880			
	KSI3	0.909			
	KSI4	0.764			
	KSI5	0.916			
Knowledge-Sharing Behaviour	KSB1	0.919	0.933	0.936	0.790
	KSB2	0.878			
	KSB3	0.926			
	KSB4	0.861			
	KSB5	0.856			

All items had loadings above 0.70, and Cronbach's α , CR, and AVE values indicated reliability and convergent validity. Discriminant validity, assessed with HTMT, was satisfactory (all < 0.85). Thus, the findings provide strong support for H1, confirming that knowledge-sharing intention is a positive and significant predictor of knowledge-sharing behaviour among TVET academicians. The results validate the core assumption of the Theory of Planned Behaviour that stronger intention is associated with higher reported levels of behaviour, in the context of vocational education.

Structural Model Assessment

The structural model was assessed to examine the hypothesised relationship between knowledge-sharing intention (KSI) and knowledge-sharing behaviour (KSB). As presented in Table 2, knowledge-sharing intention was positively and significantly associated with knowledge-sharing behaviour ($\beta = 0.763$, $t = 23.111$, $p < 0.001$). Therefore, H1 was supported. The coefficient of determination ($R^2 = 0.583$) indicates that the model explains 58.3% of the variance in knowledge-sharing behaviour. The effect size ($f^2 = 1.398$) indicates a large contribution of knowledge-sharing intention within the model. Overall, these findings demonstrate a strong positive association between academicians' intention to share knowledge and their reported knowledge-sharing behaviour. However, given the cross-sectional research design, the findings establish a positive and significant relationship rather than definitive causal evidence.

Table 2

Structural Model Results

Path	β	Stdev	t-value	p-value	f^2	Q^2	R^2
KSI $\rightarrow$ KSB	0.763	0.033	23.111	0.000	1.398	0.401	0.583

The knowledge-sharing intention (KSI) had a positive and significant relationship with knowledge-sharing behaviour (KSB), supporting H1. The effect size ($f^2 = 1.398$) was large, and predictive relevance ($Q^2 = 0.401$) was substantial. The predictive of this model ($R^2 = 0.583$) explains 60% of the variance in that endogenous construct.

The structural model results are presented in Table 2. The path coefficient indicates the direction and strength of the relationship, while bootstrapping was used to assess its significance. Knowledge-sharing intention had a positive and significant relationship with

knowledge-sharing behaviour ($\beta = 0.763$, $t = 23.111$, $p < 0.001$). Therefore, the hypothesis proposing a positive relationship between knowledge-sharing intention and knowledge-sharing behaviour was supported.

Discussion

The findings reveal a strong positive and significant relationship between knowledge-sharing intention (KSI) and knowledge-sharing behaviour (KSB) among Malaysian TVET academicians ($\beta = 0.763$, $p < 0.001$). This result suggests that academicians who report stronger intentions to share knowledge also tend to report higher levels of knowledge-sharing behaviour. The magnitude of the path coefficient highlights the importance of knowledge-sharing intention in understanding variations in knowledge-sharing behaviour within the proposed research model. These findings are consistent with the Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB), which identifies behavioural intention as an immediate antecedent of behaviour (Ajzen, 1991, 2020). Nevertheless, because the study employed a cross-sectional survey design, the findings should be interpreted as evidence of a strong association rather than definitive proof that knowledge-sharing intention causes changes in knowledge-sharing behaviour.

This finding is consistent with the Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB), which positions behavioural intention as an immediate antecedent of behaviour (Ajzen, 1991, 2020). Recent empirical evidence also supports this relationship. Afshar Jalili and Ghaleh (2021), in a meta-analysis of 47 studies involving 15,528 participants, identified knowledge-sharing intention and perceived behavioural control as important predictors of knowledge-sharing behaviour. Similarly, Hosen et al. (2023), in their study of academics at Malaysian private universities, found that knowledge-sharing intention was directly related to knowledge-sharing behaviour. The convergence between these findings and the present study strengthens the argument that intention is an important behavioural predictor across different knowledge-sharing settings.

Nevertheless, the present finding should be interpreted in relation to the specific context and scope of the study. Whereas Hosen et al. (2023) examined knowledge sharing through an extended TPB model incorporating trust and organisational climate, the present study focuses specifically on the direct relationship between intention and behaviour among TVET academicians. This distinction is relevant because TVET academicians work in an environment where applied knowledge, technical expertise, and practice-oriented teaching are important. Their willingness to share knowledge may therefore be reflected in activities such as exchanging instructional materials, discussing technical practices, providing professional guidance, and collaborating with colleagues. The present result provides context-specific evidence that the intention–behaviour relationship is also evident in Malaysian TVET institutions.

At the same time, the positive relationship does not imply that intention invariably translates into behaviour. Afshar Jalili and Ghaleh (2021) highlighted potential measurement concerns in knowledge-sharing research, including the possibility that respondents overestimate their intentions and behaviours when both are self-reported. In addition, Fan and Beh (2024), in their systematic review of knowledge sharing among academics, identified inconsistencies in how knowledge sharing is measured and highlighted the need for further research into technological and organisational influences. These observations suggest that intention is an

important predictor, but the extent to which it results in actual behaviour may still depend on the research context, measurement approach, and opportunities available to individuals.

Taken together, the findings support the relevance of the intention–behaviour proposition in TPB while extending its empirical examination to Malaysian TVET academicians. The contribution lies not in claiming that intention is the only determinant of knowledge-sharing behaviour, but in providing focused evidence of its direct relationship with behaviour in a comparatively underexamined educational setting.

Theoretical Implications

This study contributes to knowledge-sharing research by providing context-specific evidence on the intention–behaviour relationship proposed by the Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB). Although previous studies have examined knowledge-sharing intention and behaviour among academics, the present study focuses specifically on Malaysian TVET academicians, whose professional responsibilities involve the integration of theoretical knowledge, technical expertise, and practice-oriented teaching. By examining the direct relationship between knowledge-sharing intention and behaviour in this setting, the study extends the empirical application of TPB to a vocational education context that warrants further investigation.

The study also provides a focused examination of the intention–behaviour link, complementing recent research that has incorporated additional psychological and organisational variables into more elaborate models of academic knowledge sharing (Hosen et al., 2023). Its contribution is therefore contextual and empirical rather than a claim that the underlying theoretical relationship is new. The findings offer a basis for subsequent research to investigate whether organisational support, perceived behavioural control, workload, and technological resources strengthen or constrain the translation of knowledge-sharing intention into behaviour among TVET academicians.

Practical Implications

The positive relationship between knowledge-sharing intention and behaviour highlights the importance of cultivating academicians' willingness to exchange knowledge. TVET institutional leaders can support this process by recognising collaborative contributions, encouraging peer mentoring, and providing structured opportunities for academicians to exchange teaching resources and technical expertise. Such initiatives should be integrated into routine academic activities rather than treated solely as additional responsibilities.

However, the findings should not be interpreted to mean that increasing intention alone will necessarily produce corresponding behavioural changes. Institutions should also provide opportunities and resources that enable academicians to act on their intentions. These may include protected time for collaborative activities, accessible knowledge-sharing platforms, cross-disciplinary discussions, and mechanisms for documenting and disseminating industry-related experience. Such measures are particularly relevant in TVET institutions, where the sharing of applied knowledge can support curriculum relevance and the development of practice-oriented teaching. Future institutional initiatives should therefore address both academicians' willingness to share knowledge and the conditions that facilitate its enactment.

Comparison with Previous Studies

The findings align with previous research reporting a positive association between knowledge-sharing intention and behaviour (Bock et al., 2005; Lin, 2007). However, they contrast with studies suggesting that intention does not always positively associated with behaviour due to contextual barriers such as high workload or insufficient organisational support (van den Hooff & de Ridder, 2004; Wang & Noe, 2010). The strong effect observed in this study may reflect the unique characteristics of TVET institutions, where collaboration and applied knowledge sharing are integral to vocational teaching and industry engagement.

Limitations and Future Research

Despite its contributions, this study has several limitations. First, the cross-sectional design prevents causal inference, and longitudinal studies are recommended to examine how knowledge-sharing intention evolves over time. Second, the study focused on a single predictor, and other antecedents of knowledge-sharing behaviour, such as organisational support, culture, or perceived behavioural control, were not considered. Future research could adopt a multi-variable model to provide a more comprehensive understanding of knowledge-sharing behaviour in TVET. Finally, the study relied on self-reported data, which may be subject to social desirability bias. Future studies could incorporate objective measures of knowledge-sharing behaviour or multi-source data to strengthen validity.

In conclusion, this study provides empirical support for the intention–behaviour relationship among TVET academicians, providing empirical support for TPB in vocational education contexts. By highlighting the importance of intention as a motivational driver, the study offers both theoretical and practical insights for enhancing knowledge sharing in educational institutions.

Conclusion

This study examined the effect of knowledge-sharing intention on knowledge-sharing behaviour among TVET academicians in Malaysia, guided by the Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB). The findings indicate a positive and significant relationship, confirming that academicians with stronger intention are more likely to engage in actual knowledge-sharing activities.

The study makes several contributions. Theoretically, it validates the core assumption of TPB in the underexplored context of TVET institutions, demonstrating that intention is a key determinant of behaviour even in vocational education settings. Practically, the findings provide actionable insights for institutional leaders and policymakers: enhancing academicians' intention to share knowledge, coupled with structural support such as collaborative platforms and recognition programs, can effectively promote knowledge-sharing behaviour and improve institutional performance.

Despite its contributions, the study has limitations, including its cross-sectional design, focus on a single predictor, and reliance on self-reported data. Future research could adopt longitudinal designs, examine additional antecedents or moderators, and incorporate objective measures of knowledge-sharing behaviour to provide a more comprehensive understanding.

In summary, this study underscores the central role of knowledge-sharing intention in facilitating knowledge-sharing behaviour among TVET academicians and highlights the value of targeted strategies to foster intention and enable effective knowledge exchange in vocational education institutions.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to express appreciation to the respondents for their cooperation during this study. The authors also acknowledge the support by Universiti Teknologi MARA throughout the study.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Funding

This research is self-funding.

References

- Afshar Jalili, Y., & Ghaleh, S. (2020). Knowledge sharing and the theory of planned behavior: A meta-analysis review. *VINE Journal of Information and Knowledge Management Systems*, 51(2), 236–258. <https://doi.org/10.1108/VJIKMS-02-2019-0023>
- Ahmad, A. A., Alam, M. S., Kirmani, M. D., & Madsen, D. O. (2023). Why do academicians share knowledge? A study of higher education institutions in India. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, Article 1181030. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1181030>
- Ajzen, I. (1991). *The theory of planned behavior*. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179–211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T)
- Ajzen, I. (2020). The theory of planned behavior: Frequently asked questions. *Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies*, 2(4), 314–324. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbe2.195>
- Bock, G. W., Zmud, R. W., 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>
- Cabrera, A., & Cabrera, E. F. (2005). Fostering knowledge sharing through people management practices. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16(5), 720–735. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585190500083020>
- Chen, C. J., Cheng, J. L., & Hwang, M. I. (2009). The relationship between knowledge sharing and organizational learning: An empirical study. *International Journal of Management*, 26(1), 120–129.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5(1), 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11>
- Fan, Z., & Beh, L.-S. (2024). Knowledge sharing among academics in higher education: A systematic literature review and future agenda. *Educational Research Review*, 42, Article 100573. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2023.100573>

- 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/10.1108/13673271311298607>
- Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2022). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Hashim, H., Mohamad Judi, H., & Tengku Wook, T. S. M. (2016). Success factors for knowledge sharing among TVET instructors. *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Information Technology*, 85(1), 12–20.
- Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 43(1), 115–135. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-014-0403-8>
- Hosen, M., Ogbeibu, S., Lim, W. M., Ferraris, A., Munim, Z. H., Chong, Y.-L., & Piow, T. H. (2023). Knowledge sharing behavior among academics: Insights from theory of planned behavior, perceived trust and organizational climate. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 27(6), 1740–1769. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-02-2022-0140>
- Lin, H. F. (2007). Knowledge sharing and firm innovation capability: An empirical study. *International Journal of Manpower*, 28(3/4), 315–332. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437720710755272>
- Lin, H. F., & Lee, G. G. (2004). Perceptions of senior managers toward knowledge-sharing behavior. *Management Decision*, 42(1), 108–125. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00251740410513817>
- Mohamad Judi, H., Hashim, H., & Tengku Wook, T. S. M. (2018). Knowledge sharing driving factors in technical vocational education and training institute using content analysis. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Information Technology and Multimedia*, 7(2), 11–28.
- Ringle, C. M., Wende, S., & Becker, J.-M. (2015). *SmartPLS 3* [Computer software]. SmartPLS GmbH. <https://www.smartpls.com>
- Ryu, S., Ho, S. H., & Han, I. (2003). Knowledge sharing behavior of physicians in hospitals. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 25(1), 113–122. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0957-4174\(03\)00012-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0957-4174(03)00012-3)
- UNESCO. (2016). *World TVET database: Malaysia*. UNESCO-UNEVOC. <https://unevoc.unesco.org/home/TVETipedia+Glossary/fetch?id=1941>
- van den Hooff, B., & de Ridder, J. A. (2004). Knowledge sharing in context: The influence of organizational commitment, communication climate, and CMC use on knowledge sharing. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 8(6), 117–130. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13673270410567675>
- Wan Abd. Rahman, W. Z., Mohd. Zahari, A. S., & Abdullah, Z. (2024). Factors influencing knowledge-sharing behavior among academicians in technical and vocational education and training institutions. *Information Management and Business Review*, 16(1(I)), 229–238.
- Wang, S., & Noe, R. A. (2010). Knowledge sharing: A review and directions for future research. *Human Resource Management Review*, 20(2), 115–131. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2009.10.001>