

Influence of Mentoring on the Performance of Universities in Kenya

¹Magdalene Ndeto, ²Dr. Joyce Nzulwa, ³Dr. Mary Kamaara, ⁴Dr. Kepha Ombui

¹PhD. Candidate, ²Lecturer, ³Lecturer, ⁴Lecturer; Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Department of Entrepreneurship and Procurement, P.O Box 62000-00200 Nairobi, Kenya

Abstract: Tacit knowledge is acquired through experience and can be shared through several forms like on the job training, mentoring, coaching, communities of practices, peer assistance and knowledge sharing forums. The objective of this study was to determine the influence of mentoring on the performance of universities in Kenya. The study used descriptive research design and a simple random sampling to select a sample of heads of departments from the chartered universities in Kenya. The unit of analysis was the chartered universities in Kenya and the unit of observation 12 chartered universities and the respondents were the heads of department.. The sample size was 179. Data collection was done through questionnaires. The study established that mentoring had a correlation of 0.42 and the coefficient of determination R square (R^2) was 0.176 and R was 0.419 at a 0.05 significance level correlation. Therefore the study concluded that mentoring programs had a significant influence on the performance of universities in Kenya. The study recommends that the organizations which desire to to improve their performance should embrace mentoring as a practice of knowledge sharing.

Keywords: Mentoring, tacit Knowledge, knowledge sharing, performance.

1. INTRODUCTION

The twenty first century is the era of knowledge based economy (Tsai, Tsai, Li, & Lin, 2012). According to the scholars the term 'knowledge-based economy' has emerged from fuller recognition of the pivotal role that knowledge and technology plays in economic growth, as embodied in human capital, innovations and technology. Information technology and sharing of knowledge in the organizations has become very important (Sandhu, Jain, & Ahmad, (2011). The acceptance of the human resources managers' role as knowledge managers has become the vision of the organizations which are interested in keeping their competitive advantage (Ramady, 2010). According to Cranfield (2011) in the past traditional economies and organizations relied upon assets such as capital and land having physical values. The scholar further expounds that in the modern economy this trend has changed and knowledge management is now the key factor to gaining competitive advantage.

There are two types of knowledge; tacit knowledge and explicit knowledge. According to Joia and Lemos (2010) tacit knowledge is embedded in the day to day activities of the organization, in the form of intuition, feelings, insight and personal abilities which are internalized in an individual through experiences and reflections. Abdel-Aziz and Bontis (2010) explain that tacit knowledge is very important to individuals and organizations as a whole if knowledge is shared properly. Tacit knowledge is a major source of breakthroughs which offers organizations a competitive advantage. This is only possible if tacit knowledge is shared and passed from an expert employee to a beginner thus ensuring an organizational growth. However, little or no emphasis has been enforced in the sharing of tacit knowledge in many organizations (Hong, Mosca, & Luo, 2012). Tacit knowledge can also be passed from one person to another or from one group to another. The group may consist of members engaged in a formal institution, for instance, among colleagues in a workplace or informal set ups for instance among friends (Polanyi, 1967). The underlying purpose of tacit knowledge sharing is to utilize available knowledge to improve the groups or individual performance (Aktharsha, 2011). When managed properly, knowledge sharing can greatly improve performance (Yang, 2007). Tacit knowledge is acquired

through experience and can be shared through, on the job training, mentoring, coaching, communities of practices, peer assistance, knowledge sharing forums which include seminars, conferences, workshops, after action reviews, knowledge network, and knowledge fairs (Aswath & Gupta, 2009). This study focuses on mentoring as form of tacit knowledge sharing in universities.

1.1 Mentoring:

Eby (2007) defines mentoring as a process involving a relationship matching between who has the knowledge and experience, called mentor, and who tend to advance from mentor's directions, called "mentee". Mentoring is an important tool in achieving personal and professional success in one's career progression. In mentoring, the mentor and mentee share knowledge, experiences, wisdom and ideas (Megginson, Clutterbuck, & Garvey, 2007). Therefore, organizations have promoted mentoring relationship by investing their resources and identifying the relationship as a part of human resource management as explained by Florence (2007). The person to a person learning relationship involves a senior member of an organization who is assigned or voluntarily chooses to support the development of a newer or junior staff member by sharing the tacit knowledge he or she has. The relationship can be formalized although it can still be informal. Mentor is a role model who shares knowledge and advice to help the employee grow professionally. Mentoring relationships benefit the employee, as well as the employer and mentor (Boateng Dzandu and Tang, 2014)

Organizations use mentoring as an opportunity of tacit knowledge sharing for both mentors and mentees. While transferring knowledge to mentees, mentors also benefit by receiving new knowledge from them, on areas like the new theories, concepts and innovation (Eby, 2007). This is possible only if the mentees are fresh graduates, or even about other work-related issues if a mentee already has work experience in the same organization or a different one. Karkoulian, Halawi and McCarthy (2008) explain that mentoring provides learning for the participants and results in updated knowledge and skills of both mentors and mentees. Feedback in the mentoring relationship is also key because it is seen as a form of knowledge that mentees share with mentors.

As explained by Boyle, McDonnell, Mitchell & Nicholas (2012) mentoring is thought provoking and creative process that inspires them to maximize their personal and professional potential. Mentoring brings about an effective form of personal development because the client and the mentor forms an alliance that promotes personal growth and competence. Mentoring often is centered on unlocking a person's potential to maximize his or her own performance (Garvey & Megginson, 2008). A focus on improving performance and the development of skills is the key to an effective mentoring relationship.

1.2 Statement of the Problem:

Recently there has been rapid expansion of universities in Kenya and hence emergence of a competitive environment among the universities. This has created the need for universities to embrace best practices of management in order to bridge this gap. The universities in Kenya have also in the recent past been facing several underlying forces that promote competitiveness in the Kenyan education sector. This forces include; knowledge creation and knowledge sharing, the world ranking by webometrics which is very competitive and also performance contracting as explained by Gudo and Olel (2011). Despite the growing numbers of universities in Kenya the universities have continue to rank lowly in the World University ranking both globally and regionally (CUE, 2015). Research indicates that knowledge sharing in the Kenyan universities in present but minimal and faced by a number of challenges (Thiga, 2012). The Kenyan universities face the challenges of new university entry and the increasing inability of the Government to finance the public universities (Gudo & Olel, 2011). The forgoing challenges have continually influenced the competitive advantage of the Kenyan universities. This underscores the need for research on how the performance of these universities can be improved apart from solving the listed challenges. It is on this foundation that the study seeks to determine the influence of mentoring on the performance of universities in Kenya.

1.3 Objective of study:

The purpose of this study was to establish influence of mentoring on the performance of universities in Kenya.

1.4 Research Hypothesis:

In the light of the above objective, and in view of previous studies in this subject matter, the following research hypothesis was formulated:

H₁: Mentoring has a significant influence on the performance of universities in Kenya.

2. THEORETICAL FOUNDATION

The study will be grounded on one theory the theory of planned behavior. A review of the theory will provide a clear link between mentoring and the performance of universities in Kenya.

2.1 Theory of Planned Behavior:

Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) by Ajzen and Fischbein's (1980) was derived from Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA) in 1988. TPB is a motivational/behavior theory designed to predict and understand human behavior based on the individual decision making process (Xiao, 2008). TPB contains five constructs, the first five (attitude, subjective norms, intentions, perceived behavior control, and actual behavioral control) which influence the sixth construct, behavior. Xiao explains that an individual attitude is used to explain an individual's attitude towards engaging in a behavior. In mentoring the employee's attitude towards involvement in mentoring relationship is composed by the belief regarding the outcome of his/her involvement in the relationship.

Another component of TPB is subjective norms. "Subjective norms refer to a person's perception of whether significant referents approve or disapprove of a behavior," (Xiao, 2008). Behavior intentions pertain to how likely an individual is to perform a behavior within their decisional control. Behaviors within an individual's desire to control are those that require little skills, social cooperation, short-term planning, and assume a chain, additive, or recursive structure (Cohen, 2013). In mentoring social cooperation is important for the mentoring relationship to be effective. The fifth construct is the actual behavior control.

The above variables take into account factors that may influence an individual's control over his or her behaviors. In TPB actual behavior control serves a moderator between perceived behavioral control and behavior. Another addition to the basic TPB is the construct of perceived behavioral control, added by Ajzen (1991). Perceived behavioral control acts as a precursor to behavior, similar to the actions of the constructs of attitude and subjective norms. In mentoring the behavior of engaging in mentor/mentee relationship can be controlled by the sense that they are helping someone achieve their goals and that they are making a difference in another person's life (Xiao, 2008).

As with most major theories, TPB is criticized on several levels. For instance, the theory is said to be causal, due to the claimed cause and effect of relationship between the constructs of attitude and intention. In mentoring the mentor should have the intention to share the acquired knowledge and also have the right attitude to share. The construct of attitude is said to partially determine intention, which in turn is a predictor of actual behavior. However, empirical tests of the models consistently apply a correlational design, which indicates that a change in one variable causes a change in another, but the direction of causality is not evident (Armitage & Conner, 1999). The key attribute of the TPB is its simplicity; TPB is praised to be a complete theory of behavior (Ajzen, 1991). Complete in the sense that any other influences on behavior have their impact via influencing external components (Eom and Lee (2010)

External variables aside, critics question the sufficiency of the TPB constructs as universal influencers on behavior and argue in favor of the addition of independent constructs as determinants of intention that are parallel to the original predictor variables. Researchers have used the TPB to study knowledge-sharing behavior through mentoring (Fullwood, Rowley & Delbridge, 2013). Recent empirical findings also give credence to the usefulness of the TPB for studying knowledge-sharing behavior in organizations (Hislop, 2009). Despite the universal application of the original TPB, there is considerable evidence that empirical studies have benefitted from extending the framework of the TPB to fit their respective situational contexts (Liebowitz, 2008).. The above theory instigated the research objective: To evaluate the influence of mentoring on the performance of universities in Kenya.

2.2 Empirical Review:

Sriwichai, Meksamoot, Chakpitak, Dahal and Jengjalean (2014) carried out a research on the Effectiveness of Knowledge Management System in Research Mentoring in a case study of a university in Thailand. The study found that the large numbers of newly doctoral graduate were being recruited and were taking up responsibilities to teach and conduct research and this had affected the output of these new graduates. The researchers observed that in order to improve the universities performance there was need to embrace mentoring as a knowledge sharing practice. According to the researchers mentoring could be used as a practice of knowledge sharing and dissemination of research experiences by the senior staff to enhance the abilities of newly doctorate graduate staff in the universities. This could in turn make the new graduates to supervise doctorate students so as to get the qualified expected research outputs.

A study by Okurame (2008) on mentoring in the Nigerian academia: experiences and challenges revealed that, there existed few mentoring relationships which were informal and were developed on the basis of shared interests in research and delegation of duties. The results also showed that areas in which mentors have supported their protégés included enlistment in group and international research networks, publication, counselling and advice and financial support. The mentoring relationship was faced by challenges like unresponsive behaviors of the mentees.

Another study was carried out by Ndebele, Heerden and Chabaya, (2013) on the factors that affected the development and implementation of a staff peer-mentoring programme for junior and senior academics at an institution of higher learning in South Africa. The findings of the study showed an impact of mentoring on preparing the next generation of researchers. The study posts that greatest impact of mentoring was on the completion of further degrees, presenting papers at conferences and refining the papers for publication. The study showed that mentoring programme is of great value to the university and its teaching staff, because it develops the research capacity of both junior and senior staff. It also makes strong research teams within departments and schools. The study also revealed that high success rate of mentoring can be attributed to mentoring being voluntary and participants being properly motivated.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study used descriptive research design and a simple random sampling to select a sample of heads of departments from the chartered universities in Kenya. The unit of analysis was the chartered universities in Kenya and the unit of observation 12 chartered universities and the respondents were the heads of department. The study generated both qualitative and quantitative data which was collected using Likert scales and later analyzed through descriptive statistics and multiple regression analysis. Analyzed data was presented using tables, charts and graphs.

At the time of study, Kenya had a total of 40 chartered universities. The study selected 12 universities from the 40 chartered universities which was 30% of the total number of universities. The 12 selected universities had a total of 335 departments hence 335 heads of department. To select the appropriate sample size, the study used Godden (2004) formula. The Godden formula has two steps which are used to calculate the sample size. In step one, the sample size is calculated using the infinite population formula and in step two, the sample size derived from that calculation is used to calculate a sample size for the finite population. Only 179 selected were selected out of 335 by using the Godden formula.

4. RESEARCH FINDINGS

4.1 Descriptive Analysis for Mentoring Programs:

This section of the thesis discussed the descriptive statistics of the study variables. The independent variables discussed were; mentoring program, Communities of practice, Peer assistance and knowledge sharing programs. Also discussed under the descriptive study are the moderating variable of institutional characteristics and the dependent variable of organizational performance. The availability and the frequency of mentoring sessions are important if the mentoring is to be effective. In order to establish the availability of the mentoring practice in the Kenyan universities the study sought to establish whether most academic staff in the various departments had been mentored by someone more senior with more knowledge within the past 1- 3 years. According to the analysis 24.5% strongly agreed, 53.5% agreed, 7.7 % were neutral while 12.3% disagreed and 1.9% strongly disagreed. Majority of the respondents (78.0%) agreed that there was mentoring in their departments. Similar findings Eby (2007) showed that mentoring programmes were common in academic institutions. The scholar further expounded that learning institutions use mentoring as a method of sharing tacit Knowledge. Karkoulilian, Halawi and McCarthy (2008) agreed that mentoring in learning institutions was popular since it provides learning for the participants and results in updated knowledge and skills of both mentors and mentees.

The study asked the question whether most of the senior academic staff had mentoring programmes. The analysis of the responses showed that 9.0% strongly agreed that the senior staff had mentoring programmes and 24.5% agreed that the senior staff had mentoring programmes. Majority of the respondents 43.2% were neutral while 18.0% disagreed and 5.3% strongly disagreed that the senior staff had mentoring programmes to mentor the junior staff. A small percentage of the respondents (33.5%) were of the opinion that that there were mentoring programmes. A study by Okurame (2008) observed that many senior academic staff were not involved in mentoring and complained of lack of time for mentoring due to their busy schedules of office work and lecturing. The scholar further observed that where there were structured mentoring programme more academic staff were involved in mentoring. Another study by Nguyen and Mohamed (2011) revealed that learning institutions had less mentoring activities than expected and attributed this to unwillingness to share knowledge by some academic staff.

The responses to whether the newly employed staff had mentors showed that 9.0% strongly agreed that the junior staff had mentors while 1.9% agreed that the junior staff had mentors while 7.7% were neutral to the question. However 26.6% disagreed that the junior staff had mentors. Majority 54.8% strongly disagreed that the junior staff had mentors. The analysis clearly showed that majority of the junior staffs in universities lacked mentors. The lack of mentors to many junior staff is a common challenge to many institutions. A study by Sweeny (2012) on learning the teacher mentoring programs observed that in institutions of higher learning some junior staff lacked mentors. The scholar further explains that mentoring is a practice which is necessary to every new employee in organization and all junior employees should have mentors.

Mueller (2012) argues that several empirical studies have reported that mentoring is an effective way to support and socialize beginning academic staff in institutions of learning. The study sought to establish whether mentoring was a common practice in universities and the responses showed that 9.7% strongly agreed, 13.2% agreed while few 7.4% were neutral that mentoring was a common practice in their departments. However, 35.5% disagreed and 34.2% strongly disagreed that mentoring was a common practice in their departments. Majority of the respondents, 69.7% felt that mentoring was not a common practice in the universities which was a worrying trend for the universities which were not practicing mentoring. Similar findings by Sriwichai, *et al* (2014) in their study on The Effectiveness of Knowledge Management System in Research Mentoring Using knowledge Engineering noted that mentoring is a tacit knowledge sharing practice which is practiced in small scale in many organizations. The scholars further asserts that through mentoring dissemination of research experiences by the senior staff can enhance the abilities of newly doctorate graduate staff in the universities. Arnold-Roger, Arnette, & Harris (2008) similarly observed that mentoring is ignored by many organizations yet it is a key practice.

The response to the evaluation of mentoring effectiveness in universities the responses showed that 3.0% strongly agreed, 17.4% agreed while 2.3% were neutral that evaluation of the mentoring effectiveness was done. However 31.3% disagreed and 46.0% of the strongly disagreed that evaluation of the mentoring programmes for effectiveness. The findings of this study are in agreement with a study by Bartell (2014) who observed that although mentoring is carried out in organization its evaluation is often ignored. Jo (2011) also observed that the lack of evaluation of mentoring programmes in learning institutions has a negatively impact on new academic staffs ability to become familiar with their own learning institutions and procedures in their work place as well as how to manage their classrooms and how to keep appropriate records.

The responses to whether there were tools developed by the university to evaluate the effectiveness of mentoring showed that 4.8% strongly agreed, 1.0% agreed and 0.3% were neutral to the fact that there existed tools for evaluating effectiveness of mentoring. However 70.0% disagreed that there were tools for evaluating mentoring effectiveness and 23.9% strongly disagreed that there were tools in their department to evaluate the effectiveness of mentoring. This shows that 93.9% of universities had not developed mentoring evaluation tools. As study by Ingersoll (2012) on the The teacher shortage: A case of wrong diagnosis and wrong perception observed similar findings that 86.7% of the learning institutions in his study had not developed tools for evaluation of mentoring programmes. Similarly, Holloway (2010) survey on tools of evaluating effectiveness of mentoring programme showed that on 19.7% of organizations have tools of evaluating mentoring although of the 19.7% only 11.2% used their evaluation tools.

The study also sought to establish the effectiveness of mentoring programs and the analysis of the question whether the evaluation of mentoring programs was effectively done showed 8.4% strongly agreed, 11.2% agreed while 7.7% were neutral that the effectiveness of the mentoring programs was done. However 49.0% disagreed and 23.9% strongly disagreed that evaluation of mentoring programs was effectively done. These findings were in agreement with the earlier findings of this study that there were no tools of evaluating mentoring programs in many departments in the universities. This was a worrying trend that there were no tools of evaluating mentorship programs and also the mentoring programs effectiveness.

Study by Holloway (2010) on the benefits of mentoring observed that many learning institutions did not evaluate the effectiveness of mentoring programs. As a result of this the scholar explains that to maximize effectiveness for the mentoring programs there should be tools developed to evaluate the impact of mentoring programmes. A similar observation was made by Brock and Grady (2015) in their study on from first-year to first-rate: Principals guiding beginning teachers that the evaluation of mentoring was not being done in secondary schools. The scholars further explain that the benefits of mentoring can only be realized if mentoring programmes are effectively evaluated and improved on to meet their objectives. Tan, Ying, Tuan and Ying (2010) study observed that institutions which did not evaluate the effectiveness of mentoring were not able to maximize on the benefits of mentoring and this affected the institutional performance.

From the findings, it can be noted that the mean of the statements used to measure mentoring programs ranged between 3.1 and 3.7, except for two items, which had a mean of 2.1 and 2.8. This showed that majority of the respondents were not in agreement with the statements used to measure mentoring programs. Similarly, the standard deviation of the items ranged between, 1.0 to 1.4. It was deduced that the responses to the items did not deviate much, from the expected responses.

Table 4.1 Mentoring Programs

Item	SA %	A %	N %	D %	SD %	M	SD
Most academic staff in this department have been mentored by someone more senior with more knowledge within the last 1 to 3 years	24.5	53.5	7.7	12.3	1.9	2.1	1.0
Most of the senior academic staff have a mentoring program	9.0	24.5	43.2	18.0	5.3	2.8	1.0
All newly employed academic staff have mentors?	9.0	1.9	7.7	26.6	54.8	3.1	1.2
Mentoring is a common practice in this university?	9.7	13.2	7.4	35.5	34.2	3.0	1.0
Often mentoring effectiveness is evaluated	3.0	17.4	2.3	31.3	46.0	3.4	1.3
There are tools developed by this university for evaluating mentoring effectiveness	4.8	1.0	0.3	70.0	23.9	3.5	1.4
Evaluation of mentoring programs is effectively done	8.4	11.6	7.1	49.0	23.9	3.7	1.2

4.2 Mentoring Programs in Public Universities versus Private Universities:

A comparison on public and private universities on whether most staff had been mentored by a senior staff in the last 1-3 years was done. The study established that in public universities 22.8% strongly agreed, 57.5% agreed while 10.2% were neutral to the statement that most staff had been mentored by a senior staff in the last 1-3 years. However, 32.5% disagreed and 1.6% strongly disagreed that most staff had been mentored by a senior staff in the last 1-3 years. In the private universities study established that in private universities 32.5% strongly agreed, 35.1% agreed while 7.1% were neutral to the statement that most staff had been mentored by a senior staff in the last 1-3 years. However, 21.4% disagreed and 3.9% strongly disagreed that most staff had been mentored by a senior staff in the last 1-3 years. Further analysis shows that in public universities 80.3% of the academic staff had been mentored by a senior staff in the fast 1-3 years while in private universities 67.6% of the academic staff had been mentored by a senior staff in the fast 1-3 years. The analysis showed that there was more mentoring in public universities in than in private universities. Karkoulian, Halawi and McCarthy (2008) explain that mentoring programs explains that mentoring can only be available and effective in organizations which have them in their knowledge management policies.

Further analysis showed that the mean of the items were 2.1 and 2.3, this showed that majority of the respondents in both the private and the public universities agreed with the statements. This implied that the items captured the component of mentoring programs. The standard deviations were 0.9 and 1.0 implying there was no much variation in the responses of the academic staff in both the private and public universities.

Table 4.2 Most staff have been mentored by a senior staff in the last 1-3 years Comparison

Statement	University	SA %	A %	N %	D %	SD %	M	SD
Most academic staff have been mentored by a senior staff in the last 1-3 years	Public	22.8	57.5	7.9	10.2	1.6	2.1	0.9
	Private	32.5	35.1	7.1	21.4	3.9	2.3	1.0

A comparison on public and private universities on whether most senior academic staff had mentoring programs was done. The study established that in public universities 8.7% strongly agreed, 22.8% agreed while 49.6% were neutral to the statement that most senior academic staff had mentoring programs. However, 15% disagreed and 3.9% strongly disagreed most senior academic staff had mentoring programs. In the private universities, the study established that in private universities 14.3% strongly agreed, 32.1% agreed while 14.2% were neutral to the statement most senior academic staff had mentoring programs. However, 35.7 % disagreed and 3.6% strongly disagreed that most senior academic staff have mentoring programs.

Further analysis shows that in public universities 31.5% of senior academic staff had mentoring programs while in private universities 46.4% of senior academic staff had mentoring programs. The analysis showed that more of the senior staff in the private universities had mentoring programs as compared to the senior staff in the public universities. Okurame (2008) explains that for mentoring to be successful there is need to have programmes to guide mentorship by the senior staff in institutions.

In the means and the standard deviation analysis the mean of the item was 2.8 and 2.8 this showed that the respondents in both the private and the public universities had the same level of agreement with the statement that most senior academic staff have mentoring programs. The standard deviations were 0.9 and 1.1 implying there was no much variation in the responses of the academic staff in both the private and public universities. The private universities had a higher standard deviation than the public universities.

Table 4.3 Most senior academic staff have mentoring programs Comparison

Statement	University	SA %	A %	N %	D %	SD %	M	SD
Most senior academic staff have mentoring programs	Public	8.7	22.8	49.6	15	3.9	2.8	0.9
	Private	14.3	32.1	14.2	35.7	3.6	2.8	1.1

A comparison on public and private universities on whether mentoring is a common practice in the university was done. The study established that in public universities 8.7% strongly agreed, 11.0% agreed while 44.1% were neutral to the statement that mentoring is a common practice in the university. However, 33.1% disagreed and 3.1% strongly disagreed that mentoring was a common practice in this university. In the private universities study established that in private universities 3.1% strongly agreed, 39.3% agreed while 7.1% were neutral to the statement that mentoring was a common practice in this university. However, 35.7% disagreed and 3.6% strongly disagreed that mentoring was a common practice in this university.

Further analysis shows that in public universities 19.7% confirmed that mentoring was a common practice in the university while in private universities 42.4% confirmed that mentoring was a common practice in the university. The findings agreed with earlier findings of the study that in private universities most of the senior staff had mentoring programs. Islam, Ahmed, Hasan and Ahmed (2011) explain that organizations which make mentoring a common practice get the benefits of knowledge sharing through mentorship. Further the scholar point out that presence of mentoring is common in organizations which have ac knowledge sharing culture.

In the means and the standard deviation analysis the mean of the item was 3.1 and 2.8 this showed that the respondents in the public universities the respondents disagreed with the statement more compared to the respondents in the private universities. The standard deviations were 0.9 and 1.2 implying there was a variation in the responses of the academic staff in both the private and public universities. The private universities had a higher standard deviation than the public universities which implied that the data points in the private universities were far from the mean value of the item compared to the public universities.

Table 4.4 Mentoring is a common practice in this university Comparison

Statement	University	SA %	A %	N %	D %	SD %	M	SD
Mentoring is a common practice in this university	Public	8.7	11.0	44.1	33.1	3.1	3.1	0.9
	Private	3.1	39.3	7.1	35.7	3.6	2.8	1.2

A comparison on public and private universities on whether all newly employed academic staff had mentors was done. The study established that in public universities 8.7% strongly agreed, 13.4% agreed while 32.3% were neutral to the statement that all newly employed academic staff had mentors. However, 29.9% disagreed and 17.3% strongly disagreed that all newly employed academic staff had mentors. In the private universities study established that in private universities 10.7% strongly agreed, 60.7% agreed while 7.1% were neutral to the statement that all newly employed academic staff had mentors. However, 29.9% disagreed and 17.3% strongly disagreed that all newly employed academic staff had mentors. Further analysis shows that in public universities 22.1% all newly employed academic staff had mentors while in private universities 71.4% of the all newly employed academic staff had mentors. This could be attributed to earlier findings that in private universities most of the senior academic staff had mentoring programs and also the findings that mentoring was a common practice in the private universities.

In the means and the standard deviation analysis the mean of the item was 2.8 this showed that the respondents in both the private and the public universities had the same level of agreement with the statement that most senior academic staff have mentoring programs. The standard deviations were 0.9 and 1.1 implying there was no much variation in the responses of the academic staff in both the private and public universities.

Table 4.5 All newly employed academic staff have mentors Comparison

Statement	University	SA %	A %	N %	D %	SD %	M	SD
All newly employed academic staff have mentors	Public	8.7	13.4	32.3	29.9	17.3	3.3	1.2
	Private	10.7	60.0	7.1	17.9	3.6	2.4	1.0

A comparison on public and private universities on whether mentoring effectiveness was often evaluated was done. The study established that in public universities 8.7% strongly agreed, 15% agreed while 14.2% were neutral to the statement that mentoring effectiveness was often evaluated. However, 40.2% disagreed and 22.0% strongly disagreed that mentoring effectiveness was often evaluated. In the private universities study established that in private universities 17.9% strongly agreed, 28.6% agreed while 3.6% were neutral to the statement that mentoring effectiveness was often evaluated. However, 46.4% disagreed and 3.6% strongly disagreed that mentoring effectiveness was often evaluated. Further analysis showed that 62.2% of the respondents in the public universities disagreed and strongly disagreed that mentoring effectiveness was evaluated.

In private universities 50.0% disagreed and strongly disagreed that the effectiveness of mentoring programs was done. The analysis showed that the effectiveness of the mentoring programs was not being evaluated in, many universities. In public universities the evaluation of mentoring programs was least done as compared to private universities. The findings are in agreement with earlier finding that mentoring was more common in private universities. Arekkuzhiyil (2016) explains that only few organizations invest on the development of tools for mentoring evaluation to determine the effectiveness of mentoring.

In the means and the standard deviation analysis the mean of the item of comparison was 3.5 and 2.9 this showed that the respondents in both the public and the private universities had different observation on the item evaluation of mentoring effectiveness. In public universities the respondents disagreed with the statement more compared to the private universities respondents.

The standard deviations were 1.2 and 2.3 implying there a variation in the responses of the respondents. The private universities had a higher standard deviation than the public universities.

Table 4.6 Mentoring effectiveness is often evaluated Comparison

Statement	University	SA %	A %	N %	D %	SD %	M	SD
Mentoring effectiveness is often evaluated	Public	8.7	15	14.2	40.2	22	3.5	1.2
	Private	17.9	28.6	3.6	46.4	3.6	2.9	2.3

A comparison on public and private universities on whether there are tools developed to evaluate effectiveness of mentoring was done. The study established that in public universities 10.2% strongly agreed, 11.0% agreed while 11.8% were neutral to the statement that there are tools developed to evaluate effectiveness of mentoring. However, 38.6% disagreed and 28.3% strongly disagreed that there were tools developed to evaluate effectiveness of mentoring. In the private universities study established that in private universities 5.7% strongly agreed, 10.7% agreed while 3.6% were neutral to the statement that there were tools developed to evaluate effectiveness of mentoring. However, 46.4% disagreed and 3.6% strongly disagreed that there were tools developed to evaluate effectiveness of mentoring.

Further analysis shows that in public universities 66.9% of the respondents strongly disagreed and disagreed that there were tools developed to evaluate effectiveness of mentoring while in private universities 50.0% of the respondents strongly disagreed and disagreed that there were tools developed to evaluate effectiveness of mentoring. The analysis showed that the effectiveness of the mentoring programs was not being evaluated in, many universities since there were only a few universities had evaluation tools for mentoring according to the data analyzed. In public universities the evaluation of mentoring programs was least done as compared to private universities since the public universities had a higher percentage showing that only a few of the public universities had evaluation tool. Bergenholtz (2011) avers that many organization carry out mentoring informally and its evaluation is ignored.

In the means and the standard deviation analysis the mean of the item of comparison was 3.6 and 2.7 this showed that the respondents in both the public and the private universities had different observation on the item availability of tools of to evaluate mentoring effectiveness. In public universities the respondents disagreed with the statement more compared to the private universities respondents. The standard deviations were 1.3 and 1.5. It was deduced that the responses to the items did not deviate much, from the expected responses.

Table 4.7 There are tools developed to evaluate effectiveness of mentoring Comparison

Statement	University	SA	A	N	D	SD	M	SD
		%	%	%	%	%		
There are tools developed to evaluate effectiveness of mentoring	Public	10.2	11.0	11.8	38.6	28.3	3.6	1.3
	Private	5.7	10.7	3.6	46.4	3.6	2.7	1.5

A comparison on public and private universities on evaluation of mentoring programs was effectively done was Carried out. The study established that in public universities 7.9% strongly agreed, 10.2% agreed while 7.9% were neutral to the statement that evaluation of mentoring programs was effectively done. However, 45.6% disagreed and 28.3.0% strongly disagreed that evaluation of mentoring programs was effectively done. In the private universities study established that in private universities 10.7% strongly agreed, 17.9% agreed while 3.6% were neutral to the statement that evaluation of mentoring programs was effectively done. However, 64.4% disagreed and 3.6% strongly disagreed that evaluation of mentoring programs was effectively done.

Further analysis showed that 74.0% of the respondents in the public universities disagreed and strongly disagreed that evaluation of mentoring programs was effectively done. In private universities 67.9% disagreed and strongly disagreed that the evaluation of mentoring programs was effectively done. The analysis showed that the effectiveness of the mentoring programs was not being effectively evaluated in, many universities. In public universities the evaluation of the effectiveness of mentoring programs was least done as compared to private universities. The findings also agreed with earlier findings that there were no tools of evaluating mentoring programs effectiveness.

In the means and the standard deviation analysis the mean of the item of comparison was 3.8 and 3.3 this showed that the respondents in both the public and the private universities had different observation on the item of evaluation of mentoring effectiveness is done effectively. In public universities the respondents disagreed with the statement more compared to the private universities respondents. The standard deviation was 1.2. It was deduced that the responses to the items did not deviate much from the expected responses.

Table 4.8 Evaluation of mentoring programs is effectively done Comparison

Statement	University	SA	A	N	D	SD	M	SD
		%	%	%	%	%		
Evaluation of mentoring programs is effectively done	Public	7.9	10.2	7.9	45.7	28.3	3.8	1.2
	Private	10.7	17.9	3.6	64.3	3.6	3.3	1.2

4.3 Challenges of Mentoring Programs in Universities:

The study also sought to determine the challenges experienced by the academic staff during mentoring. The analysis of the challenges in descending order of the challenge encountered during mentoring were; lack of senior staff to do mentoring 48.4%, unwillingness to share knowledge 39.4%, Lack of mentoring policies 35.5%, Inadequate time for mentoring 34.5%, lack of commitment by mentees 25.8%, absence of mentoring programmes 14.8%, lack of awareness on the need to do mentoring 7.1%, high mobility of personnel 6.5%, absence of methods of evaluating mentoring 5.2%.

Similar challenges were reported by Abera (2014) in his study on the practices and challenges of mentoring in government secondary schools of Addis Ababa although not in the same order. A study also by Ehrich, Hansford and Lee, (2014) identified similar challenges in their study on formal mentoring programs in education and other professions. Other challenges observed by the scholars were unawareness by some employees on the importance of mentoring hence unwillingness to participate in mentoring. The scholars also observed that some mentors needed a financial gain attached to mentoring which was not affordable to many organizations. The effectiveness of the mentoring as a knowledge sharing practice can only be achieved if the universities addressed the challenges experienced which require support by the university management.

Table 4.9 Challenges experienced during mentoring in Universities

Challenges	Frequency	Percent
Lack of senior staff to do mentoring	75	48.4
Unwillingness to share knowledge	61	39.4
Lack of policies on Mentoring	55	35.5
Inadequate time for mentoring	54	34.8
Lack of commitment by mentees	40	25.8
Absence of Mentoring Programmes	23	14.8
Lack of awareness on importance of Mentoring	11	7.1
High mobility of personnel	10	6.5
Absence of Methods of evaluating Mentoring	08	5.2

The respondents also suggested some solutions to the stated challenges. The solutions were; employing more senior staff 53.5%, scheduling mentorship programmes 41.9%, motivate staff to share knowledge 23.2%, Formulating mentorship policies 16.1 %, and creating awareness on the need for mentorship 11.6%, providing a good environment to reduce on turn over 10.3%. The solutions suggested required the universities involvement and support.

The findings were in agreement with other empirical study by Hamid and Salim (2010) who point out that the presence of senior staff in institutions can promote mentorship if there are scheduled mentorship programmes and policies to govern the process. The study by Hanna (2012) explains similar thoughts that creating awareness of benefits of mentoring promotes mentorship. The scholar further argues that senior staff should be motivated to share knowledge in the organizations. Holloway (2010) also explains that institutions should guard against high staff turnover because when the staffs leaves organizations they leave with the tacit knowledge gained over time.

Table 4.10 Suggested Solutions to challenges experienced during mentoring

Solutions	Frequency	Percent
Employ more senior staff	83	53.5
Schedule mentorship programmes	65	41.9
Motivate the staff to share Knowledge	36	23.2
Formulate mentorship Policies	25	16.1
Creating awareness on the need for mentorship	18	11.6
Provide a good environment to reduce on turn over	16	10.3

4.4 Results of Correlation Analysis:

According to Kothari (2013) inferential analysis is used in research and it employs probability theory to infer the properties of a population from the analysis of the properties of the sample drawn from it. Creswell (2011) also point out that the inferential analysis is also concerned with the reliability and the precision of the inferences. The scores which are computed from inferential statistics were used to determine the relationship and the level of influence between tacit knowledge sharing practices (independent variables) and the performance of universities (dependent) in Kenya. This was attained using of correlation analysis and regression analysis. .

Correlation analysis in this study was used to establish the degree of relationship between tacit knowledge sharing practices (independent variable) and university performance (dependent variable). Cooper and Schindler (2011) explain that the strength of the relationship which is shown by correlation coefficient ranges from a negative one to a positive one. The positive coefficient indicates the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable is positive and perfectly linear. When the coefficient is negative one it indicates that there exists a perfect negative linear relationship between dependent and independent variables. When the value of the coefficient is zero it indicates that the dependent and independent are linearly independent. This means that the independent variable does not explain the dependent variable. The closer the correlation coefficient is to positive one the stronger the positive linear relationship between the dependent and independent variable. When the correlation coefficient is closer to negative one it indicates a strong negative linear relationship between relationship between dependent and independent variables. In this study the Pearson Correlation Coefficient was used to determine the degree of relationship between mentoring (independent Variable) and performance of universities (dependent variable).

4.5 Correlation between Mentoring Programs and Performance of Universities:

The correlation results shown in table 4.11 indicate that there is a positive linear relationship between mentoring program and performance of university as indicated by a correlation value of 0.419. This implies that a positive change in Mentoring program causes performance of universities to change positively. The associated significance level of 0.000 which is less than the threshold of 0.05 indicates that the implied relationship is statistically significant.

Table 4.11 Mentoring Program Correlation Results

		Performance of Universities	Mentoring Program
Performance of Universities	Pearson Correlation	1	.419**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	155	155
Mentoring Program	Pearson Correlation	.419**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	155	155
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			

The findings are line with the findings by Mundia and Iravo (2014) in their study on Role of Mentoring Programs on the Employee Performance in Organizations showed that mentoring programs lead to increases in employee performance which in turn led to improved organizational performance. Their study also showed a positive relationship between mentoring and organizational performance. Similar findings are by Gallupe (2010) who points out that mentoring is a major tool in achieving organizational goals of improved performance because it improves the expertise of both the mentor and the mentee. Oduma and Were (2014) on their study on influence of career development on employee performance in the public university found out that mentoring /coaching had a positive relationship with performance and that a unit increase in mentoring lead to an increase on employee performance by a factor of 0.486.

4.6 Regression Analysis Results:

Cooper and Schindler (2011) regression analysis in research is used to establish the nature of the relationship between each of the Independent variable and the dependent variable. The study carried out regression analysis by fitting linear regression models for the data. This was performed to establish the level of influence of each of the independent variable on the dependent variable.

4.7 Mentoring Program versus Performance of Universities:

Table 4.12 presents the regression model on mentoring program versus performance of universities in Kenya. As presented in the table 4.12, the coefficient of determination R square (R^2) is 0.176 and R is 0.419 at a 0.05 significance level. The R square is the coefficient of determination which showed the illustrative power of the independent variable was 0.176. These results indicate that 17.6% of the variation on performance of universities can be explained by mentoring programs. This study results clearly indicated that mentoring programs influenced performance in universities.

Table 4.12 Regression Model Summary for Mentoring Program

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.419	.176	.170	3.72154
Predictors: (Constant), Mentoring Program				

Table 4.13 presents the results of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on mentoring program and performance of universities in Kenya. As presented in the table 4.13 the ANOVA results for regression coefficients indicates an F statistic of 32.619 with a significance level of .000 which is less than 0.05 hence implying that there is a significant relationship between mentoring programs and performance of universities.

Table 4.13 ANOVA regression results for Mentoring Program

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	451.763	1	451.763	32.619	.000
	Residual	2119.026	153	13.850		
	Total	2570.790	154			
Dependent Variable: Performance Of Universities,						
Predictors: (Constant), Mentoring Program						

The study further determined the beta coefficients of mentoring program on performance of universities. Table 4.14 shows that mentoring programs influences performance of universities positively since the coefficient of mentoring programs is 0.854 which implies that a single unit change in mentoring program causes performance of universities to increase by 0.854 units. The associated significance level is 0.000 which is less than the threshold of .05 indicating that mentoring program is statistically significant in explaining the variations in university performance.

The results of the coefficient of mentoring programs had a value of 0.854 and this value was used to generate the model;-

$Y = 10.025 + 0.854X_1$ to explain further the relationship between mentoring programs (X_1) and university performance. The model depicted a positive relationship which implied that any unit increase in mentoring program led to a corresponding increase in the level of university performance.

Testing Hypothesis 1:

H_0 : Mentoring programs has no significant influence on the performance of universities in Kenya.

Where;

$H_0: \beta_1 = 0$

$H_1: \beta_1 \neq 0$

The standardized regression coefficient was significant and statistically not equal to zero (see table 4.14). Based on the same table the absolute value of the test statistic was 5.711. Creswell (2013) asserts that when the absolute value is greater than or equal to the critical value of 1.96 the null hypothesis is rejected. Using those results the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternative hypothesis; Mentoring programs has a significant influence on the performance of universities in Kenya was adopted. Therefore the study concluded that mentoring programs had a significant influence on the performance of universities in Kenya.

Table 4.14 Coefficients of Mentoring Program

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	10.025	1.088		9.214	.000
	Mentoring Program	.854	.149	.419	5.711	.000
Dependent Variable: Performance of Universities						

5. DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION, RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Discussion on Influence of Mentoring programs on the performance of universities in Kenya:

In the descriptive analysis of influence of mentoring on the performance of universities revealed that there was mentoring in their departments and that many senior academic staff lacked mentoring programmes. The findings revealed a number of challenges encountered during mentoring by the academic staff. The challenges were lack of senior staff to do mentoring, unwillingness to share knowledge, lack of mentoring policies and inadequate time for mentoring.

The respondents also outline some of the solutions to the faced challenges, which comprised of employing more senior staff, scheduling mentorship programmes, motivating staff to share knowledge, and formulate mentorship policies. Correlation analysis performed to determine the strength and direction of the relationship between mentoring programs and performance of universities confirmed that there existed a positive and significant relationship between mentoring programs and university performance.

5.2 Conclusion on Influence of Mentoring Programs on the Performance of Universities in Kenya:

The findings of this study concluded that mentoring influenced the performance of universities in Kenya. Mentoring established a positive relationship with performance of universities in Kenya. The established relationship confirmed universities and other organizations stood a better chance of improving their performance if the embraced mentoring as a knowledge sharing practice. The study established that the evaluation of the effect of mentoring should be evaluated regularly. Having mentoring programmes and evaluating the effectiveness of the mentoring programmes enables organizations to get the benefits of mentoring. The study concluded that mentoring programs influenced performance of universities.

5.3 Recommendations on Mentoring Programs:

The study established that many universities did not have mentorship evaluation tools and that this affected the evaluation of mentoring in universities. The study recommends that universities should develop tools of evaluating mentorship and also having the mentorship programs evaluated frequently for their effectiveness. The study also recommends that policies which provide for all the junior employees having mentors to promote knowledge sharing in organizations and protect the organization from knowledge loss

5.4 Areas of Further Research:

The study suggests future research areas. Future researchers should include other knowledge sharing practices not included in this study conceptualization. Future researchers could also consider operationalizing the study variables differently from the approach adopted by this study. The study could be replicated in different study context including non-learning institutions or in developed or developing countries to enhance generalizability.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abdel-Aziz, A. & Bontis, N. (2010). Intellectual capital and business performance in the pharmaceutical sector of Jordan. *Management Decision*, 1(48), 563-578
- [2] Abera W. (2014). Practices and Challenges of Mentoring in Government Secondary Schools of Addis Ababa. Master's thesis, Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia.
- [3] Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1980). *Understanding Attitudes and Predicting Social Behavior*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs.

- [4] Ajzen, I. (1991). The Theory of Planned Behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process Journal*, 50(1), 179-211.
- [5] Aktharsha, U. S. (2011). A theory of knowledge management. *Journal of Contemporary Research in Management*, 1, 103-119.
- [6] Aswath, L. & Gupta, S. (2009). "Knowledge management tools and academic library Services". Retrieved September 18, 2015, from [Http://crl.du.ac.in/ical09/papers/index files/Icarv.pdf](http://crl.du.ac.in/ical09/papers/indexfiles/Icarv.pdf).
- [7] Areekkuzhiyil, S. (2016). Heads of the Higher Education Institutions in a Transforming Era. *University News*, 54(33), 15-21.
- [8] Arnold-Roger, J., Arnette, S., & Harris, M. (2008). Mentoring new teachers in Lenoir City, Tennessee. *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, 74, 18-23
- [9] Bartell, C. (2014). *Cultivating high-quality teaching through induction and mentoring*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- [10] Bergenholtz, C. (2011). Knowledge brokering: spanning technological and network boundaries, *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 14(1), 74 – 92.
- [11] Boateng, H., Dzandu, M., & Tang Y. (2014). An investigation into knowledge acquisition idiosyncrasies in Ghanaian universities, *The journal of information and knowledge management systems*, 44(4), 579-591
- [12] Commission of University Education (2015). *Universities Authorized to Operate in Kenya*, Nairobi: CUE publishing.
- [13] Cranfield, D. (2011). *Knowledge Management and Higher Education: A UK Case Study Using Grounded Theory*. University of Southampton. Retrieved on August 27, 2015, from <http://eprints.soton.ac.uk>.
- [14] Creswell, J. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating Quantitative and qualitative research*. (3rd Ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- [15] Creswell, W. J. (2013). *Research Designs: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods R Approaches*. London: SAGE publishers.
- [16] Cooper, R. D., & Schindler, P. S. (2011). *Business Research Methods (11th Ed.)*. New York, United States: McGraw-Hill Publishers.
- [17] Cohen, W. A. (2013). *The practical Drucker. Applying the wisdom of the world's greatest management thinker*. Montreal: Amacom Publishing House.
- [18] Eby, L.T. (2007) *Understanding Relational Problems in Mentoring*, In B. R. Ragins & K. E. Kram (Eds.). *The Handbook of Mentoring at Work: Theory, Research and Practice* (pp 323-344). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- [19] Ehrich L, Hansford B. & Lee T., (2014). *Formal Mentoring Programs in Education and Other Professions: A Review of the Literature*. *Educational Administration Quarterly* 40(4), 518-540.
- [20] Eom B-Y, Lee K. (2010) *Determinants of industry-academy linkages and their impact on firm performance: the case of Korea as a latecomer in knowledge industrialization*. *Research Policy* 39: 625–639
- [21] Florence, S. (2007). *Coaching Counseling & Mentoring*. New York: AMACOM.
- [22] Fullwood F., Rowley J., & Delbridge R. (2013). Knowledge sharing amongst academic in UK universities, *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 17(1), 123 – 136.
- [23] Gallupe, B. (2010). Knowledge management systems: Surveying the landscape. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 3(1), 61-77.
- [24] Garvey, B., Stokes, P. & Megginson, D. (2008) *Coaching and Mentoring: Theory and Practice*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- [25] Grant, A.M. (2010). It Takes Time: A Stages of Change Perspective on the Adoption of Workplace Coaching, *Journal of Change Management*, 10 (1), 61 – 77.
- [26] Godden, B.W.G. (2004). *Sample Size Formulas*, Retrieved on August 27, 2015 from <http://williamgodden.com>.

- [27] Gudo, C.O & Olel, M.A (2011). Students' Admission Policies for Quality Assurance: Towards Quality Education in Kenyan Universities. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(8), 77 – 183.
- [28] Hamid, N.A.A. & Salim, J. (2010). Inter-organizational knowledge transfer through Malaysia e-government IT outsourcing: A theoretical review. *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology*, 42, 183-192.
- [29] Hanna, P. (2012). Using internet technologies (such as Skype) as a research medium: a research note. *Qualitative Research*, 12(2), 239 – 242.
- [30] Hislop, D. (2009). *Knowledge Management in Organizations*, (2nd ed.), Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [31] Holloway, J. (2010). The benefit of mentoring. *Educational Leadership*, 58(8), 85-86.
- [32] Hong, W., Mosca, T.J., Luo, L. (2012). Teneurins instruct synaptic partner matching in an olfactory map. *Nature Journal*, 484 (7393). 201-207.
- [33] Jo, S.J. (2011). Knowledge sharing: The influences of organization culture, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 18(3), 353- 364.
- [34] Joia, L.A., Lemos, B. (2010). Relevant factors for tacit knowledge transfer within organizations. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 14(3), 410-427.
- [35] Islam, M.Z., Ahmed, S.M., Hasan, I., & Ahmed, S.U. (2011). Organizational culture and knowledge sharing: Empirical evidence from service organizations. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(14), 5900-5909.
- [36] Karkoulian, S., Halawi, L. & McCarthy, R. (2008). Knowledge management, formal and informal mentoring: An empirical investigation of Lebanese banks. *The Learning Organization Journal*, 15(5), 409-420.
- [37] Kothari, C.R., (2013). *Research Methodology, Methods and Techniques*, (2nd Ed) New Delhi: New Age International Publishers.
- [38] Liska, A. (1984). A Critical Examination of the Causal Structure of the Fischbein/Ajzen Attitude- Behavior Model. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 47(1), 61-74.
- [39] Megginson, D., Clutterbuck, D., & Garvey, B. (2007). *Mentoring in Action*. India Kogan Page.
- [40] Mueller, J. (2012). Knowledge sharing between project teams and its cultural antecedents, *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 16(3), 435-447.
- [41] Mundia C. M and Iravo M. (2014). Role of Mentoring Programs on the Employee Performance in Organizations: A Survey of Public Universities in Nyeri County. Kenya. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*.
- [42] Ndebele, C. Heerden J. & Chabaya, O. (2013) Development and Implementation of a Mentoring Programme at a Historically Disadvantaged South African University. *Journal of Social Science*, 34(2): 123-133.
- [43] Nguyen, H.N., & Mohamed, S. (2011). Leadership behaviors, organizational culture, and knowledge management practices: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Management Development*, 30(2), 206-221.
- [44] Sandhu, M., Jain, K., & Ahmad, I. (2011). Knowledge sharing among public sector employees: evidence from Malaysia, *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 24(3), 206-226.
- [45] Sriwichai, P. Meksamoot, K. Chakpitak, N. Dahal K. & Jengjalean A. (2014). The effectiveness of “Knowledge Management System” in Research Mentoring Using knowledge Engineering. *Journal of International Education Studies*, 7 (5) 25-38.
- [46] Sweeny, B. (2012). *Leading the teacher induction and mentoring program*. (2nd Ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- [47] Ramady, M. A. (2010). *The Saudi Arabian economy: Policies, achievements and challenges* (2nd Ed). New York: Spring International
- [48] Tan, N., Ying, L., Tuan, N., Ying, L. (2010). Motivational factors in influencing study. *Knowledge Management Research and Practice*, 1 (1), 11-27.

- [49] Tsai, W., Tsai, M., Li, S., & Lin, C. (2012). Harmonizing firms' knowledge and strategies with organizational capabilities. *Journal of Computer Information Systems*, 53 (1), 23-32
- [50] Thiga, M. M. (2012). Knowledge Management in Kenyan Higher Education: The Challenges of Dissemination. Unpublished Master's thesis Kabarak University, Nairobi. Kenya.
- [51] Oduma C. and Were S. (2014). Influence of career development on employee performance in public university, a case of Kenyatta University. *International Journal of Social Science Management and Entrepreneurship* 1(2):1-16.
- [52] Okurame, D, E. (2008) Mentoring in the Nigerian academia: experiences and challenges *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*. 6 (2) 45-56.
- [53] Xiao, J. (2008). Applying Behavior Theories to Financial Behaviors in J. Xiao (Ed.), and book of Consumer Finance Research (p 69-81). Kingston: Springer.
- [54] Yang, J. T. (2007). Individual attitudes and organizational knowledge sharing. *Tourism management*, 29(2), 345-353.