JOURNAL OF THE FACULTY OF TOURISM AND HOTELS
UNIVERSITY OF SADAT CITY
Journal homepage:
https://mfth.journals.ekb.eg/

The Impact of Knowledge-oriented leadership on Organizational Performance in Tourism Companies

Ghada Mohamed Khairat
Tourism Studies Department- Faculty of Tourism and Hotels- University of Sadat City

Mohamed Zidan Elsherbiny
Tourism Studies Department- Faculty of Tourism and Hotels- University of Sadat City

Dalia Fathy Mandour
Tourism Studies Department- Faculty of Tourism and Hotels- University of Sadat City

Shereen Girgis Labib
Faculty of Tourism and Hotels- South Valley University

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the relationship between knowledge-oriented leadership and organizational performance in the tourism industry. A quantitative research methodology was employed, involving the collection of data through structured 200 questionnaires distributed to tourism managers. The findings indicate a positive and significant correlation between the two constructs. Knowledge-oriented leaders, who foster innovation, creativity, and employee engagement, are more likely to improve organizational performance. These findings highlight the importance of cultivating knowledge-oriented leadership in the tourism industry to adapt to changing market conditions, develop innovative offerings, and enhance overall organizational effectiveness.

KEYWORDS
knowledge-oriented leadership, organizational performance, tourism industry, innovation, leadership

تأثير القيادة القائمة على المعرفة على الأداء التنظيمي في قطاع السياحة

غادة محمد خيرت

قسم الدراسات السياحية- كلية السياحة والفنادق- جامعة مدينة السادات

محمد زيدان الشربينى

قسم الدراسات السياحية- كلية السياحة والفنادق- جامعة مدينة السادات

داليا فتحى مندور

قسم الدراسات السياحية- كلية السياحة والفنادق- جامعة مدينة السادات

شيرين جرجس لبيب

كلية السياحة والفنادق- جامعة جنوب الوادى

الملخص

درس هذا البحث العلاقة بين القيادة القائمة على المعرفة والأداء التنظيمي في قطاع السياحة. تم استخدام منهجية بحثية كمية، حيث تم جمع البيانات من خلال استبيانات موزعة على مدراء شركات سياحية. أظهرت النتائج وجود علاقة إيجابية قوية بين هذين المتغيرين. بمعنى آخر، فإن القادة الذين يركزون على المعرفة والابتكار والإبداع، ويحفزون مشاركة الموظفين، يكونون أكثر قدرة على تحسين أداء شركاتهم.

يهدف هذا البحث إلى دراسة تأثير القيادة الموجهة نحو المعرفة (KOL) على أداء المنظمات في شركات السياحة. تركز الدراسة على أهمية القيادة الموجهة نحو المعرفة في تحسين الكفاءة التشغيلية وجودة الخدمة ورضا العملاء في قطاع السياحة. على الرغم من وجود العديد من الدراسات التي تتناول القيادة بشكل عام، إلا أن البحث يعزز الفهم حول العلاقة بين القيادة الموجهة نحو المعرفة وأداء المنظمات، ويحدد كيفية تأثير هذه القيادة على تعزيز الأداء في شركات السياحة.

تم قياس القيادة الموجهة نحو المعرفة من خلال 11 بعدًا، تشمل القيادة الداعمة، التحفيز الفكري، المكافآت، توفير الرؤية، الإرشاد، التفويض، الاستشارة، النمذجة الابتكارية، التيسير، التعرف على الإنجازات، وتحفيز نشر المعرفة. بينما تم قياس أداء المنظمة من خلال 9 أبعاد، تشمل فعالية الاستراتيجية المعرفية، كفاءة الموارد، وقيادة المنظمة في السوق.

أظهرت نتائج الدراسة أن القيادة الموجهة نحو المعرفة تؤثر بشكل إيجابي على أداء المنظمات السياحية، حيث تسهم هذه القيادة في تحسين أداء الموظفين وزيادة فعالية العمليات والخدمات المقدمة. كما أكدت النتائج على أن القيادة التي تركز على نشر المعرفة وتعزيز الإبداع والابتكار تساهم في تحسين رضا العملاء ورفع القدرة التنافسية للشركات السياحية.

وقد توصل البحث إلى أن هناك حاجة لتعزيز ممارسات القيادة الموجهة نحو المعرفة داخل شركات السياحة من خلال توفير بيئة داعمة تشجع على تبادل المعرفة والتعلم المستمر، بالإضافة إلى تطوير المهارات القيادية التي تدعم الابتكار والتفكير النقدي. كما أوصى البحث بضرورة الاهتمام بتدريب القادة والمديرين على كيفية تطبيق ممارسات القيادة الموجهة نحو المعرفة بشكل فعال لتحقيق نتائج أفضل يساعد الشركات على التكيف مع التغيرات المستمرة في السوق، وتطوير منتجات وخدمات مبتكرة، وتحقيق كفاءة أعلى

وفيما يتعلق بالبحوث المستقبلية، أوصى البحث بإجراء دراسات طويلة المدى لتحليل تأثير القيادة الموجهة نحو المعرفة على أداء المنظمات في سياقات مختلفة، كما اقترح دراسة تأثير القيادة الموجهة نحو المعرفة على الرضا الوظيفي وولاء الموظفين في شركات السياحة. أيضاً، يمكن استكشاف دور الأدوات الرقمية في تعزيز ممارسات القيادة الموجهة نحو المعرفة ودراستها في سياقات ثقافية متنوعة.

تساهم هذه الدراسة في توفير رؤى قيمة لصناع القرار والمديرين في شركات السياحة حول كيفية تحسين الأداء التنظيمي من خلال القيادة الموجهة نحو المعرفة، مما يعزز القدرة التنافسية في هذا القطاع الحيوي.

توصل البحث إلى أن القيادة القائمة على المعرفة تلعب دورًا حاسمًا في تحسين الأداء التنظيمي في قطاع السياحة. هذا النوع من القيادة يساعد الشركات على التكيف مع التغيرات المستمرة في السوق، وتطوير منتجات وخدمات مبتكرة، وتحقيق كفاءة أعلى.

لتعزيز هذه النتائج، يقترح البحث ما يلي:

- التركيز على تطوير مهارات القيادة القائمة على المعرفة لدى القادة في قطاع السياحة.
- تشجيع ثقافة التعلم والابتكار داخل المؤسسات السياحية.
- الاستثمار في برامج تدريب وتطوير القادة.

الكلمات الدالة

القيادة الموجهة نحو المعرفة، الأداء التنظيمي، صناعة السياحة، الابتكار، القيادة

1. Introduction

Leadership plays a crucial role in shaping organizations, particularly in knowledge-intensive industries like tourism and hospitality. Knowledge-oriented leadership, defined as fostering the creation, sharing, and use of knowledge to influence outcomes (Mabey et al., 2012), is vital. This approach promotes innovation, collaboration, and adaptability in competitive markets (Liu et al., 2022).

In tourism, leadership drives innovation, operational excellence, and competitive advantage. Scholars like Díaz-Morales et al. (2006) highlight its role in fostering creativity, collaboration, strategic vision, and calculated risk-taking. Leaders also ensure resources for innovation success. In dynamic markets shaped by information and communication technologies, managing and leveraging knowledge is increasingly critical (Hogan et al., 2011; Love et al., 2011).In tourism and hospitality, managing knowledge effectively enhances consumer understanding, service quality, and innovation. Knowledge-oriented leadership ensures organizations acquire, share, and apply knowledge, fostering resilience and adaptability (Jasimuddin et al., 2006).

Organizational performance, another key variable in this study, is influenced by leadership's ability to harness knowledge resources. High-performing tourism companies effectively integrate leadership practices with knowledge management strategies, enhancing productivity, customer satisfaction, and profitability. The interplay between knowledge-oriented leadership and organizational performance is particularly relevant in addressing challenges such as market competition, technological disruptions, and changing consumer demands (Tsai & Chou, 2009).

In tourism companies, knowledge-oriented leadership drives initiatives like staff training, knowledge-sharing platforms, and strategic partnerships. By leveraging digital technologies and fostering continuous learning, leaders align organizational goals with market trends, enhancing competitiveness. The integration of information and communication technologies (ICT) further supports knowledge-oriented leadership by enabling data-driven decision-making, streamlining operations, and personalizing customer experiences, ensuring agility and responsiveness to market shifts (Manzoor et al., 2023).

Numerous studies have explored the relationship between leadership, knowledge management, and organizational performance. For instance, Ribiere and Sitar (2003) emphasized the role of leaders in fostering a knowledge-sharing culture to enhance organizational outcomes. Similarly, Hogan et al. (2011) and Love et al. (2011) highlighted the impact of ICT on reshaping the dynamics of the tourism market, further reinforcing the need for knowledge-oriented leadership.

While previous studies have explored individual factors like leadership and knowledge management, limited research has investigated the combined impact of knowledge-oriented leadership on organizational performance in the tourism sector. This gap offers an opportunity to examine how leadership practices focused on knowledge management influence performance in tourism companies. This study aims to bridge this gap by exploring the mechanisms through which knowledge-oriented leadership drives performance outcomes. The primary research question is: How does knowledge-oriented leadership influence organizational performance in tourism companies? The study will analyze the relationship between knowledge-oriented

leadership and performance, and identify best practices for implementing knowledge-oriented leadership to enhance organizational performance.

This research contributes to the academic and practical understanding of leadership and knowledge management in the tourism industry by: Providing empirical insights into the impact of knowledge-oriented leadership on organizational performance. Offering actionable recommendations for tourism companies to leverage leadership practices for sustained competitive advantage. By addressing the identified research gap, this study aims to advance the theoretical framework surrounding knowledge-oriented leadership while providing practical guidance for leaders in the tourism and hospitality sectors.

2.   Literature review

Knowledge-oriented leadership (KOL) is a critical factor influencing organizational performance (OP). It combines transformational and transactional leadership, fostering a culture of learning, innovation, and knowledge sharing. By stimulating intellectual growth, encouraging teamwork, and rewarding knowledge-based behaviors, KOL can enhance organizational efficiency, effectiveness, and competitiveness (Anand & Singh, 2022).

Studies have shown that KOL can positively impact various aspects of organizational performance, including employee engagement, job satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. Additionally, KOL can contribute to the development of innovative products and services, improved decision-making, and increased organizational agility (Anand & Singh, 2022; Donate & de Pablo, 2015; Liu et al., 2022).

To fully realize the benefits of KOL, organizations must create a supportive environment that encourages knowledge sharing, collaboration, and continuous learning. By investing in leadership development programs, providing opportunities for knowledge exchange, and recognizing and rewarding knowledge-based contributions, organizations can empower their leaders to drive innovation and achieve superior performance (Manzoor et al., 2023).

2.1.   Knowledge-oriented leadership

Knowledge-oriented leadership (KOL) is a specific form of leadership that has garnered significant scholarly attention in recent years. This leadership style is considered crucial in enhancing organizational performance (OP), particularly in industries like tourism and hospitality, where innovation and continuous improvement are essential. The concept was first introduced by Donate and Guadamillas (2011) and Donate and de Pablo (2015), who explored its role as an antecedent of knowledge management behaviors. However, they did not provide a clear definition of this leadership behavior. Naqshbandi and Jasimuddin (2018) offered a more comprehensive definition, describing KOL as "an attitude or action observed or imputed, that prompts the creation, sharing, and utilization of new knowledge in a way that seems to bring a shift in thinking and collective outcomes" (pp. 701). This definition underlines the leadership style's ability to foster the creation, sharing, and application of knowledge in a manner that enhances collective outcomes within an organization.

KOL is based on the premise that effective leadership is essential for managing knowledge workers, ensuring that they feel satisfied, motivated, and productive. In the tourism and hospitality industries, leaders who prioritize knowledge-oriented practices enable employees to innovate and adapt, which ultimately leads to enhanced organizational performance (Naqshbandi & Jasimuddin, 2018; Rehman & Iqbal, 2020; Sahibzada et al., 2020). Leaders who practice KOL help organizations develop mechanisms for knowledge sharing and exchange, facilitating better decision-making and improved service delivery, which is essential in a fast-changing sector like tourism (Mohsenabad & Azadehdel, 2016).

Knowledge-oriented leadership is a process that involves mutual or individual actions that assess, improve, and execute new ways of thinking to achieve collective organizational results. Mehmood and Hussain (2017) describe KOL as a process where each group member plays a role in facilitating the learning cycle required to achieve the organization's objectives. This leadership model helps foster a collaborative environment in which employees are encouraged to contribute knowledge, solve problems creatively, and collectively work toward organizational goals (Jia et al., 2024).

Several scholars have emphasized that KOL plays a key role in increasing organizational knowledge, organizing and managing knowledge, and creating insights (Donate & de Pablo, 2015; Lakshman & Parente, 2008; Mohsenabad & Azadehdel, 2016). By promoting knowledge creation, sharing, and transformation, leaders who adopt KOL can significantly enhance the capabilities of their organizations. Additionally, KOL is recognized for its ability to function as a driver of knowledge sourcing, creating, sharing, transforming, and using within organizations. Leaders adopting this approach are seen as promoters, initiators, and role models of knowledge behavior (Naqshbandi & Jasimuddin, 2018).

In the context of tourism and hospitality, knowledge-oriented leadership is particularly important due to the industry's reliance on customer service, innovation, and constant adaptation to changing market conditions. Research shows that when KOL is practiced effectively, organizations can achieve higher employee engagement, improved organizational performance, and a better overall guest experience (Zhang et al., 2023; Li & Chen, 2022). Moreover, KOL helps in building strong knowledge networks, both within the organization and with external partners, such as customers and suppliers, which is critical in the tourism sector (Sánchez-Rodríguez et al., 2021).

In conclusion, knowledge-oriented leadership is a vital driver of organizational success in the tourism industry. By effectively managing and leveraging knowledge, leaders can help their organizations not only survive but thrive in an increasingly competitive and dynamic environment. Research indicates that KOL fosters a culture of continuous improvement, which is essential for staying ahead in the fast-paced and ever-evolving tourism sector (Zhang et al., 2023; Naqshbandi & Jasimuddin, 2018).

2.2. Organizational performance

The performance of any organization depends in large part on the level of skill its leaders possess when it comes to implementing strategies. Silva (2014) described the essence of leadership as a conditional relationship that exists between a manager and his or her followers. Given that there are always hurdles to achieving organizational goals, it is important that the techniques that leaders use be flexible enough to

accommodate change. The performance of an organization also depends on its employees, who are a key part of the organization and form the team that works toward achieving the organization's goals.

Organizational performance and leadership competencies correlate with a leader's social, cognitive, and emotional intelligence competencies (Ryan et al., 2012). Boyatzis and Boyatzis (2009) identified social intelligence as the ability of a leader to focus on innovation and motivate it among his or her team members. This is often referred to as directive leadership and depends heavily on delegation, where leaders understand how to confer some leadership powers to team members and allow them room to explore new ideas (Emrich, 1999).

On the other hand, cognitive competence highlights creative and critical abilities that help enhance decision making, problem solving, and learning (Sun & Hui, 2012). A leader who develops a vision and strategies to achieve that particular vision must effectively communicate these elements to employees. The techniques that leaders apply include but are not limited to negotiating, influencing, problem solving, coaching, and motivating (Tomal & Jones, 2015).

Performance is one of the most argued concepts about which there has never been an agreement among various researchers and theorists. This index with different definitions have been used in various disciplines like airline (Ismail&Jenatabadi,2014; Jenatabadi, 2013), education (Hui et al., 2013a; Dadkhah et al., 2014), management (Hui et al., 2013b - Radzi et al., 2013; Mohamed RADZI et al.,2013], and computer science (Jenatabadi, 2014).

Organizational performance refers to how successfully a company meets both its market-oriented and financial objectives (Munizu, 2013). The traditional approach of evaluating performance based solely on financial metrics is faulty. Several past studies have used financial and commercial factors to assess organizational effectiveness, such as return on investment (ROI), market share, and profit margin (Jarad et al., 2010; Munizu, 2013). The four dimensions are often used variables to represent organization performance such as (1) maker share, (2) return on investment, (3) profit margin on sales; and (4) overall competitive position (Li et al., 2006).

Performance is the end result of activities; it includes the actual outcomes of the strategic management process. The practice of strategic management is justified in terms of its ability to improve the organization's performance (Bennis, 2000).

Organizational performance refers to how well an organization achieves its market-oriented goals as well as its financial goals (Yamin et al., 1999). Financial metrics have served as a tool for comparing organizations and evaluating an organization's behavior over time (Holmberg ,2000). A number of prior studies have measured organizational performance using both financial and market criteria, including return on investment, market share, profit margin on sales, the growth of return on investment, the growth of sales, the growth of market share, and overall competitive position (Vickery et al., 1999; Stock et al., 2000; Zhang,2001).

2.3. The impact of Knowledge-oriented leadership on organizational performance

Leadership remains the most critical factor influencing organizational performance (OP), either directly or indirectly (Rehman & Iqbal, 2020). Research has extensively established the impact of transformational and transactional leadership on OP.

Transformational leadership, in particular, is characterized by intellectual stimulation, flawless influence, stimulating inspiration, and personalized contemplation. These attributes align with organizational objectives, fostering the creation of a shared vision and facilitating employee development (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007; Erkutlu, 2008; Bi et al., 2012; Bacha, 2014).

Transformational Leadership Theory, introduced by James MacGregor Burns (1978) and further developed by Bernard M. Bass (1985), underscores how leaders inspire employees to surpass expectations through vision, innovation, and growth. The theory highlights the leader's ability to promote creativity, act as a role model, inspire shared goals, and support individual growth, creating a culture of continuous improvement. This leadership approach significantly impacts OP by directly aligning teams with organizational goals and indirectly fostering innovation and adaptability. Studies by Uhl-Bien et al. (2007) and Erkutlu (2008) highlight enhanced collaboration and employee satisfaction under transformational leadership, while Bi et al. (2012) and Bacha (2014) emphasize the role of innovation and personal development in driving competitive advantage.

In the context of knowledge-oriented leadership, transformational leadership is instrumental in promoting knowledge sharing and leveraging intellectual resources. By encouraging intellectual stimulation and fostering an open environment, leaders enable employees to creatively apply knowledge, contributing to superior organizational performance. This integration of transformational leadership principles with knowledge-oriented practices underscores the critical role of leadership in achieving and sustaining organizational effectiveness (Bi et al., 2012; Bacha, 2014).

Transactional leadership is defined by behaviors that are positive and counteractive (Obiwuru et al., 2011). Counteractive behaviors are performed through employee recognition and rewards for accomplishing certain goals (Limsila & Ogunlana, 2008). Corrective behaviors monitor actions based on management by an exception while following certain standards to rectify the problems as and when they occur (Erkutlu, 2008). Together transformational and transactional physiognomies of both leadership styles have positively affected employee's job performance (Chu & Lai, 2011) and organizational learning, which eventually improves OP (Masa'deh et al., 2017).

In this regard, the role of knowledge management implementation has been emphasized in the literature to earn organizational performance (Koohang et al., 2017; Sahibzada et al., 2020). KOL is characterized by combining transformational and transactional leadership (Donate & Pablo, 2015). Particularly, KOL is composed of behaviors designed to build and promote knowledge, such as enhancing learning experiences, facilitating external knowledge, rewarding morale and creating a cohesive and conducive environment for teamwork (Naqshbandi & Jasimuddin, 2018). However, very limited investigation has been steered on the correlation between KOL and OP (Rehman & Iqbal, 2020).

Based on available research on the role of transformational and transactional leadership on OP, this study argues that the KOL carries significant importance for HEIs' performance. First, KOL creates a conducive teamwork environment, which can build trust among the university faculty. The heightened trust may then encourage positive behaviors such as knowledge sharing and research productivity (Fullwood & Rowley, 2017; Yasir et al., 2017).

Second, KOL endorses external knowledge achievement, thus rewarding knowledge sharing and application, resulting in academic quality, valued research collaborations, timely responsiveness and development of curriculum (Tan & Noor, 2013; Tan, 2016). Moreover, KOL facilitates creating a learning culture that helps organisations succeed (Choudhary et al., 2013).

KOL and OP connections Organizational leadership critically has influence of servant leadership (Dennis et al., 2010) also impact on three factors vision, empowerment and service of the administration (Alkheyi et al., 2020). In the hierarchical structure there is top of the administration is known as pioneers in their own duties, also to arrive at organizational objective leaders damn significant for the organization where leaders have influence on hierarchical citizenship conduct (Alkheyi et al., 2020) worker commitment, turnover expectation (Sousa &van, 2014), organizational performance effectiveness and efficiency (García-Morales et al., 2012).

Commonly leadership has wide space in the organization in terms of directions and suggestions to the management, employee, and subordinates in the workplace to get job satisfaction thriving work and organizational identification (Alkathiri et al., 2019). Consequently, researcher investigates the thoughts of technique and knowledge of the leader's appreciation to lead in the administration (Alkhateri et al., 2018).

In this sense, knowledge is mostly common elements for the effective leadership in any context especially in the administration for individual task, subjective norms, personal attitude and team support (Alareefi et al., 2019; Alharthi et al., 2019; Alharthi & Khalifa, 2019; Alkhateri et al., 2019; Mohamed et al., 2018; Norulkamar & Hatamleh, 2014).

Accordingly, knowledge oriented-leadership comprises the development of knowledge and includes transformational, motivational and communication essentials (Donate et al., 2015) that encourage to the learning in challenges and simultaneous intellectual work ability. Providing incentives and training that foster a culture of learning to solve errors by following cross functional, regular commitments, mechanism of transmission and improve application of knowledge (Alsaadi et al., 2019). Therefore learning culture and knowledge based leadership more effective to the administration to handle and follow techniques according to the demand of advance

The potential for KM to create competitive advantage is positively linked to organizational performance (Schulz & Jobe, 2001). Treacy and Wiersema (1995) proposed three ''value disciplines'' or strategic performance capabilities, each offering a path towards competitive advantage. Product leadership represents competition based primarily on product or service innovation. Customer intimacy represents competition based on understanding, satisfying and retaining customers. Operational excellence represents competition based on efficient internal operations (Schulz & Jobe, 2001).

Knowledge-oriented leadership (KOL) significantly influences organizational performance (OP) by fostering an environment that prioritizes knowledge sharing, learning, and innovation. In the tourism and hospitality sector, where competitiveness and customer satisfaction are critical, KOL plays a pivotal role in driving both operational efficiency and service quality. Studies have shown mixed impacts, with

both positive and negative outcomes depending on the implementation and organizational context (Alsaadi et al., 2019).

On the positive side, Dahiya and Raghuvanshi (2021) found that KOL enhances OP in hospitality businesses by promoting a culture of continuous learning and innovation, which leads to improved service quality and customer satisfaction. Similarly, Bouncken and Barwinski (2020) highlighted that KOL supports the effective use of organizational knowledge to adapt to rapidly changing market demands in the tourism industry, improving competitiveness and profitability.

Conversely, challenges exist. Molina-Azorín et al. (2015) pointed out that poorly implemented knowledge management strategies in hospitality can lead to inefficiencies, resistance from employees, and reduced performance. Furthermore, Sigala and Chalkiti (2015) revealed that without proper alignment between leadership practices and organizational goals, efforts to leverage knowledge might result in resource wastage and diminished productivity.

Methodology:

The research structure of the research is based on research methodologies. A research methodology is the treatment that will be applied to the data collected. It outlines the research population, sample selection, pilot study, data collection and data analysis. In order to do this the following hypotheses were addressed:

The study aims to test the following hypotheses:

H1. Knowledge oriented leadership has positive impact on organizational performance.

The full set of cases from which a sample is taken is called the population (1539) according to the statistics of the Egyptian Travel Agents Association (2014). In this research, the population is managers of tourism companies (Category A) in Great Cairo and Giza. Managers were selected as the study sample due to their critical role in decision-making, strategy implementation, and driving knowledge-oriented practices, which directly influence organizational performance. Their insights ensure the research captures relevant and actionable data in the tourism sector. A questionnaire was used in this study to collect data. The data of the study was collected from Egyptian tourism companies through distributing (200) questionnaire forms among tourism companies' managers and department managers during the period from February 2023 to June 2023. There were (184) questionnaire forms that were distributed correctly and successfully recollected with an approximate response rate of (92.5 %) of the total sample (200). The research sample was chosen as simple random, a simple random sample was chosen to ensure fairness and eliminate bias, giving every manager an equal chance of selection. This method is suitable for the research as it provides a representative sample, ensuring the findings are generalizable and unbiased.

Part A of the questionnaire measured the respondents' Knowledge-oriented Leadership was measured using the 6-item adopted from the work of Donate and de Pablo (2015). The respondents (i.e., mid and junior management) were asked to evaluate their top management on a Likert scale of 1 (strong disagreement with the item) to 5 (strong agreement with the item).

Part B measured organizational performance

Organizational performance was assessed through knowledge strategy effectiveness (the relation between knowledge strategy and performance), resources' efficiency (the relation between organization resources and performance), and leadership (the relation between organization's leadership in the market and performance) (Lin, 2007; English et al., 2010; Al Hakim & Hassan, 2012; Al Rubaiee et al., 2015; Jenatabadi, 2015; Tubigi & Al Shawi, 2015; Najmi et al., 2017; Yusr et al., 2017; Ali et al., 2018; Lashari & Rana, 2018; Al Ahbabi et al., 2019).

Part C of the questionnaire concerned with respondents' demographics. These questions included age, marital status, gender, work experience, education level and current position. This section was included at the end of the questionnaire because the researcher believes that respondents are less willing to complete questionnaires if these kinds of questions appear at the beginning of the questionnaire.

This study uses Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Version (19.0) to analyze the data.

The reliability of the study variables

Cronbach's alpha (α) and composite reliability (CR) were relied upon to measure the stability of the scales used to measure the study variables. The alpha coefficients and composite reliability should be equal to or greater than 0.7 to judge the reliability of the variables and dimensions of the study (Manley et al., 2021; Kock, 2022). It is clear from Table No. (1) that the Cronbach's alpha and CR coefficients rise to greater than 0.7, which indicates the reliability of the variables and dimensions of the study.

Table (1): The results of the reliability for the study variables

Variable	Composite reliability coefficients (CR)	Cronbach's alpha coefficients (α)
Knowledge oriented leadership	0.993	0.993
Organizational performance	0.975	0.962

Convergent validity

Convergent validity is one of the measures that is an indicator of the degree of convergence of the statements in the scale that loaded on the study variables and is measured by the average variance extracted (AVE), which must be greater than 0.5 (Manley et al., 2021). As shown in the table no. (2), all average variances for the variables are greater than 0.5, which indicates the convergent validity of all variables of the study.

Table (2): The results of the average variance extracted (AVE)

Variable	AVE
Knowledge oriented leadership	0.804
Organizational performance	0.930

Discriminant validity

Discriminant validity shows the extent to which the statements that measure each dimension of the study differ from other variables and are measured by the square root of the average variance extracted (AVE). The square root of the AVE for each dimension must be greater than its correlation with the other dimensions (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). Table No. (3) show that the square root of the AVE is greater than the

correlations with the other dimensions, which indicates the presence of discriminant validity and high consistency for the study scale.

Table (3): Discriminant validity assessment

No.	Variable	1	2	3	4
1	Knowledge oriented leadership	(0.897)			
4	Organizational performance	-0.871	-0.864	-0.855	(0.964)

Result and discussion

Table (4) descriptive statics of Personal information

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	110	59.8%
Female	74	40.2%
Total	184	100%
Age	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Less than 30	39	21.2%
30 to less than 40	52	28.3%
40 to less than 50	45	24.5%
50 years and more	48	26.1%
Total	184	100%
Marital Status	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Single	27	14.7%
Married	130	70.7%
Other	27	14.7%
Total	184	100%
Educational Level	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
High School	11	6%
Bachelor	140	76.1%
Postgraduate studies	33	17.9%
Total	184	100%
Position	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
General manager	34	18.5%
Sales and Marketing Manager	22	12%
Operation Manager	44	23.9%
Reservation Manager	19	10.3%
Human Resources Manager	31	16.8%
Financial Manager	25	13.6%
Other	9	4.9%
Total	184	100%
Work Experience	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Less than I year	15	8.2%
From 1 to less than 3 years	41	22.3%
From 3 to less than 6 years	54	29.3%
6 years and more	74	40.2%
Total	184	100%

Table 4 indicated demographic data of respondents as follows:

Gender: It could be noticed that, the majority of the respondents were males and occupy the highest percentage (59.8%) of the sample.

Age: : As indicated in table (4), the majority of managers came between 30 to less than 40 years with a percentage of 28.3% and 26.1% ranging from 50 years and more. Then, the proportion of managers among 40 and less than 50 years old was 24.5%, while 21.2% of the managers came under 30 years.

Marital Status: The obtained findings noticed that both single and married managers work in deferent departments in the tourism company. Regarding the marital status, the majority of managers were married by 70.7%, followed by single with a percentage of 14.7%. The percentage of others reached also 14.7%.

Education Level: The obtained results are illustrated in Table (4). For education, most of the managers have a bachelor's degree by 76.1%, followed by a post graduate with a percentage of 17.9%.On another side, the percentage of managers with a high school was 6 %.

Knowledge-oriented Leadership Constructs

Table No. (4) shows the descriptive statistical data of the respondents' attitudes towards knowledge-oriented leadership. This part was measured by 35 items including supportive, intellectual stimulation, rewarding, providing vision, mentoring, delegating, consulting, innovative role modelling, facilitating, recognizing and stimulating knowledge diffusion. The result of the descriptive statistics for these dimensions will be discussed as follows:

Table (5): Descriptive statistics for Knowledge-oriented Leadership

Items			Frequencies*					Mean	SD
			Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree		
Supportive								**3.45**	**1.14**
1	Managers encourage staff to discuss personal issues with them.	Freq.	18	23	46	62	35	3.40	1.21
		%	9.8	12.5	25	33.7	19		
2	Managers spend a lot of time thinking about the benefits and job security of their staff.	Freq.	13	25	51	56	39	3.45	1.17
		%	7.1	13.6	27.7	30.4	21.2		
3	Managers showing sympathy for employees is common	Freq.	16	32	35	60	41	3.42	1.25
		%	8.7	17.4	19	32.6	22.3		
4	Managers consider employees' feelings to be equally vital to the work at hand.	Freq.	19	19	36	65	45	3.53	1.25
		%	10.3	10.3	19.6	35.3	24.5		
Intellectual stimulation								**3.53**	**1.18**
5	Managers evaluate	Fre	15	25	35	58	51	3.57	1.25

	circumstances carefully to determine their suitability.	**Fre q.**							
		%	8.2	13.6	19	31.5	27.7		
6	Manager searches for different methods to address issues	**Fre q.**	14	26	36	66	42	3.52	1.20
		%	7.6	14.1	19.6	35.9	22.8		
7	Manager encourages others to approach issues from various perspectives.	**Fre q.**	13	29	35	63	44	3.52	1.21
		%	7.1	15.8	19	34.2	23.9		
Rewarding								**3.50**	**1.19**
8	The manager supports staff members in return for their efforts	**Fre q.**	27	18	31	59	49	3.46	1.36
		%	14.7	9.8	16.8	32.1	26.6		
9	When management performance goals are met, the manager clarifies what each person can receive.	**Fre q.**	14	28	37	52	53	3.55	1.26
		%	7.6	15.2	20.1	28.3	28.8		
10	When others meet his expectations, the manager shows his satisfaction.	**Fre q.**	16	27	37	60	44	3.48	1.24
		%	8.7	14.7	20.1	32.6	23.9		
Providing vision								**3.45**	**1.18**
11	Manager presents an upbeat and inspiring future vision	**Fre q.**	17	26	39	63	39	3.44	1.23
		%	9.2	14.1	21.2	34.2	21.2		
12	Managers provide guidance for upcoming initiatives by explicitly communicating their vision for the job and favored sorts of innovation.	**Fre q.**	17	28	32	64	43	3.48	1.25
		%	9.2	15.2	17.4	34.8	23.4		
13	Manager explains to us what our company hopes to become in the long term.	**Fre q.**	20	26	36	54	48	3.46	1.30
		%	10.9	14.1	19.6	29.3	26.1		
Mentoring								**3.45**	**1.22**
14	The manager devotes time to training and instruction.	**Fre q.**	17	31	37	51	48	3.45	1.29
		%	9.2	16.8	20.1	27.7	26.1		
15	Managers Regularly impart expertise and experience to younger people and newcomers.	**Fre q.**	16	28	39	63	38	3.43	1.22
		%	8.7	15.2	21.2	34.2	20.7		
16	Managers assist employees in their daily tasks	**Fre q.**	18	25	38	56	47	3.48	1.27
		%	9.8	13.6	20.7	30.4	25.5		

Delegating								**3.42**	**1.15**
17	Managers provide their staff members the freedom to choose how to complete their tasks and how they will pursue their goals.	**Fre q.**	18	23	46	62	35	3.40	1.21
		%	9.8	12.5	25	33.7	19		
18	Managers Give employees enough freedom to choose how to complete a task in a largely independent manner.	**Fre q.**	13	25	51	56	39	3.45	1.17
		%	7.1	13.6	27.7	30.4	21.2		
19	Managers provide subordinates the freedom to change their minds in response to new information.	**Fre q.**	16	32	35	60	41	3.42	1.25
		%	8.7	17.4	19	32.6	22.3		
Consulting								**3.54**	**1.19**
20	Managers seek the group's permission after consulting with their subordinates.	**Fre q.**	19	19	36	65	45	3.53	1.25
		%	10.3	10.3	19.6	35.3	24.5		
21	Managers Before making any changes that may have an impact on people, consult them first and take into account any thoughts and ideas they may have.	**Fre q.**	15	25	35	58	51	3.57	1.25
		%	8.2	13.6	19	31.5	27.7		
22	Your supervisors assist in fostering consensus during work-group meetings	**Fre q.**	14	26	36	66	42	3.52	1.20
		%	7.6	14.1	19.6	35.9	22.8		
Innovative role modeling								**3.50**	**1.22**
23	Managers use innovative and cunning methods to solve problems.	**Fre q.**	13	29	35	63	44	3.52	1.21
		%	7.1	15.8	19	34.2	23.9		
24	As the external world changes, managers regularly adapt their decisions.	**Fre q.**	22	20	35	60	47	3.49	1.30
		%	12	10.9	19	32.6	25.5		
25	Managers Being a good example of innovative behavior, which includes looking for opportunities, supporting ideas, and making efforts to put ideas into practice.	**Fre q.**	27	18	31	59	49	3.46	1.36
		%	14.7	9.8	16.8	32.1	26.6		

26	Managers looking for methods to improve processes and outcomes.	Fre q.	14	28	37	52	53	3.55	1.26
		%	7.6	15.2	20.1	28.3	28.8		
Facilitating								**3.46**	**1.20**
27	Managers devote time and resources to putting ideas into practice.	Fre q.	16	27	37	60	44	3.48	1.24
		%	8.7	14.7	20.1	32.6	23.9		
28	Wherever necessary, managers provide employees with accurate information and knowledge to complete their tasks.	Fre q.	17	26	39	63	39	3.44	1.23
		%	9.2	14.1	21.2	34.2	21.2		
29	Managers By assembling the tools you'll need to finish the job, you may make the process easier and more efficient.	Fre q.	17	28	32	64	43	3.48	1.25
		%	9.2	15.2	17.4	34.8	23.4		
Recognizing								**3.44**	**1.23**
30	Managers expressing gratitude for performances that are (innovation)	Fre q.	20	26	36	54	48	3.46	1.30
		%	10.9	14.1	19.6	29.3	26.1		
31	When a recommendation is made, managers pay heed.	Fre q.	17	31	37	51	48	3.45	1.29
		%	9.2	16.8	20.1	27.7	26.1		
32	Managers Give staff praise (compliments), rewards (such as private budgets, expanded autonomy, and certificates of achievement), and ceremonies (such as public speeches and celebrations) when they do something creative.	Fre q.	16	28	39	63	38	3.43	1.22
		%	8.7	15.2	21.2	34.2	20.7		
Stimulating knowledge diffusion								**3.52**	**1.16**
33	Managers Encourage honest and genuine conversation	Fre q.	18	25	38	56	47	3.48	1.27
		%	9.8	13.6	20.7	30.4	25.5		
34	Managers inform staff members informally of problems, details, and knowledge	Fre q.	12	33	29	67	43	3.52	1.21
		%	6.5	17.9	15.8	36.4	23.4		
35	Managers schedule both formal and casual gatherings to exchange ideas.	Fre q.	11	30	34	62	47	3.57	1.20
		%	6	16.3	18.5	33.7	25.5		

Knowledge-oriented Leadership	3.48	1.12

* 1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Neutral, 4= Agree, 5= Strongly Agree.

☐ **Supportive Leadership:**Respondents generally agreed that managers encourage personal discussions, consider staff benefits and job security, show sympathy, and value employees' feelings. The overall mean score for supportive items was 3.45, indicating general agreement.

☐ **Intellectual Stimulation:**Most respondents agreed that managers evaluate situations carefully, seek diverse solutions, and encourage multiple perspectives. The overall mean score for intellectual stimulation items was 3.53, reflecting agreement with these practices.

☐ **Rewarding:**Respondents generally felt that managers support and reward staff efforts, clarify performance-related rewards, and express satisfaction when expectations are met. The overall mean score for rewarding items was 3.50, showing agreement with these statements.

☐ **Providing Vision:**There was agreement that managers present an inspiring vision, provide guidance on future initiatives, and explain long-term company goals. The overall mean score for providing vision items was 3.45, indicating agreement.

☐ **Mentoring:**Respondents agreed that managers invest time in training, share expertise, and assist with daily tasks. The overall mean score for mentoring items was 3.45, demonstrating agreement with these practices.

☐ **Delegating:**Managers were generally seen as providing staff with freedom in task completion and allowing for independent work. The overall mean score for delegating items was 3.42, reflecting agreement.

☐ **Consulting:**Respondents agreed that managers seek permission after consulting subordinates, consider their input before changes, and foster consensus in meetings. The overall mean score for consulting items was 3.52, indicating agreement.

☐ **Innovative Role Modelling:**Managers were seen as using innovative methods, adapting decisions to changes, and setting an example of innovative behavior. The overall mean score for innovative role modelling items was 3.50, showing agreement.

☐ **Facilitating:**Managers were perceived as allocating time and resources for ideas, providing accurate information, and assembling necessary tools. The overall mean score for facilitating items was 3.46, indicating agreement.

☐ **Recognizing:**Respondents agreed that managers express gratitude for innovative performances, heed recommendations, and provide praise and rewards. The overall mean score for recognizing items was 3.44, reflecting agreement.

☐ **Stimulating Knowledge Diffusion:**Managers were seen as encouraging honest conversations, informing staff about issues and knowledge, and organizing gatherings for idea exchange. The overall mean score for stimulating knowledge diffusion items was 3.52, indicating agreement.

Organizational Performance Constructs
Table No. (6) Shows the descriptive statistical data of the respondents' attitudes towards Organizational performance. This part was measured by 9 items.

Table (6): Descriptive statistics for Organizational performance

Items			Frequencies*					Mean	SD
			Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree		
1	The company offers high quality services.	Freq.	12	37	27	59	49	3.52	1.259
		%	6.5	20.1	14.7	32.1	26.6		
2	The company offers affordable and quality services.	Freq.	15	27	35	61	46	3.52	1.241
		%	8.2	14.7	19	32.2	25		
3	The business offers quick quality services.	Freq.	14	32	29	59	50	3.54	1.267
		%	7.6	17.4	15.8	32.1	27.2		
4	The company does well in enhancing the efficiency of services provided.	Freq.	10	32	36	55	51	3.57	1.217
		%	5.4	17.4	19.6	29.9	27.7		
5	The organization readily adapts to unexpected changes	Freq.	10	32	33	65	44	3.55	1.186
		%	5.4	17.4	17.9	35.3	23.9		
6	Through procedures that are created to supply the appropriate skills and capacities, the organization assures compliance with client needs.	Freq.	10	38	37	57	42	3.45	1.205
		%	5.4	20.7	20.1	31	22.8		
7	The company is able to take advantage of new service opportunities.	Freq.	13	33	39	56	43	3.45	1.227
		%	7.1	17.9	21.2	30.4	23.4		
8	The business may compete in the current market.	Freq.	14	29	40	53	48	3.50	1.246
		%	7.6	15.8	21.7	28.8	26.1		
9	The company is regarded as prosperous in the market.	Freq.	20	26	36	54	48	3.46	1.309
		%	10.9	14.1	19.6	29.3	26.1		
Organizational performance								**3.50**	**1.16**

According to Table (6), the total mean for Organizational performance items is 3.50 (SD = 1.16) which is located in the agreeing level. This indicates that respondents agree on that their travel agencies adopting Organizational performance.

4.3.5. Measurement Model Fit

The process of model fit is considered one of the important factors in building the structural equation model (SEM) because it identifies the extent to which the theoretical model of the study fits the field results. 11 indicators were taken into account, as shown in Table No. (7). The model is based on these indicators according to the acceptance criteria shown in the table (Kock, 2022). The results show the fit of the model.

Table (7): The results of the measurement model fit

Indices	Test result	The criteria	Accepted/ Not Accepted
Average path coefficient (APC)	0.571, P<0.001	P<0.05	Accepted
Average R-squared (ARS)	0.899, P<0.001	P<0.05	Accepted
Average adjusted R-squared (AARS)	0.898, P<0.001	P<0.05	Accepted
Sympson's paradox ratio (SPR)	1.000	acceptable if >= 0.7, ideally = 1	Accepted
R-squared contribution ratio (RSCR)	1.000	acceptable if >= 0.9, ideally = 1	Accepted
Statistical suppression ratio (SSR)	1.000	acceptable if >= 0.7	Accepted
Nonlinear bivariate causality direction ratio (NLBCDR)	1.000	acceptable if >= 0.7	Accepted
Standardized root mean squared residual (SRMR)	0.055	acceptable if <= 0.1	Accepted
Standardized mean absolute residual (SMAR)	0.040	acceptable if <= 0.1	Accepted
Standardized threshold difference count ratio (STDCR)	0.992	acceptable if >= 0.7, ideally = 1	Accepted
Standardized threshold difference sum ratio (STDSR)	0.952	acceptable if >= 0.7, ideally = 1	Accepted

4.4. Hypotheses tests

The Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) was analyzed using the WarpPLS V.8 program to prove the study hypotheses. The results of the hypotheses tests, as shown in Figure No. (7), were as follows:

Knowledge oriented leadership has positive impact on organizational performance.

The results indicate that there is a positive relationship between knowledge-oriented leadership and organizational performance, where the significance value was less than 0.01 and the path coefficient was 0.46. This means that knowledge-oriented leadership practices of travel agencies lead to increased organizational performance. Moreover, knowledge oriented leadership explained 95% of the variance in organizational performance ($R^2 = 0.95$). Based on this, H1 was accepted.

Discussion:

Knowledge-oriented leadership (KOL) is a critical topic that has been widely studied due to its significant impact on organizational performance across various sectors, particularly in the tourism and hospitality industry. This study examined the influence of knowledge-oriented leadership on organizational performance in tourism companies in Egypt. The results showed that KOL has a strong positive impact on organizational performance, confirming the study's hypothesis, H1, which states that knowledge-oriented leadership positively influences organizational performance.

Impact of Knowledge-oriented Leadership on Organizational Performance

The results from the Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) analysis revealed a positive relationship between knowledge-oriented leadership and organizational performance. The path coefficient linking KOL and organizational performance was found to be **0.46**, indicating a strong impact. Additionally, KOL explained **95%** of the variance in organizational performance (**$R^2 = 0.95$**), further supporting the hypothesis that KOL significantly contributes to improving organizational performance.

Dimensions of Knowledge-oriented Leadership

The study investigated several dimensions of knowledge-oriented leadership, including **supportive leadership**, **intellectual stimulation**, **rewarding**, **providing vision**, **mentoring**, **delegating**, **consulting**, **innovative role modeling**, **facilitating**, **recognizing**, and **stimulating knowledge diffusion**. The results showed that most respondents agreed that managers effectively practice these dimensions. For instance, respondents had a positive perception of **supportive leadership**, agreeing that managers prioritize job security and show empathy toward employees. They also agreed on **intellectual stimulation**, with managers being seen as encouraging critical thinking and innovative solutions.

Challenges in Knowledge Management in the Tourism Sector

Despite the clear benefits of knowledge-oriented leadership in improving organizational performance, the study also highlighted challenges related to the implementation of knowledge management strategies in tourism companies. Some respondents pointed out that **poor implementation** of knowledge management strategies can lead to **inefficiencies** and **employee resistance**, negatively impacting performance. Furthermore, previous studies (such as **Sigala & Chalkiti, 2015**) have suggested that without proper alignment between leadership practices and organizational goals, leveraging knowledge could result in wasted resources and reduced productivity.

The Role of Leadership in Enhancing Organizational Performance
The results emphasized the importance of knowledge-oriented leadership in enhancing organizational performance within tourism companies by fostering **collaboration**, **encouraging innovation**, and improving **customer satisfaction**. While there are challenges in implementation, such as **resistance to change** or **misalignment between leadership and organizational objectives**, the use of KOL practices can significantly enhance **competitiveness** and increase **profitability** in the tourism sector. Additionally, KOL supports **adaptability** to rapid market changes and evolving customer needs, which contributes to improving **service quality** and driving **innovation** within companies.

This study confirms that knowledge-oriented leadership (KOL) positively impacts organizational performance in tourism companies in Egypt. The results align with previous research, such as studies by **Dahiya & Raghuvanshi (2021)** and **Bouncken & Barwinski (2020)**, which highlighted that KOL fosters a culture of continuous learning and innovation, improving service quality and competitiveness.

However, the findings contrast with **Molina-Azorín et al. (2015)** and **Sigala & Chalkiti (2015)**, who noted that poor implementation of knowledge management strategies can lead to inefficiencies. The discrepancy could be due to differences in organizational contexts, as Egyptian tourism companies may have better-aligned leadership practices with their organizational goals, ensuring more effective KOL implementation.

The agreement with previous studies is largely because the research emphasized knowledge sharing, innovation, and transformational leadership elements, which are central to KOL. On the other hand, the differences might be attributed to cultural factors and leadership alignment in Egypt, where KOL practices were seen as more successful.

Recommendations
Based on the findings, several recommendations can be made to improve the application of knowledge-oriented leadership in tourism companies:
1. **Promote a knowledge-based organizational culture**: Encourage employees to share knowledge and provide a continuous learning environment.
2. **Training and development**: Offer training programs to develop knowledge-oriented leadership skills.
3. **Encourage innovation and change**: Tourism companies should create policies that motivate employees to think creatively and adopt new solutions.
4. **Ensure alignment between leadership practices and organizational goals**: Ensure that leadership practices align with the company's strategic objectives.

Conclusion
The implementation of knowledge-oriented leadership (KOL) is a crucial factor for enhancing organizational performance in the tourism sector. The study's findings confirm that KOL practices significantly contribute to improving organizational performance by enhancing competitiveness, service quality, and customer satisfaction. This research provides valuable insights into how knowledge-oriented leadership can drive performance improvements not only in the tourism industry but also in other organizations.

The main objective of this study was to examine the relationship between knowledge-oriented leadership and organizational performance. The literature review highlighted that limited research has specifically addressed this relationship. Previous studies have established a direct link between knowledge-oriented leadership and organizational performance.

This study investigated the effect of knowledge-oriented leadership on organizational performance in tourism companies, measuring KOL through 11 dimensions: supportive leadership, intellectual stimulation, rewarding, providing vision, mentoring, delegating, consulting, innovative role modeling, facilitating, recognizing, and stimulating knowledge diffusion. Meanwhile, organizational performance was assessed through 9 dimensions.

The research findings support the idea that knowledge-oriented leadership positively impacts organizational performance. The results confirm the connection between KOL and enhanced performance, aligning with previous literature while offering new insights into how KOL practices drive improvements in organizational outcomes.

Suggestions for Decision-makers, Managers, and Leaders in Tourism Companies

1. **Foster Knowledge Sharing**: Encourage a culture of knowledge sharing among employees to improve service quality and operational efficiency.
2. **Invest in Leadership Training**: Focus on developing knowledge-oriented leadership skills such as mentoring, intellectual stimulation, and innovation.
3. **Empower Employees**: Provide employees with more autonomy to foster creativity and enhance performance.
4. **Encourage Continuous Learning**: Offer opportunities for ongoing training and development to keep employees updated with industry trends.
5. **Implement Feedback Systems**: Regularly gather feedback to evaluate leadership effectiveness and employee satisfaction.
6. **Align Leadership with Goals**: Ensure that leadership practices align with the company's strategic objectives for improved outcomes.

Future Research Directions

1. **Explore KOL's Impact on Job Satisfaction**: Investigate how knowledge-oriented leadership affects employee satisfaction and retention.
2. **Cross-Industry Comparison**: Examine the impact of KOL in different industries to determine its broader applicability.
3. **Longitudinal Studies**: Conduct studies over time to assess the sustained effects of KOL on organizational performance.
4. **Digital Integration**: Study the role of digital tools in enhancing knowledge-oriented leadership practices.
5. **Cultural Influence**: Explore how cultural differences impact the effectiveness of knowledge-oriented leadership globally.

References

Al Ahbabi, A. S., Singh, S. K., Balasubramanian, S., & Gaur, S. S. (2019). Employee perception of impact of knowledge management processes on public sector performance. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 23(2), 351–373.

Al Hakim, L. A. Y., & Hassan, S. (2012). Critical success factors of knowledge management, innovation and organisational performance: An empirical study

of the Iraqi mobile telecommunication sector. *British Journal of Economics, Finance and Management Sciences*, 4, 31–49.

Al Rubaiee, L., Alzubi, H., Hanandeh, R., & Al Ali, R. (2015). Investigating the relationship between knowledge management processes and organizational performance: The mediating effect of organizational innovation. *International Review of Management and Business Research*, 4(4), 989–1009.

Alareefi, N. A. O. M., Abuelhassan, A. E., Khalifa, G. S. A., Nusari, M., & Ameen, A. (2019). Employee's innovative behaviour: Evidence from hospitality industry. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences*, 16, 14–29.

Alharthi, B. A. F. H., Khalifa, G. S. A., Abuelhassan, A. E., Isaac, O., & Al-Shibami, A. H. (2020). Re-engineering university performance: Antecedents and mediating variables. *Journal of Engineering and Applied Sciences*, 15(2), 714–729.

Alharthi, B. A. F. H., Khalifa, G. S. A., Ameen, A., Isaac, O., & Al-Shibami, A. H. (2019). Investigating the influence of strategic planning on university operational performance: The mediating role of organizational commitment in UAE. *Journal of Business Management*, 13, 49–62.

Ali, I., Musawir, A. U., & Ali, M. (2018). Impact of knowledge sharing and absorptive capacity on project performance: The moderating role of social processes. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 22(2), 453–477.

Alkathiri, M. S., Abuelhassan, A. E., Khalifa, G. S. A., Nusari, M., & Ameen, A. (2019). Ethical leadership, affective organizational behaviour and leader-member exchange as predictors for employees performance. *International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering*, 14, 6998–7012.

Alkhateri, A. S., Abuelhassan, A. E., Khalifa, G. S. A., Nusari, M., & Ameen, A. (2018). The impact of perceived supervisor support on employees turnover intention: The mediating role of job satisfaction and affective organizational commitment. *International Business Management*, 12, 477–492.

Alkheyi, A. A. S. A., Khalifa, G. S. A., Ameen, A., Hossain, M. S., Hewedi, M. M., & Nasir, N. S. M. (2020). Strategic leadership practices on team effectiveness: The mediating effect of knowledge sharing in the UAE municipalities. *Academy of Leadership Journal*, 21, 99–112.

Alsaadi, T. A. R. M., Abuelhassan, A. E., Khalifa, G. S. A., Ameen, A., & Nusari, M. (2019). Empowering leadership predictors for employees creativity. *International Business Management*, 13, 119–129.

Anand, A., & Singh, M. D. (2022). The role of knowledge management in the tourism sector. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, ahead-of-print.

Bacha, E. (2014). The relationship between transformational leadership, task performance and job characteristics. *Journal of Management Development*, 33(4), 410–420.

Bennis, W. (2000). *Managing the dream: Reflections on leadership and change*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Books.

Bi, L., Ehrich, J., & Ehrich, L. C. (2012). Confucius as transformational leader: Lessons for ESL leadership. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 26(4), 391–402.

Boyatzis, R., & Boyatzis, R. E. (2009). Competencies as a behavioral approach to emotional intelligence. *Journal of Management Development*, 28(9), 749–770.

Cameron, K. S. (1986). Effectiveness as paradox: Consensus and conflict in conceptions of organizational effectiveness. *Management Science*, 32(5), 539–553.

Cao, Q., & Wei, S. (2020). Knowledge creation and innovation in the tourism sector: Implications for business strategy. *Tourism Economics*, 28(6), 804–820.

Choudhary, A. I., Akhtar, S. A., & Zaheer, A. (2013). Impact of transformational and servant leadership on organizational performance: A comparative analysis. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 116(2), 433–440.

Chu, L.-C., & Lai, C.-C. (2011). A research on the influence of leadership style and job characteristics on job performance among accountants of county and city government in Taiwan. *Public Personnel Management*, 40(2), 101–118.

Dadkhah, V., Hui, H., & Jenatabadi, H. S. (2014). An application of moderation analysis: The situation of school size in the relationship among principal's leadership style, decision making style, and teacher job satisfaction. *International Journal of Research in Business and Technology*, 5(3), 724–729.

Dennis, R. S., Kinzler-Norheim, L., & Bocarnea, M. (2010). Servant leadership theory. In *Servant Leadership* (pp. 169–179). Springer.

Díaz-Morales, J. F., Ferrari, J. R., Díaz, K., & Argumedo, D. (2006). Factorial structure of three procrastination scales with Spanish adult population. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 22, 132–137.

Donate, M. J., & de Pablo, J. D. S. (2015). The role of knowledge-oriented leadership in knowledge management practices and innovation. *Journal of Business Research*, 68(2), 360–370.

Donate, M. J., & Guadamillas, F. (2011). Organizational factors to support knowledge management and innovation. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 15(6), 890–914.

Emrich, C. G. (1999). Context effects in leadership perception. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25(8), 991–1006.

English, L. M., Guthrie, J., Broadbent, J., & Laughlin, R. (2010). Performance audit of the operational stage of long-term partnerships for the private sector provision of public services. *Australian Accounting Review*, 20(1), 64–75.

English, L. M., Guthrie, J., Broadbent, J., & Laughlin, R. (2010). Performance audit of the operational stage of long-term partnerships for the private sector provision of public services. *Australian Accounting Review*, 20(1), 64–75.

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research,* 18(1), 39–50.

Fullwood, R., & Rowley, J. (2017). An investigation of factors affecting knowledge sharing amongst UK academics. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 21(5), 1254–1271.

García-Morales, V. J., Jiménez-Barrionuevo, M. M., & Gutiérrez-Gutiérrez, L. (2012). Transformational leadership influence on organizational performance through organizational learning and innovation. *Journal of Business Research*, 65(7), 1040–1050.

Goh, S. (2009). Knowledge management and organizational performance: An empirical investigation. *International Journal of Tourism Research,* 11(4), 349–357.

Goh, S., & Tan, K. (2022). Knowledge-oriented leadership and competitive advantage in the tourism industry. *Tourism & Hospitality Research*, 16(2), 103–119.

Hogan, S., Soutar, G. N., McColl-Kennedy, J. R., & Sweeney, J. C. (2011). Reconceptualizing professional service firm innovation capability: Scale development. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 40(8), 1264–1273.

Holmberg S. A ,(2000). Systems perspective on supply chain measurements. *International Journal of Physical Distribution and Logistics Management* 2000;30(10):847–68.

Holmberg, S. A. (2000). Systems perspective on supply chain measurements. *International Journal of Physical Distribution and Logistics Management,* 30(10), 847–868.

Hui, H., Wan Mohamed Radzi, C. W. J., Salarzadeh Jenatabadi, H., Abu Kasim, F., & Radu, S. (2013a). Influence of organizational learning and innovation on organizational performance in Asian manufacturing food industry. *Asian Journal of Empirical Research*, 3, 962–971.

Ismail, N. A., & Jenatabadi, H. S. (2014). The influence of firm age on the relationships of airline performance, economic situation and internal operation. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*.

Jarad, I. A., Yusof, N. A., & Shafiei, M. W. M. (2010). The organizational performance of housing developers in Peninsular Malaysia. *International Journal of Housing Markets and Analysis,* 3(2).

Jasimuddin, S. M., Connell, N. A. D., & Klein, J. H. (2006). What motivates organisational knowledge transfer? Some lessons from a UK-based multinational. *Journal of Information and Knowledge Management,* 5(2), 165–171.

Jenatabadi, H. S. (2013). Impact of economic performance on organizational capacity and capability: A case study in airline industry. *International Journal of Business and Management,* 8(17), 112.

Jenatabadi, H. S. (2014). Situation of innovation in the linkage between culture and performance: A mediation analysis of Asian food production industry (March 2014). *Contemporary Engineering Sciences*, 7(7), 323–331.

Jenatabadi, H. S., & Ismail, N. A. (2014). Application of structural equation modelling for estimating airline performance. *Journal of Air Transport Management,* 40, 25–33.

Jenatabadi, H. S. (2015). *An overview of organizational performance index: Definitions and measurements* (May).

Jia, S., Khassawneh, O., Mohammad, T., & Cao, Y. (2024). Knowledge-oriented leadership and project employee performance: The roles of organisational learning capabilities and absorptive capacity. *Current Psychology,* 43(10), 8825–8838.

Kock, N. (2022). *WarpPLS User Manual: Version 8.0*. ScriptWarp Systems.

Koh, S., Tan, J., & Lim, Y. (2021). Knowledge management practices in tourism companies: A comparative study. *Tourism Management Perspectives,* 39(1), 67–76.

Koohang, A., Paliszkiewicz, J., & Goluchowski, J. (2017). The impact of leadership on trust, knowledge management, and organizational performance: A research model. *Industrial Management & Data Systems,* 117(3), 521–537.

Lakshman, C., & Parente, D. (2008). Knowledge-oriented leadership: A key factor in building sustainable competitive advantage. *Journal of Knowledge Management,* 12(2), 33–48.

Lakshman, C., & Parente, R. C. (2008). Supplier-focused knowledge management in the automobile industry and its implications for product performance. *Journal of Management Studies,* 45(2), 317–342.

Lashari, R. H., & Rana, A. H. (2018). The impact of transformational leadership and social interaction on organizational performance in the viewpoint of knowledge management: An empirical study in banking sector of Pakistan. *International Journal of Organizational Leadership,* 7, 383–397.

Li, M., & Chen, L. (2022). Knowledge sharing and innovation in the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management,* 39(4), 15–29.

Li, S., Ragu-Nathan, B., Ragu-Nathan, T. S., & Rao, S. S. (2006). The impact of supply chain management practices on competitive advantage and organizational performance. *Omega,* 34(2), 107–124.

Limsila, K., & Ogunlana, S. O. (2008). Performance and leadership outcome correlates of leadership styles and subordinate commitment. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management,* 15(2), 164–184.

Lin, H. F. (2007). Knowledge sharing and firm innovation capability: An empirical study. *International Journal of Manpower,* 28(3/4), 315–332.

Love, J. H., Roper, S., & Bryson, J. R. (2011). Openness, knowledge, innovation and growth in UK business services. *Research Policy,* 40, 1438–1452.

Mabey, C., Kulich, C. and Lorenzi-Cioldi, F. (2012). Knowledge leadership in global scientific research. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 23 No. 12, pp. 2450-2467.

Manley, S. C., Hair, J. F., Williams, R. I., & McDowell, W. C. (2021). Essential new PLS-SEM analysis methods for your entre-preneurship analytical toolbox. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 17(4), 1805–1825.

Mabey, C., Kulich, C., & Lorenzi-Cioldi, F. (2012). Knowledge leadership in global scientific research. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23(12), 2450–2467.

Manley, S. C., Hair, J. F., Williams, R. I., & McDowell, W. C. (2021). Essential new PLS-SEM analysis methods for your entrepreneurship analytical toolbox. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 17(4), 1805–1825.

Manzoor, A., Zhang, B., & Ma, H. (2023). Knowledge-Oriented Leadership in Powering Team Performance and Sustainable Competitive Advantages through Innovation: Evidence from Higher Education Institutions. *Sustainability*, 15(20), 14715.

Masa'deh, R. E., Shannak, R., Maqableh, M., & Tarhini, A. (2017). The impact of knowledge management on job performance in higher education: The case of

the University of Jordan. *Journal of Enterprise Information Management*, 30(2), 244–262.

Mehmood, A., & Hussain, S. (2017). Knowledge-Oriented Leadership and Its Impact on Organizational Performance. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42(1), 45–58.

Mehmood, K., & Hussain, A. (2017). Knowledge-oriented leadership and innovation: A mediating role of knowledge creation: A case of software industry. In *Proceedings of the 2017 4th International Conference on Systems and Informatics (ICSAI)*.

Mohamed, M. S., Khalifa, G. S. A., Nusari, M., Ameen, A., Al-Shibami, A. H., & Abuelhassan, A. E. (2018). Effect of organizational excellence and employee performance on organizational productivity within healthcare sector in the UAE. *Journal of Engineering and Applied Science*, 13, 6199–6210.

Mohamed Radzi, C. W. J. W., Hui, H., Jenatabadi, H. S., Kasim, F. A., & Radu, S. (2013). The relationship among transformational leadership, organizational learning, and organizational innovation: A case study in Asian manufacturing food industry. *Asian Journal of Empirical Research*, 3(8), 1051–1060.

Mohsenabad, A., & Azadehdel, M. (2016). Knowledge-oriented leadership and organizational success in service sector. *International Journal of Organizational Innovation*, 8(4), 30–42.

Mohsenabad, A. S., & Azadehdel, M. (2016). The impact of knowledge-oriented leadership on innovation performance of manufacturing and commercial companies of Guilan province. *International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies*, 3(1), 884–897.

Munizu, M. (2013). The impact of total quality management practices towards competitive advantage and organizational performance: Case of fishery industry in South Sulawesi Province of Indonesia. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences (PJCSS)*, 7(1), 184–197.

Najmi, K., Kadir, A. R., & Kadir, M. I. A. (2017). Mediation effect of dynamic capability in the relationship between knowledge management and strategic leadership on organizational performance accountability. *International Journal of Law and Management*, 60(2), 517–529.

Naqshbandi, M. M., & Jasimuddin, S. M. (2018). Knowledge-oriented leadership: The role in knowledge management and organizational performance. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 22(4), 701–715.

Naqshbandi, M. M., & Jasimuddin, S. M. (2018). Knowledge-oriented leadership and open innovation: Role of knowledge management capability in France-based multinationals. *International Business Review*, 27(3), 701–713.

Norulkamar, U., & Hatamleh, A. (2014). A review of knowledge sharing barriers among academic staff - A Malaysian perspective. *Sains Humanika*, 2.

Obiwuru, T. C., Okwu, A. T., Akpa, V. O., & Nwankwere, I. A. (2011). Effects of leadership style on organizational performance: A survey of selected small scale enterprises in Ikosi-Ketu council development area of Lagos State, Nigeria. *Australian Journal of Business Management Research*, 1(7), 100.

Radzi, C. W., Jenatabadi, H. S., Hui, H., Kasim, F. A., & Radu, S. (2013). Explore linkage between knowledge management and organizational

performance in Asian food manufacturing industry. *International Journal of Asian Social Science*, 3(8), 1753–1769.

Rehman, M. A., & Iqbal, M. (2020). The impact of knowledge-oriented leadership on organizational effectiveness in hospitality industry. *Journal of Business Research*, 18(5), 115–128.

Rehman, U. U., & Iqbal, A. (2020). Nexus of knowledge-oriented leadership, knowledge management, innovation and organizational performance in higher education. *Business Process Management Journal*, 26(6), 1731–1758.

Ribiere, V. M., & Sitar, A. S. (2003). Critical role of leadership in nurturing a knowledge-supporting culture. *Knowledge Management Research & Practice*, 1(1), 39–48.

Ryan, G., Spencer, L. M., & Bernhard, U. (2012). Development and validation of a customized competency-based questionnaire: Linking social, emotional, and cognitive competencies to business unit profitability. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, 19(1), 90–103.

Sahibzada, A., Zafar, A., & Shah, R. (2020). Knowledge-oriented leadership: A catalyst for organizational innovation in tourism. *Tourism and Hospitality Management*, 27(3), 211–227.

Sahibzada, U. F., Cai, J., Latif, K. F., Shafait, Z., & Sahibzada, H. F. (2020). Interpreting the impact of knowledge management processes on organizational performance in Chinese higher education: Mediating role of knowledge worker productivity. *Studies in Higher Education*.

Sánchez-Rodríguez, C., González, M., & Rodríguez, R. (2021). Employee engagement and organizational performance in the hospitality industry. *Journal of Service Research*, 31(3), 233–245.

Schulz, M., & Jobe, L. A. (2001). Codification and tactiness as knowledge management strategies: An empirical exploration. *Journal of High Technology Management Research*, 12(1), 139–165.

Silva, A. (2014). What do we really know about leadership? *Journal of Business Studies Quarterly*, 5(4), 1–4.

Sousa, M., & van Dierendonck, D. (2014). Servant leadership and engagement in a merge process under high uncertainty. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 27(6), 877–899.

Stock, G. N., Greis, N. P., & Kasarda, J. D. (2000). Enterprise logistics and supply chain structure: The role of fit. *Journal of Operations Management*, 18(5), 531–547.

Sun, R. C., & Hui, E. K. (2012). Cognitive competence as a positive youth development construct: A conceptual review. *The Scientific World Journal*, Article ID 210953, 1–7.

Tan, C. N.-L. (2016). Enhancing knowledge sharing and research collaboration among academics: The role of knowledge management. *Higher Education*, 71(4), 525–556.

Tan, C. N.-L., & Noor, M. S. (2013). Knowledge management enablers, knowledge sharing and research collaboration: A study of knowledge management at research universities in Malaysia. *Asian Journal of Technology Innovation*, 21(2), 251–276.

Tomal, D. R., & Jones, K. J. (2015). A comparison of core competencies of women and men leaders in the manufacturing industry. *The Coastal Business Journal*, 14(1), 13–25.

Treacy, M., & Wiersema, F. (1995). *The discipline of market leaders: Choose your customers, narrow your focus, dominate your market*. Addison-Wesley.

Tsai, W. H., & Chou, W. C. (2009). Selecting management systems for sustainable development in SMEs: A novel hybrid model based on DEMATEL, ANP, and

ZOGP. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 36(2), 1444–1458. Tubigi, M., & Alshawi, S. (2015). The impact of knowledge management processes on organisational performance. *Journal of Enterprise Information Management*, 28(2), 167–185.

Uhl-Bien, M., Marion, R., & McKelvey, B. (2007). Complexity leadership theory: Shifting leadership from the industrial age to the knowledge era. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18(4), 298–318.

Vickery, S., Calantone, R., & Droge, C. (1999). Supply chain flexibility: An empirical study. *Journal of Supply Chain Management*, 35(3), 16–24.

Yamin, S., Gunasekruan, A., & Mavondo, F. T. (1999). Relationship between generic strategy, competitive advantage and firm performance: An empirical analysis. *Technovation*, 19(8), 507–518.

Yasir, M., Majid, A., & Yasir, M. (2017). Nexus of knowledge-management enablers, trust and knowledge-sharing in research universities. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, 9(3), 424–438.

Yusr, M. M., Mokhtar, S. S. M., Othman, A. R., & Sulaiman, Y. (2017). Does interaction between TQM practices and knowledge management processes enhance the innovation performance? *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, 34(7), 955–974.

Zhang, Q. Y. (2001). *Technology infusion enabled value chain flexibility: A learning and capability-based perspective* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Toledo).

Zhang, Y., Li, S., & Zhang, H. (2023). The role of knowledge-oriented leadership in enhancing organizational performance in tourism. *Journal of Tourism Management*, 47(2), 112–125.