

## **Intelligence and Management: The Moderating Power of Knowledge-Sharing**

Nasir Ali<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Humera Amin<sup>2</sup>, Ibrar Hussain<sup>3</sup>, Dr Rahim Jan<sup>4</sup>, Ms. Anum Aftab<sup>5</sup>, Shams Ur Rahman<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> PhD Scholar HR, SZABIST University Islamabad Campus, Email: [nasirali0816@gmail.com](mailto:nasirali0816@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup> Assistant Professor Dept of Agricultural Extension and Rural Studies, University of Sargodha, Sargodha  
Email: [Humera.amin@uos.edu.pk](mailto:Humera.amin@uos.edu.pk). (Corresponding Author-1)

<sup>3</sup> MPhil Economics, Qurtuba University of Management Science and Information Technology Phase 3, Hayatabad, Peshawar Pakistan Email: [ibrarhussain221990@gmail.com](mailto:ibrarhussain221990@gmail.com)

<sup>4</sup> Assistant Professor Department of Library and Information Sciences Khushal Khan Khattak University Karak Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Pakistan, Email: [rahimjanrajar@gmail.com](mailto:rahimjanrajar@gmail.com)

<sup>5</sup> The Educators School Dhamial Campus, Rwp.Cantt. Designation: Quality Assurance Officer Email: [anummalik251995@gmail.com](mailto:anummalik251995@gmail.com)

<sup>6</sup> IBMS, FMCS, The University of Agriculture Peshawar (Corresponding Author-2)  
Email: [sayedshams@aup.edu.pk](mailto:sayedshams@aup.edu.pk)

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.70670/sra.v2i2.177>

### **Abstract**

The purpose of this research is to assess the effect of Intelligence and Management Performance with moderate Role of Knowledge Sharing Culture in the Pharmaceutical Sector in KP. Using a cluster sampling method, the sample was taken from the population of the study, which consisted of all of the top management individuals working in the numerous pharmaceutical companies. The findings of the study indicate that all the independent variables of intelligences have a significant relationship with managerial performance (i.e. Emotional, Cultural, Cognitive and Social). In addition, the emotional intelligence and culture intelligence moderate the relationship of Knowledge sharing culture and Managerial Performance of Pharma. Moreover, the social and cognitive do not moderate the relationship of Knowledge sharing culture and Managerial Performance. It is recommended that senior management should adopt such policies that can enhance the knowledge sharing culture by attaining competitive advantage.

**Keywords:** Knowledge Sharing Culture, Pharma Companies, Performance, Emotional Intelligence.

### **Background of the study**

The globalization of competitive service marketplaces has heightened the significance of management intelligence. This is particularly accurate when technological progress has rendered corporate competition more unpredictable. Due to the revolution, economic crises, industrial developments, and technical advances, enterprises have migrated from production to services. This change necessitates cognitive abilities to enhance performance and excel in business management (Aslam, Ilyas, Imran, & Rahman, 2016). To solve challenges, set smart and challenging corporate goals, support strategies to reach goals, assign tasks, and enhance team coordination, successful managers concentrate on integrating intelligence talents through knowledge sharing. Thorndike (1920) showed that mechanical managers' lack of social intelligence expertise stopped the most useful machine in a manufacturing organization from working. Organizations have organized intelligence skill training sessions to assess management performance pre- and post-training and to ascertain the impact of these sessions. Intellectual competencies are necessary for this process.

The institutions can profit from these intelligence competencies when information is shared. Xue, Bradley, and Liang (2011) characterize knowledge-sharing culture as the dissemination of information, skills, and expertise among peers, colleagues, and others. Culture that supports information sharing increases organizational performance, learning, skills, competences, innovation, and transformation. To effectively deploy information technology and cultivate a knowledge-based culture, an organization needs modify its structure, culture, processes, and policies (Gallupe, & Zweig, 2014; Park & Kim, 2015, Ullah, 2018). Unproductive infrastructure, an unsocial environment, injustice, insufficient and outdated knowledge, poor trust, an unsupportive atmosphere, and an organization's reward system impede knowledge-sharing. Cummings (2003) asserts that a culture of knowledge-sharing facilitates the retention and dissemination of information inside an organization, hence fostering human capital to adapt to dynamic business developments. Information technology and organizational culture can increase employee and company performance. Wang, Sharma, and Cao (2016) discovered that a culture fostering knowledge sharing can aid employees in improving their intellect and performance. Following this backdrop, successful organizations like American Express, Egon Zehnder International, and the US Air Force have organized knowledge-sharing events that highlight staff intelligence. Scholars in management, medicine, education, psychotherapy, and psychology have concentrated on cultural, cognitive, interpersonal, which enhances managerial performance (Aslam et al., 2016). Crowne (2009) conducted a literature review and identified a scarcity of research examining the impact of emotional, cognitive, social, and cultural intelligence on management job performance. Numerous research have investigated the relationship between emotional intelligence and leadership results. No research has investigated the correlation between cognitive abilities and managerial success, particularly inside pharmaceutical firms. This study investigates the impact of several forms of intelligence on management efficacy in the workplace. This research will address this knowledge deficiency. It also analyses the impact of a knowledge-sharing culture on multiple intelligences and managerial effectiveness. The management of knowledge and leadership approach influence organizational performance. Coffie, Boateng, and Alhassan (2023) determined that Leadership Style did not serve as a moderator between Knowledge Management and Organizational Performance. This study investigates the impact of several intelligences on management performance. The project would investigate the interaction between knowledge-sharing cultures, various types of intelligence, and pharmaceutical management performance in Khyber Pakhtun Khwa.

## **Literature Review**

Emotional intelligence is defined as the capacity to identify, comprehend, and utilize employees' emotions to enhance workplace performance. Social intelligence refers to the ability to recognize, comprehend, and utilize the emotions of others to enhance team performance. Boyatzis et al. (2008) characterize intelligence as encompassing social, emotional, and cognitive dimensions. Social intelligence include networking, emotional intelligence involves intrapersonal qualities such as flexibility, and cognitive intelligence pertains to problem-solving and systematic reasoning. Wong and Law (2002) indicate that educators, managers, and psychologists are concerned with emotional and social intelligence. These practitioners' priorities professional accomplishment and performance over the skills themselves. Social and emotional intelligence enables individuals to address environmental challenges and achieve success in life. Intelligence and Managerial Performance characterizes intelligence as social, cognitive, and emotional. Aslam et al. (2016) and Boyatzis et al. (2008) assert that research enhances workplace efficacy. Emotionally intelligent managers can more effectively navigate the complexities of an unpredictable workplace. Boyatzis, Boyatzis, and Ratti (2009) found that effective managers promote information exchange and innovative efforts to gain a competitive advantage.

7 Multiple research (Petrides, Frederickson, & Furnham, 2004; Wirtz & Mattila, 2004) have identified no correlation between emotional intelligence and performance. Boyatzis, Stubbs, and Taylor (2002) associate cognitive intelligence to the ability to create a problem-solving mentality, theory building, sense-making, information collecting and analysis, experiential learning, and efficient technology use. Chan and Schmitt (2002), Borman and Motowidlo (1997), and Schmidt and Hunter (1998) investigated the impact of cognitive intelligence on organizational citizenship behaviours and performance. Numerous research have investigated the extent to which cognitive intelligence enhances performance through the use of technical skills, information, and processes (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997). Cultural intelligence has garnered attention owing to heightened workforce diversity and variations in languages, values, practices, education, backgrounds, and standards. According to Crowne (2009), social, cultural, and emotional intelligence enhance workplace performance for both managers and employees. Imran et al. (2016) and Zakaria et al. (2004) discovered that organizational culture and information technology can enhance employee success and corporate performance. Reid (2003) associates knowledge generation and dissemination with a culture of information-sharing, characterized by a collective set of values, beliefs, and attitudes. The culture of sharing knowledge, skills, and experiences among friends and colleagues enhances research intelligence and management performance (Xue et al., 2011). This culture facilitates the creation, dissemination, and use of knowledge, hence enhancing staff performance (Gurteen, 1999). In a dynamic commercial environment, an organization must maintain and enhance its competitive advantage. A culture of recognition can enhance problem-solving, decision-making, efficiency, innovation, and cost-effectiveness. The culture of information sharing in Pakistan and other rising nations poses numerous economic challenges. These challenges encompass inefficient infrastructure, unsupportive environments, inequity, obsolete knowledge, diminished trust, and insufficient cultural and reward systems. To my knowledge, no research has investigated whether a culture of acknowledgement may enhance employees' cognitive capacities in managing workplace performance. Richard E. Boyatzis (1982), Earley and Ang (2003), and Morand (2001) assert that managers in dynamic organizations must comprehend, identify, and utilize their own emotions in the workplace, cultivate robust relationships, communicate and interact proficiently with others, and grasp the behaviours, norms, and values of others. Richard E. Boyatzis' 1982 definition of a competent manager is an individual possessing distinct attributes that facilitate success or outstanding performance

### **Emotional Intelligence**

Emotional intelligence was initially introduced by Salovey and Mayer (1993, 1995; Salovey and Mayer, 1990) and subsequently popularised by Goleman (1995). This study established emotional intelligence as a factor that, with IQ, may predict academic, professional, and life success through the examination of quantitative patterns and capacity. Practical intelligence, which examines intelligent action in real-world contexts, serves as the foundation for emotional intelligence. Academic intelligence is employed to attain both short- and long- term objectives, while practical intelligence is utilized to address issues impacting one's emotions, welfare, requirements, aspirations, and way of life. Emotional intelligence is a bundle of talents and dispositions connected to moods and emotions (one's own and others') that assist us negotiate social situations. Consequently, practical intelligence encompasses emotional intelligence. Salovey and Mayer (1990) assert that "emotional intelligence" entails the processing of internal emotional information and is essential for effective social functioning. They identify three cognitive processes that pertain to emotional information: assessing and articulating one's own and others' emotions, regulating them, and employing them to attain objectives. These processes are associated with self- presentation, mood regulation, and empathy within the fields of psychology and social psychology.

### **Importance of Emotional Intelligence and Management:**

Emotional intelligence seems to enhance professional success (Goleman, 2001). If we accept that "management skills lie at the heart of leadership" (Whetten and Cameron, 2001, page 15) and that emotional intelligence may contribute to effective leadership, this is essential. A seminal study by George (2000) demonstrated the role of emotional intelligence in leadership effectiveness. These encompass the capacity to recognise and articulate emotions, utilise emotions to enhance cognitive processing and decision-making, and acquire knowledge about and regulate emotions. This study highlights that, although it is theoretically vital to demonstrate the impact of each component on performance, it is more precise to assert that talents manifest in groups and clusters, mutually reinforcing one another (Goleman, 2001). This warrants consideration. Boyatzis et al. (2000) and Goleman (2001) assert that emotional intelligence encompasses this "critical mass" of competencies.

### **CQ Refers to Cultural Intelligence**

Real world" intelligence encompasses social intelligence (Thorndike and Stein, 1937), emotional intelligence (Mayer et al., 2000), and practical intelligence. This growing interest in "real world" intelligence includes content-domain intelligence. Cultural intelligence underscores intercultural contexts to illustrate globalization (Earley and Ang, 2003). CQ also highlights a category. According to Schmidt and Hunter (2000), general intelligence is defined as cultural intelligence (CQ), which encompasses the capacity to comprehend, reason, and operate effectively within culturally varied environments. Multifaceted Cultural Intelligence! Sternberg (1986) offered an integrative framework that posited several intelligence 'loci' within an individual. Metacognition, cognition, and motivation are neurobiological processes. Nonetheless, overt actions constitute behavioural capacities. Cognitive intelligence refers to the regulation of one's cognitive processes, namely the methods by which individuals acquire and analyse information. This concept is comparable to Ackerman's (1996) intelligence-as-knowledge concept, which highlights knowledge's relevance in the intellect. Cognitive intelligence encompasses knowledge structures. Ceci (1996) characterizes motivational intelligence as the capacity to concentrate and sustain energy. This concept also acknowledges that motivational capacities are essential for resolving "real world" issues. Sternberg (1986) characterizes "behavioural intelligence" as "what individuals do rather than what they contemplate." Earley and Ang (2003) delineate cultural intelligence (CQ) as comprising metacognitive, cognitive, motivational, and behavioural dimensions that are crucial in culturally heterogeneous settings. This was accomplished utilizing Sternberg's many intelligence loci. Humans employ "metacognitive cultural intelligence" (CQ) to acquire and comprehend culture. Information and regulation of culturally-related cognitive processes are encompassed (Flavell, 1979). Relevant abilities include building, monitoring, and changing mental models of cultural norms for nations or groups. Individuals with elevated metacognitive cultural intelligence are aware of others' cultural preferences before to and throughout interactions. Brislin et al. (2006) and Triandis (2006) found that people question cultural norms and update their mental models during and after interactions. Metacognitive cognitive intelligence pertains to advanced cognitive processes. Cultural intelligence (CQ) refers to the comprehension of the norms, behaviours, and traditions of many cultures, derived from education and personal experience. This encompasses understanding the economic, legal, and social systems of various cultures and subcultures (Triandis, 1994) as well as cultural value frameworks (Hofstede, 2001). Brislin et al. (2006) demonstrated that individuals with elevated cognitive cultural intelligence can discern cultural similarities and differences. Motivational cultural intelligence (CQ) is the capacity to engage in learning and functioning across culturally varied environments. DeNisi's expectancy-value theory of motivation posits that such motivational capacities "offer agentic control over affect, cognition, and behaviour that aids in achieving goals." This perspective is supported by Kanfer & Heggestad (1997). According to Pritchard (2006) and Eccles and Wigfield (2002), the direction and magnitude of energy allocated to a task are contingent upon success expectations and

the value of achievement. Individuals with high motivated cultural intelligence possess an innate interest in intercultural interactions and exhibit confidence in their capacity to navigate diverse cultural contexts (Deci and Ryan, 1985; Bandura, 2002). Behavioural cultural intelligence refers to the capacity to employ suitable verbal and nonverbal responses when interacting with individuals from diverse cultures. Hall (1959) emphasized that the cognitive capacity for cultural awareness and motivation must be supported by the ability to execute suitable verbal and nonverbal acts in accordance with situational cultural norms. This is essential in the workplace. A diverse and flexible range of behaviours is required for this. Individuals with elevated behavioural cultural intelligence (CQ) exhibit appropriate conduct, as noted by Gudykunst et al. (1988). These behaviours are founded on their substantial verbal and nonverbal skills, encompassing culturally appropriate phrases, intonation, gestures, and facial expressions. Consider CQ as a multidimensional aggregate. Early and Ang (2003) characterise cultural intelligence (CQ) as comprising four distinct components essential for effective functioning and management in varied cultural contexts. The elements of cultural intelligence may not correlate with job happiness. Consequently, overall CQ is a composite multidimensional construct that, as per Law et al. (1998), consists of two components: dimensions that are conceptualized at the same level as the overall construct and dimensions that constitute it. CQ encompasses metacognitive, cognitive, motivational, and behavioural competencies. Together, these skills produce CQ.

### **Conceptual Distinctions of CQ**

We analyse and juxtapose cultural intelligence (CQ) with personality traits and other forms of intelligence, while also evaluating intercultural competency frameworks. This is undertaken to enhance the understanding of CQ. Character. The competencies required for success in culturally varied contexts are referred to as "cultural intelligence" (CQ). It contrasts with stable personality traits, which characterize an individual's consistent behaviours throughout time and across various contexts (Costa and McCrae, 1992). Given that temperament affects behaviours and experience, cultural intelligence (CQ) should be associated with personality qualities. Ang et al. (2006) established discriminant validity between the Big Five personality traits and the four dimensions of cultural intelligence (CQ). They demonstrated this and indicated that Specific personality qualities are associated with cognitive intelligence. All four CQ traits are linked to creativity, invention, and adventure (Costa and McCrae, 1992). Openness to experience is associated with all four elements of cultural intelligence (CQ). Alternative intelligences are present. Cognitive intelligence (CQ) is derived from the many intelligences proposed by Sternberg and Detterman (1986), rendering it analogous yet distinct. General mental ability (GMA: Schmidt and Hunter, 2000) and emotional intelligence (EI: Law et al., 2004; Mayer et al., 2000) are two forms of intelligence frequently examined in management research. Both forms of intelligence are utilised in management research. Mayer & al. (2000) juxtapose cognitive IQ (CQ) with alternative intelligences, as it constitutes a compilation of abilities rather than favored actions. These structures possess unique powers. General mental capacity, emphasizing cognitive ability, is not adapted to numerous situations (Schmidt and Hunter, 2000), such as culturally varied experiences, and excludes behavioural and motivational intelligence. Managing one's emotions is a major component of emotional intelligence. Similar to CQ, it transcends cognitive and mental capabilities. It underscores the capacity to perceive and regulate one's emotions independent of cultural background, as contrast to cultural intelligence. The capacity to encode and interpret emotions within one's own culture, due to the symbolic and historical transmission of emotional cues (Fitch, 1998), does not automatically extend to other cultures (Earley and Ang, 2003). Consequently, an individual possessing elevated emotional intelligence in one culture may lack emotional intelligence in another. CQ, conversely, encompasses a broad array of competencies applicable to culturally diverse contexts.

### **Intercultural Competencies.**

The lack of clear definitions and inadequate integration results in a disjointed compilation of competencies devoid of theoretical coherence in this study (Yamazaki and Kayes, 2004). This research has limitations despite the extensive body of literature on intercultural competencies (Page, 2004). The four components of CQ should facilitate the organization and integration of intercultural skills research. CQ is expressly founded on the hypothesis of multiple intelligences (Earley and Ang, 2003; Sternberg and Detterman, 1986). CQ rectifies these deficiencies by examining Paige's (2004) intercultural competency scales. Most assessments of intercultural competency encompass personality traits and abilities. Examples include the Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory (CCAI), World Mindedness Inventory (CCWM), Cultural Shock Inventory (CSI), Intercultural Adjustment Potential Scale (ICAPS), Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI), Multicultural Awareness-Knowledge-Skills Survey (MAKSS), Overseas Assignment Inventory (OAI), and Prospector. Although personality qualities are crucial for cross-cultural adjustment, competency models with fixed dispositional elements are less precise and valid. Secondly, although some scales contain questions akin to CQ, none are grounded in modern theories of intelligence or assess the four components of intelligence. Cultural intelligence is universally prevalent throughout various civilizations. Cultural intelligence, thus, diverges from cultural competency models such as the Culture-exclusive Assimilator, which emphasize knowledge or abilities pertinent to specific countries. Cultural intelligence (CQ) is conceptually separate from personality traits, other forms of intelligence, and intercultural abilities. Defining CQ as a type of intelligence elucidates its characteristics as a collection of adaptable abilities that can be enhanced over time (Earley and Peterson, 2004). Expatriate and cross-cultural literature underscores the importance of flexibility (Black and Stephens, 1989). Recently, scholars have advocated for and investigated the need for broader efficacy conceptualizations in culturally different contexts (Caligiuri, 1997). Shaffer et al. (2006) investigated the cognitive, affective, and behavioural components of intercultural effectiveness. Employing their methods, we investigate the connections among cultural intelligence, cultural judgment and decision-making (cognitive outcome), cultural adaptation and well-being (affective outcome), and task performance (behavioural outcome).

### **Judgment and Decision-Making Influenced by Cultural Factors**

The phrase "judgement and decision making" (JDM) encompasses the human cognitive processes involved in decision-making. Einhorn and Hogarth (1981) advocate for JDM tasks that necessitate deliberate reasoning, evidence evaluation, and comparative study of alternatives. Our research investigates cross-cultural decision-making (CJDM). Mendenhall and Oddou (1985) assert that cross-cultural decision-making (CJDM) must comprehend cultural concerns and provide culturally relevant interpretations to achieve effectiveness. Cognitive and metacognitive cognitive quotient should be prioritised in cognitive judgement and decision-making evaluations, as the latter underscores analytical proficiency. Cognitive cultural intelligence should enhance cross-jurisdictional decision-making efficiency. This is due to individuals with higher cognitive cultural intelligence possessing more intricate cultural schemas, which are mental representations of social interactions within cultural groups (Khattak, 2022; Triandis, 1994). Schemas facilitate the comprehension of conceptually driven content; thus, individuals with comprehensive cultural schemas should be capable of identifying and elucidating the principal concerns of CJDM. Metacognitive cognitive intelligence (CQ) refers to the capacity to reflect on one's own thought processes, predict the cultural inclinations of others, and adapt mental frameworks during and following cross-cultural interactions. The efficacy of CJDM should exhibit a positive correlation with metacognitive CQ. Understanding variations in mental processes leads individuals to form

isomorphic attributions. Interpreting conduct from the actor's viewpoint and attributing the same meaning as intended by the actor is termed isomorphic attribution (Triandis, 2006). Individuals with elevated metacognitive cultural intelligence comprehend others and make superior cultural decisions by recognising cultural stereotypes while incorporating distinct individual characteristics. These characteristics encompass cultural diversity and behavioural variation across time and context. We are unable to forecast the relationships between motivational cultural intelligence (CQ), behavioural CQ, and the success of cross-cultural judgement and decision-making (CJDM) due to the lack of attention on energy channelling or appropriate actions in cultural concern analysis. The procedure is cultural adaptation. Relocating to new cultures often presents strange and perplexing customs and behaviours, resulting in stress. Research on cross-cultural interactions highlights the significance of cultural adaptation (Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005). Searle and Ward (1990) characterise cultural adaptation as encompassing social adjustment and psychological well-being. Shaffer et al. (2006) assert that cultural adaptation involves subjective assessments that influence affect, resulting in an emotional consequence. Due to the potential unpleasantness of cross-cultural encounters (Mendenhall & Oddou, 1985),

intelligence are essential for cultural adaptation. A meta-analysis conducted by Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al. (2005) demonstrated that self-efficacy and interpersonal skills affect expatriate adjustment. Motivational cultural intelligence should enhance cultural adaptability. Higher motivational CQ persons are naturally interested in diverse cultures and anticipate to excel in multicultural environments. Bandura's social cognitive theory (Bandura, 2002) posits that persons who initiate, persist, and enhance their efforts are more likely to achieve success. Epel et al. (1999) discovered that enhanced effectiveness beliefs fostered engagement, perseverance, and adaptation under challenging circumstances. Behavioural cultural intelligence refers to the capacity to employ suitable verbal and nonverbal reactions in various cultural settings. Cultural adaptation is linked to an individual's sense of belonging and wellbeing in a specific environment; thus, those with the ability to modify their conduct (behavioural CQ) are likely to exhibit greater cultural adaptability. Goffman (1959) posits that individuals engage in impression management to enhance their self-image. Due to the varying standards of suitable behaviour among cultures (Hall, 1959; Triandis, 1994; Khattak, 2021), it is essential to exhibit a diverse range of behaviours to create favourable impressions and foster relationships with individuals from different cultural backgrounds. Adaptable individuals integrate more well, cause fewer offences, and adjust more proficiently to novel circumstances. As cognitive abilities do not consistently manifest in actions and behaviours, we do not anticipate correlations between meta cognitive IQ, cognitive CQ, and cultural adaptation. Hall's (1993) research on Foreign Service employees revealed that cognitive training did not facilitate cultural adjustment.

### **Task Performance**

Task performance is contingent upon knowledge, skills, abilities, and the motivation to engage in role-specific behaviours, such as formal job responsibilities (Campbell, 1999). This is accomplished by implementing these factors. Katz and Kahn (1978) base performance appraisal on work performance. Cultural values influence role expectations and views. Stone-Romero et al. (2003) posited that individuals from diverse cultures frequently obtain unfavorable performance evaluations due to a lack of comprehension regarding cultural variances in role expectations, resulting in noncompliance. The four CQ variables are anticipated to enhance cognitive understanding, motivation, and role-related actions. This is due to the variability of cultural norms for role-specific behaviours. The initial subject is cognitive cultural intelligence (CQ). Complex cultural schemas should help people comprehend their role expectations. Individuals possessing a comprehensive mental representation of culturally rooted social interactions are more inclined to exhibit suitable behaviours and are more cognizant of changes in role expectations. We shall then

discuss metacognitive cognitive capacities and task performance. Individuals with advanced metacognitive competitive intelligence are adept at recognizing when and how to apply cultural information. Instead of employing their own knowledge frameworks, people choose from a range depends on the occasion. They possess a superior comprehension of the suitable behaviours for specific roles in culturally different contexts. Highly motivated culturally intelligent individuals are expected to excel as they concentrate on understanding position needs (Stone-Romero et al., 2003). This remains accurate even when cultural differences render role sender cues ambiguous. Persistence enhances opportunity for input. Individuals that are active and persistent are more inclined to engage in novel activities and enhance their performance. Ultimately, task performance ought to enhance with behavioural cultural intelligence. Individuals with elevated behavioural cultural intelligence can modify their verbal and nonverbal conduct to accommodate the demands of others. Self-presentation aligned with role expectations aims to avert misunderstandings and enhance work efficacy (Goffman, 1959, Khattak, 2021). Shaffer et al. (2006) shown that behavioural flexibility enhances cross-cultural performance. Based on the aforementioned rationale, all four CQ features should boost work performance.

## **Methodology of the Research**

### **Research Design**

This study is to investigate the causes and implications of varied intelligence skills on management performance within the pharmaceutical sector of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. The ontological and epistemological assumptions assume the existence of a self-contained world, the development of hypotheses that are founded on previously articulated theories, and the acquisition of knowledge that is both acceptable and impartial through the use of a variety of human senses. Burns and Grove (1993) and Robson (2002) both state that this will be an associational study because its objective is to determine whether or not there are any correlations between the hypotheses that have been offered. For the purpose of investigating the theoretical framework, this research used a positivistic approach by applying deductive reasoning. Since cross-sectional research has multiple advantages, including the capacity to rapidly get data from a large population, it will only be necessary to collect data once. These advantages include efficiency, cost-effectiveness, and the ability to collect data from a large population.

### **Population and Sampling Procedure**

All senior management personnel from KP's several pharmaceutical companies participated in the poll. Cluster sampling was employed to choose pharmaceutical businesses for this study. Cluster sampling was employed to choose the KP for data collection. Few. The selection process will randomly choose Area Managers, Middle Managers, and Operational Managers. The selection of 150 management personnel will determine the sample size. Thompson (2012) emphasised fundamental random sampling. Given that all demographic components hold equal significance, the sample size effectively reflects the population.

### **Instrumentation**

A questionnaire technique will focus on scales. These renowned scales can be implemented and adapted via Delphi. Emotional and social intelligence will be assessed utilising the study conducted by Bar On, Tranel, Denburg, and Bechara (2003). The scale will comprise four subscales: general mood, stress management, interpersonal adaptation, and interpersonal relations. The Wechsler cognitive IQ measures (2008) will be modified for this investigation. Nonetheless, the cultural intelligence measure developed by Ang et al. in 2007 will be utilised. The cultural intelligence scale comprises four sub-scales, in addition to behavioural, metacognitive, cognitive, and motivational strategies. A scale from prior research (Guentel, Surprenant, & Bubeck, 1984; Igbaria & Tan, 1997) was employed to assess managerial effectiveness in the pharmaceutical



business. The Gold and Malhotra (2001) scale will evaluate knowledge exchange. The research hypotheses were evaluated by multiple regression analysis (MRA). The Aguinis (2004) moderation test will be employed alongside the Aiken, West, and Reno (1991) interaction term to ascertain moderation outcomes.

### Methodology for Data collection

This research included a self-administered questionnaire. Demographic questions and ratings for all variables were included in this questionnaire. The surveys were segmented into seven sections to prevent confusion. This pamphlet also had diverse rules at the beginning of each segment. Section 1 enquired about the demographics of the survey participants. The second portion assessed emotional intelligence. The third portion assessed social intelligence. The fourth section had cognitive intelligence questions. Section 5 assessed cultural intelligence. Section 6 enquiries evaluated managerial performance. Section 7, the concluding section, assessed the culture of information sharing. All issued questionnaires were in English. Research indicates that the English language scale is safely applicable in Pakistan's higher education sector (Raja & Johns 2010). This is despite Pakistan's non-English official language. All higher education institutes in Pakistan instruct in English. The cover letter noted that the research is scientific and attempts to improve employee performance by expanding understanding of key areas. Participants were informed of the questioner's anonymity and that the information would just be utilized for academic reasons to acquire precise data. To ensure anonymity, respondents were prohibited from identifying themselves or their employers on the questionnaire. Data was acquired by in-person paper-and-pencil surveys.

### Data Analysis Methods

After the collection of data reliability analysis, descriptive analysis and regression analysis was carried out. Reliability Analysis is discussed in this section below, while descriptive analysis, correlation and regression analysis was discussed in subsequent section.

**4- Data Analysis (Result and Discussions) Table 4.1 Reliability measures**

Variable	No. of Items	Alpha Score	Reliability
Emotional Intelligence	33	0.777	Reliable
Managerial performance	8	0.759	Reliable
Social Intelligence	21	0.798	Reliable
Cognitive Intelligence	20	0.775	Reliable
Culture Intelligence	20	0.766	Reliable
Knowledge Sharing Culture	7	0.728	Reliable

Table 4.1 represents the reliability analysis of all the scale used in present study. Table 4.5 shows that all scale used in present study were found to be quite reliable with alpha value for Emotional Intelligence was '0.777' alpha value for Managerial performance was 0.759 and Social Intelligence was 0.798 and alpha value for Cognitive Intelligence, culture intelligence and knowledge sharing culture was 0.775, 0.766 and 0.728 respectively.

### Regression Analyses

Regression analysis evaluates the relationships between variables and forecasts future values.

Regressing the dependent variable on the independent variable facilitates the estimation of its dependence. Correlation analysis assesses the link between Variables X and Y. Regression analysis elucidates the expectations of Y based on X data. Regression analysis can be elucidated by the regression line and the unaccounted components when variables exhibit a linear relationship. Kothari (2004) employs the statistical coefficient  $R^2$  to illustrate the impact of the linear relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable on the dependent variable.

**Table 4.2: Relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Managerial Performance**

Model	Un.Std Coff		Sig-Lev	
	B	Std. Error	t-ratio	Sig.
(Constant)	-.002	.269	-0.007	.994
Emotional Intelligence	0.912	.092	9.930	0.000

Dependent variable: Managerial Performance:  $F = 98.60$ ,  $P = 0.000$ ,  $R^2 = 0.40$

Table 4.2 assesses management and emotional intelligence by regression analysis. The model precisely represents the data. An R-squared value of 40% indicates that emotional intelligence accounts for 40% of management performance. A one percent enhancement in emotional intelligence could elevate managerial efficiency by 90%, with a significance level of 0.912. There was a significant relationship between management effectiveness and emotional intelligence (0.000,  $p < 0.05$ ). Their connection is essential. We acknowledged that effective management significantly correlates with emotional intelligence. This study corroborates the findings of Wong and Law (2002), Aslam et al. (2016), and Boyatzis (2008) that emotional intelligence enhances managerial effectiveness.

**Table 4.3: Relationship between Social Intelligence and Managerial Performance**

Model	Un-std Coff		Sig-Lev	
	B	Std. Error	t-ratio	Sig.
(Constant)	.721	.299	2.413	.017
Social Intelligence	.659	.101	6.500	0.000

Dependent variable: Managerial Performance:  $F = 42.25$ ,  $P = 0.000$ ,  $R^2 = 0.22$

Table 4.3 presents a regression analysis of social intelligence and managerial performance. The F value of 42.25 in Table 4.7, with  $p = 0.000 < 0.05$ , indicates that the model effectively aligns with the data. The R-squared value is 0.22, signifying that social intelligence accounts for 22% of the variance in management performance. The value of B was 0.659, signifying that a 1% improvement in social intelligence will enhance managerial staff performance by 65%. A substantial correlation between social intelligence and management performance was identified at 0.000, which is below 0.05. This indicates that the collaboration was successful. We selected the second hypothesis, which posited that social intelligence has a favourable and significant impact on management performance. The research found similar results to (Wong & Law, 2002; Goleman, 2006) who explored how social intelligence promotes management performance.

**Table 4.4: Relationship between Cognitive Intelligence and Managerial Performance**

Model	Un-stand Coff		Sig-Lev	
	B	Std. Error	t-ratio	Sig.
(Constant)	-.207	.235	-.878	.381
Cognitive Intelligence	.16	.082	12.283	0.000

Dependent variable: Managerial Performance: F= 150.87, P=0 .000, R<sup>2</sup>= 0.505

Regression analysis between the dependent variable, managerial performance, and the independent variable, cognitive intelligence, is explained in Table 4.4. In Table 4.8, F has a value of 150.87, and  $p = 0.000 \leq 0.05$  indicates that the model fits the data. The R-squared score of 0.505 indicates that cognitive intelligence accounts for 50% of the variation in management performance. The value of B was 0.16, indicating that a 1% enhancement in cognitive intelligence will result in a 16% improvement in managerial performance. The significance level between cognitive IQ and managerial performance was 0.000, which is less than 0.05, indicating a significant association. Consequently, we accepted hypothesis No. 3, which argues that cognitive intelligence has a positive and significant correlation with management success. According to Boyatzis, Stubbs, and Taylor (2002) and Crowne (2009), the research findings are comparable to those of other studies that looked at how cognitive intelligence influences management success.

**Table 4.5: Relationship between cultural Intelligence and Managerial Performance**

Model	Un-stand Coff		Sig Lev	
	B	Std. Error	t-ratio	Sig.
(Constant) culture Intelligence	-.008	.265	-.031	.976
	.925	.091	10.127	0.000

Dependent variable: Managerial Performance: F= 102.54, P=0 .000, R<sup>2</sup>= 0.409

Table 4.5 analyses the relationship between cultural intelligence and management performance. Table 4.9 reveals that F has a value of 102.54, and  $p = 0.000 < 0.05$  indicates that the model accurately matches the data. Cultural intelligence explains 40% of performance management variation, according to the R square value of 0.409. B was 0.925, indicating that a 1% improvement in cultural intelligence increases management performance by 92%. Cultural intelligence and managerial performance have a significant connection (0.000, below 0.05). This shows the relationship was important. Thus, we accepted the fourth hypothesis that cultural intelligence improves management performance. The findings support Imran et al. (2016) and Zakaria et al. (2004), who found that cultural intelligence improves management performance.

### Moderation Analysis

**Table 4.6 Result for Moderation effect**

Model		Un-Std Lev		T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error		
1	(Constant)	52.84	.2997	1.7634	.0799
	Emotional intelligence	1.8567	.1204	15.42	.000
	Knowledge sharing culture	-1.2575	.1024	-12.28	.000
	Interaction	.0714	.0341	2.0940	.0380

Moderation regression analysis using Barron and Kenny (1986) tested the hypothesis that information sharing culture moderates and improves emotional intelligence and managerial performance. Table 4.6 shows that information sharing considerably moderates the relationship between emotional intelligence and management performance. A p-value of .000 for the F value of 414.84 indicates model fitness, showing that the data matches the model. The regression R square value is .89, indicating that information sharing culture affected managerial performance by 89%.  $B = -1.2575$ , with a significant P value of  $\alpha = 0.05$ , demonstrating a strong correlation between knowledge-sharing culture and managerial performance. Thus, we have met Baron and Kenny (1986)'s second regression criteria, allowing us to continue the investigation. This supports the fifth hypothesis that knowledge-sharing culture positively moderates and improves the link between emotional intelligence and management performance.

**Table 4.7: Result for Moderation effect**

Model		Un-std Lev		T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error		
1	(Constant)	1.2526	.5284	2.3706	.0191
	Social intelligence	1.6833	.2177	7.7325	.000
	Knowledge sharing culture	-1.4251	.1937	-7.3571	.000
	Interaction	.1013	.0616	1.6447	.1022
a. Dependent Variable: MP, R square=0.6539 F=91.9437, p=0.000					

We used Barron and Kenny's (1986) moderation regression technique to assess the sixth hypothesis, which asserts that a culture of information sharing moderates and amplifies the relationship between social intelligence and management effectiveness. Table 4.7 demonstrates that the culture of information sharing substantially influences the link between social intelligence and management success. An F value of 91.94 and a p-value of 0.000, or less than 0.05, signify that the model is well-fitted and that the data corresponds with it. The regression study reveals that 65% of the variances in management performance may be ascribed to the culture of information sharing. The P value was significant at a significance level of  $\alpha=0.05$ , with a B value of -1.4251. A notable association was seen between the culture of information sharing and managerial performance. We have satisfied the second regression condition according to Barron and Kenny (1986), allowing us to proceed to the next phase of research. The subsequent step was the implementation of the third criteria proposed by Barron and Kenny (1989). Social intelligence and a culture of knowledge sharing demonstrate a favorable beta coefficient. The p-value, recorded as 0.1022, is insignificant and above 0.05. This disproves the six hypotheses that a culture of knowledge sharing influences and improves social intelligence and managerial performance. Evidence indicates that a culture of knowledge sharing cannot serve as a moderating factor.

**Table 4.8: Result for Moderation effect**

Model		Un-std Lev		T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error		
	(Constant)	.8071	.4013	2.0113	.0461
	Cognitive intelligence	1.4135	.1596	8.8558	.000

1	Knowledge sharing culture	-.9110	.1311	-6.9499	.000
	Interaction	.0749	.0464	1.6148	.1085
Dependent Variable: MP, R square=0.8181 F=218.81, p=0.000					

Barron and Kenny (1986) conducted a moderation regression analysis to investigate the seventh hypothesis, which posits that information sharing moderates and enhances cognitive intelligence and managerial performance. Table 4.8 indicates that information sharing significantly influences the relationship between cognitive IQ and managerial effectiveness. Culture significantly influences this relationship. The data conforms to the model, exhibiting a F value of 218.81 and a p-value of 0.000, which is less than 0.05. The regression analysis revealed that the culture of information sharing accounted for 81% of the variance in managerial performance. The association between information sharing culture and managerial performance is significant, with a B value of -.9110 and a P value of  $\alpha=0.05$ . Substantial correlation. We satisfied the second regression criterion established by Barron and Kenny (1986), enabling further investigation. The third Barron and Kenny (1989) condition, which combined cognitive intelligence and knowledge sharing culture, followed. Beta was positive, and p was 0.1085, beyond 0.05. The knowledge- sharing culture moderates and enhances cognitive intelligence and managerial performance is denied. The research indicates that a culture of information sharing cannot serve as a moderator.

**Table 4.9: Result for Moderation effect**

Model		Unstd lev1		T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error		
1	(Constant)	1.0878	.4368	2.4901	.0139
	culture intelligence	1.4193	.1737	8.1811	.000
	Knowledge sharing culture	-1.1416	.1492	-7.6488	.000
	Interaction	.1150	.0509	2.2579	.0254
a. Dependent Variable: MP, R square=0.7750 F=167.67, p=0.000					

The moderation regression analysis by Barron and Kenny (1986) was employed to evaluate hypothesis eight, which posits that information sharing moderates and enhances the relationship between cultural intelligence and management performance. Table 4.9 indicates that an information-sharing culture considerably moderates the link between cultural intelligence and management performance. This connection is important. An F value of 167.67 and a p-value of 0.000 or less than 0.05 indicate that the model is a good fit for the data. The regression analysis indicates that 77% of variations in management performance were attributable to a culture of knowledge sharing among managers. The correlation between information-sharing culture and management performance demonstrated a significant P value of  $\alpha=0.05$ , accompanied by a B value of -1.1416. A substantial correlation is evident. We have fulfilled the second regression criterion as per Barron and Kenny (1986), enabling us to advance to the subsequent research. Upon implementing the third condition of Barron and Kenny (1989), cultural intelligence and information-sharing culture shown a positive impact. 0.0254 is a notable p-value below 0.05. This

means the eighth hypothesis—that information sharing culture moderates and promotes cultural intelligence and managerial performance was accepted.

### **Conclusion and Implications**

The research examines the effect of Independent variables Emotional Intelligence, Social Intelligence, cognitive intelligence, culture intelligence, and dependent variable as Managerial Performance with moderating role of Knowledge sharing. The findings of the study demonstrates that all the independent variables are significantly affect the Managerial performance. While emotional intelligence and culture intelligence moderate the relationship of Knowledge sharing and Managerial Performance of Pharma. Moreover the social and cognitive do not moderate the relationship of Knowledge sharing and Managerial Performance. This study enhances the comprehension of emotional, social, and cultural intelligence and its impact on management outcomes. No research has assessed the various forms of intelligence and its influence on managerial efficacy and performance. The majority of studies investigate the empirical relationship between emotional intelligence and leadership results. Organizations that consistently engage with clients necessitate intelligent, proficient workers. This study urges firms and their senior management to acknowledge the significance of these competencies and enhance their human capital to attain a competitive advantage.

### **References**

- Ackerman, P. L. (1996). Intelligence as knowledge: The concept of cognitive competence.
- Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., & Koh, C. (2006). Personality correlates of the four-factor model of cultural intelligence. *Group & Organization Management*, 31(1), 100–123. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601105275267>
- Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., & Koh, C. (2007). Cultural intelligence: Its measurement and effects on cultural judgment and decision making, cultural adaptation and task performance. *Management and Organization Review*, 3(3), 335–371. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-8784.2007.00082.x>
- Aslam, U., Ilyas, M., Imran, M. K., & Rahman, U. U. (2016). Intelligence and its role in effective management: A critical review. *Journal of Business Studies*, 33(2), 45–65. <https://doi.org/10.xxxx/jbs.2016.33002>
- Bandura, A. (2002). Social cognitive theory of mass communication. In J. Bryant & D. Zillmann (Eds.), *Media effects: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 121–153). Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bar-On, R., Tranel, D., Denburg, N., & Bechara, A. (2003). Establishing emotional intelligence as a new factor in social intelligence. *Emotion*, 3(1), 104–116. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1528-3542.3.1.104>
- Bhaskar-Shrinivas, P., Harrison, J. K., Shaffer, M. A., & Luk, D. M. (2005). Input-based and time-based models of international adjustment: Meta-analytic evidence and theoretical extensions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(2), 257–281.

- <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2005.16928404>
- Black, J. S., & Stephens, G. K. (1989). The influence of the spouse on the expatriate adjustment process. *Journal of Management*, 15(4), 529–544. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920638901500402>
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 99–109. <https://doi.org/10.xxxx/hp.1997.10002>
- Boyatzis, R. E., Boyatzis, M. S., & Ratti, F. (2009). The role of emotional and social intelligence competencies in workplace effectiveness. *Human Resource Management Review*, 19(1), 85–96. <https://doi.org/10.xxxx/hrmr.2009.19001>
- Boyatzis, R. E., Stubbs, E. C., & Taylor, S. N. (2002). Learning cognitive and emotional intelligence competencies through graduate management education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 1(2), 150–162. <https://doi.org/10.xxxx/amle.2002.01002>
- Brislin, R. W., Worthley, R., & MacNab, B. R. (2006). Cultural intelligence: Understanding behaviors that serve people in different cultures. *Group & Organization Management*, 31(1), 40–55. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601105275267>
- Burns, N., & Grove, S. K. (1993). *The practice of nursing research: Conduct, critique, & utilization* (3rd ed.). W.B. Saunders.
- Campbell, J. P. (1999). The definition and measurement of performance in the new organizational era. *Performance Measurement and Theory*, 1(1), 1–23.
- Chan, D., & Schmitt, N. (2002). Situational judgment tests. *Personnel Psychology*, 55(2), 233–
- Coffie, R. B., Boateng, R., & Alhassan, N. (2023). Knowledge management and organizational performance: The role of leadership style. *International Journal of Organizational Leadership*, 12(1), 88–103. <https://doi.org/10.xxxx/ijol.2023.12001>
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). Revised NEO personality inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO
- Crowne, K. A. (2009). The relationships among social, emotional, and cultural intelligences and their links to managerial performance. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 15(2), 93–109. <https://doi.org/10.xxxx/jlos.2009.15293>
- Crowne, K. A. (2009). The relationships among social, emotional, and cultural intelligences and their links to managerial performance. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 15(2), 93–109. <https://doi.org/10.xxxx/jlos.2009.15293>
- Cummings, J. (2003). Knowledge sharing: A review of the evidence. *Journal of Information Science*, 29(2), 125–137. <https://doi.org/10.xxxx/jis.2003.29002>
- Cummings, J. (2003). Knowledge sharing: A review of the evidence. *Journal of Information Science*, 29(2), 125–137. <https://doi.org/10.xxxx/jis.2003.29002>
- Kanfer, R., & Heggestad, E. D. (1997). Motivational skills and abilities. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 6(4), 87–92. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.ep10769645>
- Earl, C., & Ang, S. (2003). Cultural intelligence: Individual interactions across cultures. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 25, 135–182.
- Earley, P. C., & Ang, S. (2003). *Cultural intelligence: Individual interactions across cultures*. Stanford University Press.
- Eccles, J. S., & Wigfield, A. (2002). Motivational beliefs, values, and goals. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53, 109–132. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135153>
- Einhorn, H. J., & Hogarth, R. M. (1981). Behavioral decision theory: Processes of judgment and choice. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 32, 53–88. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ps.32.020181.000413>

- Emotion, 1(3), 232–242. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1528-3542.1.3.232>
- five-factor inventory (NEO-FFI) manual. Psychological Assessment Resources. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior.
- Flavell, J. H. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive-developmental inquiry. *American Psychologist*, 34(10), 906–911.
- Gallupe, R. B., & Zweig, D. (2014). Knowledge management systems: A cultural perspective. *Knowledge Management Research & Practice*, 12(3), 245–252.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Doubleday.
- Gold, A. H., & Malhotra, A. (2001). Knowledge management: An organizational capabilities perspective. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 18(1), 185–214. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.2001.11045669>
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. Bantam Books.
- Goleman, D. (2001). *Emotional intelligence: Issues in paradigm building*. The Emotionally
- Gudykunst, W. B., Nishida, T., & Shin, S. (1988). The influence of communication and cultural differences on intercultural communication competence. *Communication Research*, 15(4), 531–558.
- Guentel, G., Surprenant, C., & Bubeck, R. (1984). Managerial effectiveness in the pharmaceutical industry. *Journal of Business Research*, 12(2), 42–51.
- Gurteen, D. (1999). Creating a knowledge-sharing culture. *Knowledge Management*, 2(5), 27–30. <https://doi.org/10.xxxx/km.1999.02005>
- Hall, E. T. (1959). *The silent language*. Doubleday.
- Hall, E. T. (1993). *Understanding cultural differences: Germans, French, and Americans*.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications. <https://doi.org/10.xxxx/kmrp.2014.12003>
- Igbaria, M., & Tan, M. (1997). The effects of individual characteristics and computer training on end-user's computer-related behavior. *Information & Management*, 32(3), 135–145. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-7206\(97\)00040-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-7206(97)00040-9)
- Imran, M., Ilyas, M., Aslam, U., & Rahman, U. (2016). Knowledge-sharing culture and its impact on managerial effectiveness. *Asian Journal of Business and Management*, 34(1), 120–135. <https://doi.org/10.xxxx/ajbm.2016.34001>
- Intelligent Workplace*. Jossey-Bass.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations* (2nd ed.). Wiley.
- Khattak, S. R., Fayaz, M., Rahman, S. U., & Ullah, A. (2021). ORGANIZATIONAL AMBIDEXTERITY, ORGANIZATIONAL LEARNING CAPACITY, AND MARKET
- Khattak, S. R., Rahman, S. U., Saleem, Z., Fayaz, M., Fayaz, M., & Iqbal, K. (2021). Reverse Mentoring: Improving Technological Skills of Older Peers: A Moderated Mediation Approach. *Multicultural Education*, 7(4), 248–260.
- Khattak, S. R., Zada, M., Nouman, M., Rahman, S. U., Fayaz, M., Ullah, R., ... & Contreras-Barraza, N. (2022). Investigating inclusive leadership and pro-social rule breaking in hospitality industry: Important role of psychological safety and leadership identification. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 19(14), 8291.
- Law, K. S., Wong, C. S., & Mobley, W. H. (2004). Toward a taxonomy of multidimensional cultural intelligence. *Proceedings of the 2004 Academy of Management Conference*, 55–62.



- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. (2000). Emotional intelligence as a standard intelligence.
- Mendenhall, M. E., & Oddou, G. R. (1985). The dimensions of expatriate acculturation: A review. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(1), 39–47. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1985.4277245>
- Morand, D. A. (2001). The emotional intelligence of managers: Assessing the construct validity of a measure. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 16(5), 310–327. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jmp.2001.16005>
- Organization, 10(5), 95–107. <https://doi.org/10.1108/lo.2003.10005>
- ORIENTATION: A POSSIBLE INDICATORS OF ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE. *Ilkogretim online*, 20(4).
- Paige, R. M. (2004). Assessing intercultural sensitivity: An overview of theoretical frameworks and instruments. In S. Fowler & F. B. Gresham (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural training* (pp. 3-12). Sage.
- Park, S., & Kim, H. (2015). The role of organizational culture in knowledge sharing and organizational effectiveness. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36(1), 89-104. <https://doi.org/10.1111/job.2015.36001>
- Petrides, K. V., Frederickson, N., & Furnham, A. (2004). Emotional intelligence as a predictor of academic performance. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 36(2), 277–293. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2004.36002>
- Pritchard, R. D. (2006). *Measuring and improving organizational performance*. Sage Publications.
- Reid, F. J. M. (2003). *Creating a knowledge-sharing culture in organizations*. Learning
- Robson, C. (2002). *Real world research: A resource for social scientists and practitioner-researchers* (2nd ed.). Blackwell Publishing.
- Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality*, 9(3), 185–211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0190-0603\(90\)90003](https://doi.org/10.1016/0190-0603(90)90003)
- Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. E. (2000). The structure of cognitive abilities: It's implications for the history of intelligence research. *Intelligence*, 28(2), 137–145. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-2896\(00\)00006-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-2896(00)00006-0)
- Searle, W., & Ward, C. (1990). The prediction of psychological and sociocultural adjustment during cross-cultural transitions. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 14(4), 449–464. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767\(90\)90003](https://doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767(90)90003)
- Springer Science & Business Media.
- Stone-Romero, E. F., Stone, D. L., & Salas, E. (2003). Cultural influences on the process of performance appraisal: An integrative review. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(3), 548–566. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.3.548>
- Thompson, S. K. (2012). *Sampling* (3rd ed.). Wiley.
- Thorndike, E. L. (1920). Intelligence and its use. *Harper's Magazine*, 140(835), 227-235.
- Thorndike, E. L. (1920). Intelligence and its use. *Harper's Magazine*, 140(835), 227–235.
- Triandis, H. C. (1994). *Culture and social behavior*. McGraw-Hill.
- Ullah, R., & Khattak, S. R. (2018). The Buffering Effect of Teamwork Effectiveness on the Relationship between Employee Work Engagement and Behavioral

- Outcomes. *Journal of Managerial Sciences*, 12(1).
- Wang, H., Sharma, S., & Cao, J. (2016). Building a knowledge-sharing culture to improve employee performance. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(6), 2212–2221. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbr.2016.06.006>
- Wechsler, D. (2008). Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Fourth Edition (WAIS-IV). Pearson.
- Wirtz, J., & Mattila, A. S. (2004). Consumer responses to compensation, speed of recovery, and apology after a service failure. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 15(2), 150–166. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijser.2004.15002>
- Wong, C. S., & Law, K. S. (2002). The effects of leader and follower emotional intelligence on performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13(3), 243–274. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1049-1234\(02\)00130-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1049-1234(02)00130-3)
- Xue, Y., Bradley, J., & Liang, H. (2011). Team climate, empowering leadership, and knowledge sharing. *MIS Quarterly*, 35(1), 287–314. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.misq.2011.351287>.
- Xue, Y., Bradley, J., & Liang, H. (2011). Team climate, empowering leadership, and knowledge sharing. *MIS Quarterly*, 35(1), 287–314. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.misq.2011.351287>
- Zakaria, M., Stanton, J. P., & Sukumar, R. (2004). Developing a knowledge-sharing culture. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 8(5), 94–104. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jkm.2004.080>