

**THE EFFECT OF TACIT KNOWLEDGE SHARING ON INNOVATIVE WORK
BEHAVIOR: BIG PERSONALITY, MOTIVATION, SELF-EFFICIENCY
AND TRUST AS ANTACEDENTS**
(Study on the Academic Staff of the Surakarta Batik Islamic University)

Rosyida Nur Laili, Sinto Sunaryo
Universitas Sebelas Maret Surakarta
E-mail: rosyi.laili@gmail.com

Abstract: *This study aims to determine the relationship between Tacit Knowledge Sharing in Innovative Work Behavior: Big Personality, Motivation, Self-Efficacy and Trust as Antecedents (Study on Academic Staff of the Islamic University of Batik Surakarta). This research method uses quantitative methods with a total population of UNIBA academic staff 100 personnel. The sampling technique for this study used non-probability sampling by taking samples from all of the respondent's data. Data collection techniques using questionnaires that will be given UNIBA academic staff. The data analysis tool uses the Smart-PLS application. The research results show that extraversion variable has a positive effect on tacit knowledge sharing, conscientiousness variable has a positive effect on tacit knowledge sharing, agreeableness variable has a positive effect on tacit knowledge sharing, emotional stability variable has a positive effect on tacit knowledge sharing, openness variable has a positive effect on tacit knowledge sharing, motivation variable has a positive effect on tacit knowledge sharing, self-efficacy variable has a positive effect on tacit knowledge sharing, trust variable has a positive effect on tacit knowledge sharing, tacit knowledge sharing variable has a positive effect on innovative work behavior.*

Keywords: *Tacit Knowledge Sharing, Extraversion, Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, Emotional Stability, Openness, Motivation, Self-Efficacy, Trust, Innovative Work Behavior*

1. Introduction

Knowledge is widely regarded as an important commodity for organizations to generate competitive advantage (Kukko, 2013; Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1995; Bello and Oyekunle, 2014). Knowledge is becoming increasingly important for organizations in terms of gaining competitive advantage because institutions strive to compete in a knowledge-based era (Iqbal et al., 2011; Nonaka, 1994; Wei-Li et al., 2009; Nielsen and Cappelen, 2014). Knowledge management (KM) provides a means to align organizational goals with knowledge, leading to further growth and competitive advantage (Amayah, 2013; Howell and Annansingh, 2013; Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1995). Universities are in the business of generating and disseminating knowledge (Basu and Sengupta, 2007; Cheng et al., 2009; Daud and Abdul Hamid, 2006; Kim and Ju, 2008; Omerzel et al., 2011; Rowley, 2000; Sohail and Daud, 2009). With this in mind, it became clear to universities that KM is a valuable tool for meeting organizational goals (Loh et al., 2010). The process that has the

most impact on the success of the KM program is Knowledge sharing (KS) (Amayah, 2013; Cabrera, 2005; Fullwood et al., 2013).

Knowledge sharing(KS) is one of the main stages of knowledge management (KM) (Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1995), and can be defined as the process of disseminating information and knowledge among individuals (Alam et al., 2009). KS is a field that has received the attention of researchers during the last two decades; however, most of the available literature is about KS in business organizations. Researchers classify knowledge into two broad spectrums: explicit and tacit (Haldin-Herrgard, 2000; Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1995). Explicit knowledge refers to knowledge that has been expressed and written about through books, journals, manuals, guidelines, databases, and other materials (Addis, 2016; Godfroid, 2016; Mirza, 2009). On the other hand, tacit knowledge is the ability of each individual to produce knowledge through experience, expertise, insight, observation,

Besides being influenced by the big five personality, TKS is also influenced by motivation. TKS among staff is personal and difficult to establish because of its unconventional shape. Consequently, tacit knowledge is neither codified nor incorporated into a "single language"; instead it is obtained by sharing experiences, reflection and imitation of others to perform an action (Hau et al., 2013). Osterloh and Frey (2000) argue that both extrinsic and intrinsic motivational tools play an important role in explicit and tacit knowledge sharing within an organization. Behringer and Sassenberg (2015) demonstrated that perceptions of the benefits of media drive individual motivation for KS among organizational members. Apart from considering the factors that influence tacit knowledge sharing above,

2. Research Method

This study used a survey research design, with the scope of research or the object being the entire number of UNIBA academic staff 100 personnel, this research will use a sampling technique using a questionnaire with a 5-point Likert scale.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Results

Instrument Test (Outer Model)

This study uses a test instrument convergent validity, discriminant validity and composite reliability.

Convergent Validity

The results of the outer loading value generated for each item have a value of > 0.7 which means that all of these items are valid. Meanwhile, the AVE value generated by all constructs has a value of > 0.5 , which means that all of these constructs are valid. Based on this, it can be concluded that the table items are declared convergently valid

Discriminant Validity

The Discriminant Validity test is carried out in 2 ways, namely by looking at the cross loading value on the indicator must be greater than the cross loading value of other indicators. Based on research results the indicator cross loading value is greater than the cross loading value on the traffic variable indicator. Thus it can be concluded that the constructs in the study can be said to have good discriminant validity. The second way is by AVE each construct with the relationship between other constructs in the model. Based on the research results, the AVE square root result is higher than the correlation between

latent variables in the same column so that the variable passes the Discriminant validity test.

Evaluation of the Inner Model

- **R-squared value** can be seen in the following table:

| Variable | R Square | Category |
|---------------------------------|----------|-------------|
| <i>Innovative Work Behavior</i> | 0.487 | Currently |
| <i>Tacit Knowledge Sharing</i> | 0.824 | substantial |

The table above shows that the R-square value for innovative work behavior is 0.487. This means that the variability of the innovative work behavior construct can be explained by the variability of the tacit knowledge sharing construct of 48.7%, while the rest is explained by other variables not included in this study. Meanwhile, the R-square value for tacit knowledge sharing is 0.824. This means that the variability of the tacit knowledge sharing construct can be explained by the variability of the constructs of agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability, extraversion, motivation, openness, self-efficacy, and trust of 82.4% while the rest is explained by other variables not included in this study.

- **Q2 value** can be seen in the following table:

| Variable | SSO | SSE | $Q^2 (= 1 - SSE/SSO)$ |
|---------------------------------|---------|---------|-----------------------|
| <i>Innovative Work Behavior</i> | 900,000 | 529,337 | 0.412 |
| <i>Tacit Knowledge Sharing</i> | 700,000 | 187,129 | 0.733 |

Based on the values presented in the table above, it shows that the value is greater than zero, it can be concluded that the prediction accuracy of the path model is acceptable. $Q^2 Q^2$

- **GOF value** can be seen as follows:

| | <i>Saturated Model</i> | <i>Estimated Model</i> |
|-------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| SRMR | 0.045 | 0.054 |

Based on the table above, it is known that the value of SRMR = 0.054 means that the fit model is suitable so that it is suitable for testing hypotheses.

3.2. Discussion

Based on the test above, it can be said that the questionnaire data obtained is valid and reliable. This is based on testing the outer model instrument in the form of convergent validity, discriminant validity, as well as the inner model test, namely the R square, Q square and GOF tests. Furthermore, in the effect test it is said that *extraversion* positive effect on tacit knowledge sharing, conscientiousness has a positive effect on tacit knowledge sharing, agreeableness has a positive effect on tacit knowledge sharing, emotional stability has a positive effect on tacit knowledge sharing, openness has a positive effect on tacit knowledge sharing, motivation has a positive effect on tacit knowledge sharing, self-efficacy has a positive effect on tacit knowledge sharing, trust has a positive effect on tacit knowledge sharing tacit knowledge sharing has a positive effect on innovative work behavior.

4. Conclusion

Based on the results of data analysis and discussion of the hypotheses carried out in this study, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. Based on the analysis conducted, this study proves that there is a significant positive effect of extraversion on tacit knowledge sharing. This shows that when the academic staff of the Surakarta Batik Islamic University have good extraversion, the tacit knowledge sharing of the Surakarta Batik Islamic University academic staff will be good.
2. Based on the analysis conducted, this study proves that there is a significant positive effect of extraversion on tacit knowledge sharing. This shows that when the academic staff of the Surakarta Batik Islamic University have good conscientiousness, the tacit knowledge sharing of the Surakarta Batik Islamic University academic staff will be good.
3. Based on the analysis conducted, this study proves that there is a significant positive effect of extraversion on tacit knowledge sharing. This shows that when the academic staff of the Surakarta Batik Islamic University have good agreeableness, the tacit knowledge sharing of the Surakarta Batik Islamic University academic staff will be good.
4. Based on the analysis conducted, this study proves that there is a significant positive effect of extraversion on tacit knowledge sharing. This shows that when the academic staff of the Surakarta Batik Islamic University have good emotional stability, the tacit knowledge sharing of the Surakarta Batik Islamic University academic staff will be good.
5. Based on the analysis conducted, this study proves that there is a significant positive effect of extraversion on tacit knowledge sharing. This shows that when the academic staff of the Surakarta Batik Islamic University have good openness, the tacit knowledge sharing of the Surakarta Batik Islamic University academic staff will be good.
6. Based on the analysis conducted, this study proves that there is a significant positive effect of extraversion on tacit knowledge sharing. This shows that when the academic staff of the Surakarta Batik Islamic University have good motivation, the tacit knowledge sharing of the Surakarta Batik Islamic University academic staff will be good.
7. Based on the analysis conducted, this study proves that there is a significant positive effect of extraversion on tacit knowledge sharing. This shows that when the academic staff of the Surakarta Batik Islamic University have good self-efficacy, the tacit knowledge sharing of the Surakarta Batik Islamic University academic staff will be good.
8. Based on the analysis conducted, this study proves that there is a significant positive effect of extraversion on tacit knowledge sharing. This shows that when the academic staff of the Surakarta Batik Islamic University have good trust, the tacit knowledge sharing of the Surakarta Batik Islamic University academic staff will be good.
9. Based on the analysis conducted, this study proves that there is a significant positive effect of extraversion on tacit knowledge sharing. This shows that when the academic staff of the Surakarta Batik Islamic University have good tacit knowledge sharing, the innovative work behavior of the Surakarta Batik Islamic University academic staff will be good.

References

- Addis, M. (2016), "Tacit and explicit knowledge in construction management", *Construction Management and Economics*, Vol. 3No. 7-8, pp. 439-445.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01446193.2016.1180416>
- Alam, SS, Abdullah, Z., Ishak, NA and Zain, ZM (2009), "Assessing knowledge sharing behavior among employees in SMEs: an empirical study", *International Business Research*, Vol. 2 No. 2, p. 115
- Amayah, AT (2013), "Determinants of knowledge sharing in a public sector organization", *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 17 No. 3, pp. 454-471.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-11-2012-0369>
- Basu, B. and Sengupta, K. (2007), "Assessing success factors of knowledge management initiatives of academic institutions – a case of an Indian business school", *The Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 5 No. 3, pp. 273-282.
- Behringer, N., & Sassenberg, K. (2015). Introducing social media for knowledge management: Determinants of employees' intentions to adopt new tools. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 48, 290-296. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.01.069>
- Bello, OW and Oyekunle, RA (2014), "Attitude, perceptions and motivation towards knowledge sharing: views from universities in Kwara State, Nigeria", *African Journal of Library, Archives & Information Science*, Vol. 24 No. 2, pp. 123-134.
- Cabrera, EF and Cabrera, A. (2005), "Fostering knowledge sharing through people management practices", *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 16 No. 5, pp. 720-735. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585190500083020>
- Cheng, MY, Ho, JSY and Lau, PM (2009a), *Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 7 No. 3, pp. 313-324.
- Daud, S. and Abdul Hamid, H. (2006), "Successful knowledge sharing in private higher education institutions: factors and barriers", paper presented at the Knowledge Management International Conference and Exhibition, Kuala Lumpur, June 6-8.
- Fullwood, R., Rowley, J. and Delbridge, R. (2013), "Knowledge sharing amongst academics in UK universities", *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 123-136.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/13673271311300831>
- Godfroid, A. (2016), "The effects of implicit instruction on implicit and explicit knowledge development", *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, Vol. 38 No. 2, pp. 177-215.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263115000388>
- Haldin-Herrgard, T. (2000). Difficulties in diffusion of tacit knowledge in organizations. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, Vol. No. 4, 357–365. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14691930010359252>

- Hau, YS, Kim, B., Lee, H. and Kim, YG (2013), “The effects of individual motivations and social capital on employees' tacit and explicit knowledge sharing intentions”, International Journal of Information Management, Vol. 33 No. 2, pp. 356-366. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2012.10.009>
- Howell, KE and Annansingh, F. (2013), “Knowledge generation and sharing in UK universities: a tale of two cultures?”, International Journal of Information Management, Vol. 33 No. 1, pp. 32-39, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2012.05.003>
- Iqbal, MJ, Rasli, A., Heng, LH, Ali, MBB, Hassan, I. and Jolaei, A. (2011), “Academic staff knowledge sharing intentions and university innovation capability”, African Journal of Business Management, Vol. 5 No. 27, p. 11051. <https://doi.org/10.5897/AJBM11.576>
- Kim, S. and Ju, B. (2008), "An analysis of faculty perceptions: attitudes toward knowledge sharing and collaboration in an academic institution", Library & Information Science Research, Vol. 30 No. 4, pp. 282-290. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lisr.2008.04.003>
- Kukko, M. (2013), “Knowledge sharing barriers in organic growth: a case study from a software company”, The Journal of High Technology Management Research, Vol. 24 No. 1, pp. 18-29. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hitech.2013.02.006>
- Loh, B., Ai-Chee, T., Menkhoff, T., Chay, YW and Evers, H. (2010), "Applying knowledge management in university research", in Menkhoff, T., Evers, H.-D. and Chay, YW (Eds), Governing and Managing Knowledge in Asia, World Scientific Publishing, Singapore, Hackensack, NJ and London, pp. 221-248. http://dx.doi.org/10.1142/9789814289900_0011
- Mirza, RS (2009). Knowledge management and clinical framework for cross-country healthcare organizations. Master, Department of Interaction and System Design, Blekinge Institute of Technology, Sweden.
- Nielsen, C. and Cappelen, K. (2014), "Exploring the mechanisms of knowledge transfer in university-industry collaborations: a study of companies, students and researchers", Higher Education Quarterly, Vol. 68 No. 4, pp. 375-393, <https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12035>
- Nonaka, I. (1994), “A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation”, Organizational Science, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 14-37. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.5.1.14>
- Omerzel, DG, Biloslavo, R. and Trnavčević, A. (2011), “Knowledge management and organizational culture in higher education institutions”, Journal for East European Management Studies, pp. 111-139. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23281852>.
- Osterloh, M., & Frey, BS (2000). Motivation, knowledge transfer, and organizational forms. Organization science, 11(5), 538-550. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.11.5.538.15204>

Rowley, J. (2000), “Is higher education ready for knowledge management?”, International Journal of Educational Management, Vol. 14 No. 7, pp. 325-333.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/09513540010378978>

Sohail, MS and Daud, S. (2009), “Knowledge sharing in higher education institutions: perspectives from Malaysia”, Vine, Vol. 39 No. 2, pp. 125-142.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/03055720910988841>

Wei-Li, W., Chien-Hsin, L., Bi-Fen, H. and Ryh-Song, Y. (2009), “Interpersonal trust and knowledge sharing: moderating effects of individual altruism and a social interaction environment”, Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal, Vol. 37 No. 1, pp. 83-93. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2009.37.1.83>