Jurnal Informatika Ekonomi Bisnis

http://www.infeb.org

2025 Vol. 7 Iss. 3 Hal: 519-525 e-ISSN: 2714-8491

Unveiling the Determinants of Knowledge Sharing and Their Impact on Service Innovation Performance in the Government Sector

Fajar Rizky[1]✉, Iqbal Caraka Altino[2], Dana Indra Sensuse[3], Sofian Lusa[4], Nadya Safitri[5], Damayanti Elisabeth[6]

[1,2,3,5,6]Faculty of Computer Science, Universitas Indonesia, Depok, Indonesia
[4]Master's degree of Tourism Department, Institut Pariwisata Trisakti, Indonesia

fajar.rizky@ui.ac.id

Abstract

Knowledge sharing serves as a fundamental driver of organizational innovation, particularly in enhancing public service quality, yet remains significantly underutilized in government institutions. Many public sector organizations fail to recognize the value of knowledge sharing due to its perceived long-term benefits and the absence of concrete evidence demonstrating its measurable impact on service innovation performance. This study examines the driving factors of knowledge sharing and its impact on service innovation performance in government organizations. Data was collected through an online survey targeted at National Civil Service Agency (Badan Kepegawaian Negara or BKN) employees. A total of 465 responses were obtained, which analysed using partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM). This study demonstrates that organizational, individual, and technological factors play a significant role in the implementation of knowledge sharing. Most importantly, the research provides empirical validation that knowledge sharing behavior directly and substantially enhance service innovation performance - a relationship previously overlooked in public sector studies. By expanding the theoretical framework of Planned Behavior to incorporate these organizational, individual, and technological dimensions, this study offers public administrators compelling evidence to prioritize knowledge sharing initiatives while providing scholars with a more holistic understanding of innovation mechanisms in government contexts. Future studies should explore additional factors beyond the Theory of Planned Behavior that influence knowledge sharing, as well as other knowledge management dimensions affecting service innovation. Further research could also investigate impacts of knowledge sharing beyond innovation performance, such as organizational resilience or employee well-being in public sector contexts.

Keywords: Government Sector, Knowledge Sharing, PLS-SEM, Service Innovation Performance, Theory of Planned Behavior.

1. Introduction

Knowledge within government organizations is a crucial asset that must be managed to improve organizational performance. To ensure that knowledge does not remain confined to a single individual or specific organizational unit, knowledge sharing (KS) is essential. KS is a process within organizations used to search for and transfer the expertise and skills of one individual to others [1] [2]. One important form of KS in government organizations is through the management of lesson learned. Lesson learned refers to the ability to effectively gain insights from past mistakes or problem solving context then use the knowledge acquired from these experiences to improve actions and decisions moving forward [3] [4].

By the implementation of KS, a government organization can avoid repeating the same mistakes, address issues quickly and consistently, improve procedures, and enhance existing systems [2] [5]. This enables government organizations to make more accurate decisions, foster collaboration between units, and enhance the quality of public services. In addition, KS in government can drive innovation in service delivery by disseminating relevant new ideas. This process also accelerates adaptation to regulatory or policy changes by ensuring all stakeholders have a shared understanding [6]. By leveraging collective knowledge, government organizations can enhance operational efficiency and ensure more sustainable solutions to various challenges [7].

Currently, discussions about KS often stop at the stage of sharing knowledge without further exploring its impact, particularly on service innovation performance (SIP). Previous studies [8] [9] [10] [11] [12] have extensively discussed the factors influencing knowledge sharing behavior, but few have examined its impact on service innovation. Research addressing the impact of KS on SIP is currently limited to the corporate sector [13] are focuses on the impact of organizational learning rather than KS [14]. The lack of research and understanding about the impact of KS may lead public sector organizations to show less interest in implementing it optimally. Without a clear understanding of how KS can contribute to improving organizational performance, particularly in terms of service innovation, organizations tend to view KS as a secondary and non-urgent activity.

In addition to not yet understanding the benefits of KS, particularly in relation to SIP, there are several factors such as organizational conditions, technology, and the individuals themselves that may influence the effectiveness of KS activities [15] [16]. From the organizational perspective, the absence of a supportive

Accepted: 01-07-2025 | Revision: 31-07-2025 | Publication: 24-08-2025 | doi: 10.37034/infeb.v7i3.1204

organizational culture often hinders employees from actively sharing knowledge, resulting in KS being underutilized. Furthermore, insufficient management support and complex bureaucratic structures can impede communication between units or staff members. In terms of technology, inadequate digital infrastructure or the lack of user-friendly KS platforms may reduce employee participation [6]. On an individual level, a lack of motivation, distrust, or fear of criticism can discourage employees from sharing their insights. Overall, these challenges reduce the efficiency of KS in the public sector delaying innovation and hindering enhancements in the quality of public services.

In the public sector, particularly within government institutions, organizational factors hold significant importance in fostering both knowledge sharing intention (KSI) and knowledge sharing behavior (KSB). Organizational factors are external to individual employees and originate from the organizational environment [6] [17]. With efforts to enhance KS or transfer activities, organizational factors can become crucial in promoting effective KS. Support from management, a supportive organizational culture, organizational norms, and policies can strengthen employees' motivation to share knowledge [6] [16], [18] [19].

In addition, individual factors among employees also play an important role in facilitating KS [20]. Individual factors such as attitude and behavioral control have been proven to enhance employees' interest in KS [10] [18] [19]. Employees with a positive attitude towards KS and control over factors such as time availability and the ability to share knowledge are more likely to develop the desire to share what they know with others [10] [21] [22]. It is crucial for public sector organisation to equip employees with the necessary skills and provide sufficient time to ensure effective KS activities. In terms of technology, previous researches have demonstrated that the availability of knowledge sharing technology can substantially enhance these activities. [6] [23]. This situation highlights the need for further investigation into technology availability. Additionally, factors such as competency in using knowledge sharing technology should also be considered as supportive elements for effective knowledge sharing activities [24].

Based on the above explanation, this study aims to examine the impact of KS on SIP, particularly in the public sector, a topic that has not been extensively explored in previous research. Additionally, this study also explores in greater depth how the existing factors (organizational, individual, and technological) can influence KS through KSI or KSB. By understanding these factors, the study also attempts to develop strategic approaches that can help overcome existing barriers. Based on the above, the research questions for this study are formulated as follows. What are the factors that can influence KS in public sector. Does KS influence service innovation performance in the public sector.

2. Research Method

This study was conducted through several key phases, including theoretical framework and hypothesis development, questionnaire construction, and data collection and analysis. Each phase was designed to ensure methodological rigor and alignment with the research objectives [33]. In this study, civil servants at National Civil Service (Badan Kepegawaian Negara or BKN) in Indonesia were the target respondents. The selection of this case study is motivated by the fact that KS activities at BKN are rarely a primary priority for organizational leaders. This is because the benefits of KS are often not immediately apparent to the organization. This is also evident from the lack of KS activities at BKN, highlighting the need for more serious efforts to enhance awareness and participation in KS through appropriate factors. The target respondents were those who had engaged in knowledge sharing activities, either informally or formally, through platforms like BKN PEDIA or Zoom. The study did not include other government employees, like contract staff and those hired for specific roles (e.g., cleaners and security personnel), as they do not receive the same benefits and treatment as civil servants. All questions, except those related to demographics, used a 5-point Likert scale to measure participants' intentions to share knowledge and their knowledge sharing behaviors. The scale ranged from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. Considering there are two approaches to knowledge sharing (voluntary and involuntary), the questions were designed to include both formal (involuntary) and informal (voluntary) knowledge sharing channels [34].

The minimum number of respondents/participants for this study is 75, based on the highest number of arrows pointing to a variable, which is six, and an estimated minimum R2 of 0.25 [35]. The online questionnaire was distributed via Instagram, WhatsApp, and other social media platforms to civil servants. Demographic information collected included name, email, gender, highest academic qualification obtained, and office location. In this study, the data obtained through the questionnaire was analysed using the PLS-SEM method with the SmartPLS 4.0 software [36]. The analysis in this study was carried out in three stages: measurement model assessment, structural model assessment, and result interpretation [37].

3. Result and Discussion

The questionnaire was distributed online from December 7th 2024 to January 31st 2025 and received 498 responses. The researchers then conducted a quality check of the responses. Responses that had identical values for all statements were eliminated. As a result of this quality assessment, 465 respondents' data were deemed suitable for analysis in this study. A summary of the respondents' demographics can be found in Table 1.

Table 1. Summary of Demographic Data

Demographic Variable	Frequency (n=465)	Percentage
Gender:		
Males	251	54%
Females	214	46%
Education:		
High School	14	3%
Diploma	67	14%
Bachelor	312	67%
Master	67	14%
Doctoral	5	1%
Years of Experience:		
0-2 years	147	32%
3-5 years	133	29%
6-10 years	102	22%
More than 10 years	83	18%
Place of Work		
Headquarters	278	60%
Branch Office	187	40%

In assessing the measurement model, evaluations were conducted on indicator reliability, internal consistency, convergent validity, and discriminant validity. The results for indicator reliability, internal consistency, and convergent validity are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. The Result of Indicator Reliability, Internal Consistency Reliability, and Convergent Validity Measurements

Variable	Indicator	Outer Loading	CA	CR	AVE
OC	OC1	0.928	0.728	0.877	0.781
	OC2	0.837			
MS	MS1	0.809	0.715	0.839	0.635
	MS2	0.833			
	MS3	0.746			
SN	SN1	0.791	0.713	0.839	0.635
	SN2	0.867			
	SN3	0.727			
KSP	KSP1	0.837	0.727	0.876	0.780
	KSP2	0.927			
KSA	KSA1	0.867	0.832	0.910	0.772
	KSA2	0.904			
	KSA3	0.864			
PBC	PBC1	0.788	0.710	0.838	0.634
	PBC2	0.735			
	PBC2	0.862			
ITA	ITA2	0.881	0.722	0.878	0.782
	ITA3	0.888			
ITC	ITC1	0.865	0.722	0.872	0.773
	ITC3	0.893			
KSI	KSI1	0.899	0.787	0.876	0.704
	KSI2	0.852			
	KSI3	0.759			
KSB	KSB1	0.732	0.720	0.843	0.643
	KSB2	0.863			
	KSB3	0.806			
SIP	SIP1	0.889	0.726	0.879	0.785
	SIP3	0.883			

Furthermore, discriminant validity was assessed by examining the Heterotrait-Monotrait (HTMT) ratio. Discriminant validity is considered valid when the HTMT value is below 0.9 [25]. The study shows that all HTMT values are below 0.9. In measuring indicator reliability, an indicator is considered reliable when it has indicator loadings above 0.7 [26]. The study indicates that there are six indicators with values below 0.7, which were not included in the model measurement. These indicators are OC3, OC4, ITA1, ITC2, and SIP2. In addition, this removal was conducted to ensure that the internal consistency value meets the required criteria. Previously, these invalid indicators resulted in poor internal consistency values on its variable.

Internal consistency was evaluated using Cronbach's Alpha (CA) and Composite Reliability (CR). Meanwhile, convergent validity was calculated through the Average Variance Extracted (AVE). In this study, the CA and CR values were above 0.7, indicating good consistency, and the AVE values were above 0.5, demonstrating that the indicators are valid and reliable [26]. After conducting the measurement model assessment and confirming that all indicators meet the appropriate thresholds, the authors proceed to assess the structural model. This assessment involves evaluating the path coefficients (β), effect size (f2), the coefficient of determination (R^2), and the blindfolding-based cross-validated redundancy measure Q^2 [27].

To derive path coefficient results, bootstrapping procedures are employed [28]. In this study, the bootstrapping procedure is conducted with a significance level of 0.05 and a one-tailed test type. Recommended by Hair et al. [29], 10,000 bootstrap subsamples are used. Path coefficient values close to -1 indicate a strong negative relationship, while values near +1 suggest a strong positive relationship [30]. Hypotheses are accepted when the path coefficient approaches +1, the p-value is less than 0.005, and the t-statistic exceeds 1.64 [31]. Based on these criteria, 11 hypotheses are accepted. Detailed path coefficient and effect size f2 measurements are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Path Coefficient and f2-Effect Size

Hypothesis	β	f^2	t-values	p-values	Status
H1	0.178	0.061	4.984	0.000	Accepted
H2	0.146	0.043	4.927	0.000	Accepted
H3	0.214	0.091	6.625	0.000	Accepted
H4	0.180	0.057	4.639	0.000	Accepted
H5	0.337	0.242	8.131	0.000	Accepted
H6	0.080	0.013	2.184	0.014	Accepted
H7	0.311	0.172	6.692	0.000	Accepted
H8	0.075	0.012	2.384	0.009	Accepted
H9	0.295	0.166	8.860	0.000	Accepted
H10	0.338	0.229	9.902	0.000	Accepted
H11	0.513	0.357	13.225	0.000	Accepted

Effect size f2 is used to demonstrate the effect or influence of independent variables on the dependent variable [32]. An f^2 value above 0.35 is interpreted as large, 0.15 as medium, and 0.02 as small. The results of the effect size measurement indicate that there are six variables with a small effect, four variables with a medium effect, and one variable with a large effect. Next, the measurement of R2 is conducted. R^2 is used to evaluate the combined effects of exogenous latent variables on the endogenous variable [33]. The R^2 value falls between 0 and 1, with higher values indicating a greater amount of variance explained. R^2 values are regarded as substantial when they reach 0.75, moderate at 0.5, and weak at 0.25 [33]. In this study, 3 endogenous variables are examined: KSI, KSB, and SIP. Two variables demonstrate a moderate status, while one shows a weak status. The moderate values are found in the variables KSI and KSB, with

69% and 64%, respectively. Meanwhile, the SIP variable has a weak status with a value of 28%. Detailed R^2 calculations are provided in Table 4.

Table 4. Result of R^2 and Q^2

Variable	R2	Status	Q2	Accuracy
KSI	0.686	Moderate	0.413	Large
KSB	0.649	Moderate	0.476	Large
SIP	0.263	Weak	0.205	Small

The final step in assessing the structural model involves determining the Q^2 value. This value indicates the predictive effectiveness of the partial least squares path model [34]. Specifically, Q^2 values exceeding 0 yang indicate small, 0.25 indicates medium, and 0.50 indicates large levels of predictive relevance, respectively [35]. These benchmarks provide a measure of how well the model performs in forecasting the outcome variables. A higher Q^2 value indicates better predictive accuracy of the model. In the Table 4 shows that the KSB variable has the largest value, namely 0.476, which means this variable has predictive ability from data outside the existing sample. Meanwhile, the lowest value is for the SIP variable, namely 0.209.

Based on the analysis presented earlier, there are three main factors (organizational, individual, and technological) that can influence Knowledge Sharing (KS). In terms of organizational factors, it is evident that OC, MS, KSP, and SN can have a positive influence on KSI at BKN. This demonstrates that a positive organizational culture can create motivation among employees to engage in KS and make it a part of their daily activities [3] [8] [9]. Based on this, BKN needs to develop a culture that supports KS by creating a collaborative organizational environment among employees and units. Regarding policy factors, effective policies can create an environment that encourages knowledge exchange among employees and units at BKN through clear guidelines and binding provisions. Management support also plays a crucial role in supporting KS activities. Through MS, employees receive support and encouragement from upper management to engage in KS [16] [18] [20]. Meanwhile, SN influences individuals' perceptions of the expectations around them (from supervisors, colleagues, and family) regarding knowledge sharing, which can enhance their motivation to participate in such activities [10] [18] [19]. The findings of this study corroborate previous research, demonstrating how factors within the organizational domain can provide significant and positive support for KSI [9] [16] [18] [19] [28] [29].

In the technological factor ITA has a significant positive influence on KSB. The availability of information technology tools such as BKN PEDIA or communication applications like Zoom assists BKN in facilitating knowledge sharing among employees and units. ITA eliminates geographical and temporal barriers, enabling more efficient communication and collaboration among employees at different locations [6] [23]. By utilizing technologies such as BKN PEDIA and communication applications like Zoom, BKN can enhance access to information and expedite the knowledge sharing process. These findings support previous research indicating that ITA can positively influence KSB [6] [23]. Regarding ITC, this study demonstrates that ITC also has a significant positive influence on KSB. It shows that if the public sector has strong competency IT staff and is supported by a robust IT organization, it can positively influence KSB. This finding aligns with the notion that ITC is not just a basic requirement but also a key driver of knowledge sharing within organizations [24].

In the individual factor, elements such as KSA have a significant positive influence on employees' interest in KS. This reinforces previous research that demonstrates the positive relationship between KSA and KSI [1] [8] [9]. A positive perspective on KS needs to be fostered among employees to create a positive experience for them. This positive experience encompasses benefits, comfort, and enjoyment [18] [19]. In this study, the PBC factor has a significant impact on KSI and KSB. This impact of PBC on KSI and KSB also supports findings from prior research [10] [18] [19]. The employees' perception of behavioral control, which includes the availability of time, media, and their capabilities, has proven to influence intention and behavior in knowledge sharing.

In this study, the organizational and individual factors collectively account for a 69% influence at a moderate to substantial level on employees' interest in engaging in KS. Meanwhile, the cumulative impact of KSI, technological factors, and individual factors through PBC contributes to a 65% influence on KSB at a moderate to substantial level. This indicates that the influence of the above factors tends to be significant on KSI and KSB, making it important for BKN to continuously pay attention to the factors that have been measured. When examining the impact on each variable, KSP plays the strongest role in influencing KSI within the organizational factor, with a coefficient of 0.091. In the individual factor, KSA has an influence of 0.172 to KSI and PBC has influence of 1.66 on KSB, which both falls within the moderate to large range. Furthermore, ITA within the technological factor has a large effect, with a coefficient of 0.242, on KSB.

Practically, this indicates that the establishment of clear and binding policies for the KS process plays a crucial role in government organizations. Organizations can also implement reward and punishment policies to support the implementation of KS. In addition, organizations need to continuously foster a positive attitude among employees regarding the importance of knowledge sharing by promoting the significance of KS within the organization. Organizations should also provide scheduled time and skill development for staff to facilitate the implementation of KS. On the other hand, the provision of reliable information technology must be consistently prioritized to support the implementation of KS within the organization. Thus,

the combination of supportive policies, positive employee attitudes, and adequate technology availability will create a conducive environment to enhance the effectiveness of knowledge sharing in the public sector.

This study seeks to further elucidate the impact of KSB on SIP, an area that has been minimally explored in previous research, particularly within governmental organizations. This objective is rooted in the lack of attention from BKN organizational leaders towards the importance of knowledge sharing, due to its indirect impact on the organization. Based on the analysis conducted previously, this research demonstrates that KSB has an influence on SIP. These findings reinforce earlier studies [13] [14]. Through KSB, an organization is capable of effectively discovering, developing, and implementing new service techniques, methods, and ideas that can benefit the public. KSB accounts for a 26% influence on SIP, which is at a weak to moderate level. Additionally, the measurement of effect size indicates that KSB has a substantial or large influence, with a value of 0.389.

Empirically, this study has proven that KSB has a significant influence SIP. These findings indicate that through knowledge-sharing behavior, organizations can drive the creation of innovation in the services provided to the public. Although the cumulative effect of KSB on SIP is still considered weak to moderate, the significance of this relationship underscores the importance of fostering a knowledge-sharing culture within government organizations. Additionally, this study identifies that there is still room to enhance the impact of KSB on SIP by considering other factors that may not have been measured. Therefore, organizations like BKN need to improve knowledge-sharing activities to continue fostering innovation in their services.

4. Conclusion

The conclusion of this study indicates that organizational, individual, and technological factors significantly influence employees' intentions and behaviors in KS, which in turn positively impacts SIP. KSP, KSA, PBC, and ITA are key factors driving employee engagement in knowledge sharing activities. The study also highlights that PBC can directly affect KSB without going through KSI. Additionally, the research underscores the importance of fostering KS activities to enhance service innovation, emphasizing the need for greater attention from organizational leaders to maximize the potential of knowledge sharing in improving public service performance. Furthermore, this study highlights the need for an integrated strategic approach to optimize organizational, individual, and technological factors in knowledge sharing. The utilization of advanced technologies, such as artificial intelligence-based systems, can accelerate the knowledge management processes within organizations. Additionally, enhancing individual capabilities through training and development in knowledge sharing becomes key to increasing motivation for sharing knowledge. A supportive organizational environment, such as a collaborative culture and leadership support, can further encourage knowledge-sharing behaviors. With these measures, organizations can better maximize the use of knowledge as a strategic asset. On the other hand, this study is subject to several limitations. Data collection was conducted exclusively through online questionnaires, resulting in the exclusion of several low-quality responses. The research is confined to a case study of the National Civil Service Agency (BKN) in Indonesia, which may limit the generalizability of the findings due to contextual differences across countries, particularly in terms of culture and public policy. The proposed model is grounded in the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB), with the inclusion of several additional factors; however, it does not account for other potential determinants of knowledge sharing behavior (KSB). Moreover, the limited sample, which excludes other governmental institutions, may affect the external validity of the results. Future studies are recommended to expand the scope by involving various government agencies across Indonesia, incorporating broader contextual variables, and examining the influence of external factors such as national policy, social dynamics, and technological developments. Additionally, future research should investigate the impact of KSB beyond system implementation performance (SIP) and explore other individual and organizational factors to enhance the theoretical understanding of knowledge management in the public sector.

References

[1] Park, Y., & Joo, B.-K. (2022). Determinants of Knowledge Sharing: The Roles of Learning Organization Culture, Empowering Leadership, and Learning Goal Orientation. *International Journal of Applied Management and Technology*, *21*(1). DOI: https://doi.org/10.5590/ijmat.2022.21.1.04 .

[2] Ji, Y., Jiang, Z., Li, X., Huang, Y., & Wang, F. (2023). A Multitask Context-Aware Approach for Design Lesson-Learned Knowledge Recommendation in Collaborative Product Design. *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing*, *34*(4), 1615–1637. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10845-021-01889-7 .

[3] Chua, K., Thinakaran, R., & Vasudevan, A. (2023). Knowledge Sharing Barriers in Organizations - A Review. *TEM Journal*, *12*(1), 184–191. DOI: https://doi.org/10.18421/TEM121-24 .

[4] Akosile, A., & Olatokun, W. (2020). Factors Influencing Knowledge Sharing Among Academics in Bowen University, Nigeria. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, *52*(2), 410–427. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0961000618820926 .

[5] Kaffashan Kakhki, M., Hadadian, A., Namdar Joyame, E., & Malakooti Asl, N. (2020). Understanding Librarians' Knowledge Sharing Behavior: The Role of Organizational Climate, Motivational Drives and Leadership Empowerment. *Library and Information Science Research*, *42*(1). DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lisr.2019.100998 .

[6] Chandran, D., & Alammari, A. M. (2021). Influence of Culture On Knowledge Sharing Attitude Among Academic Staff In Elearning Virtual Communities In Saudi Arabia. *Information Systems Frontiers*, *23*(6), 1563–1572. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-020-10048-x .

[7] Abdel Fattah, F. A. M., Mohamed, A. H. H. M., Bashir, M. I. A., & Al Alawi, A. M. M. (2020). Determinants of knowledge-

Sharing Behaviour Among Students at Higher Educational Institutions in Oman: A Planned Behaviour Theoretical Perspective of Knowledge Sharing. *Global Knowledge, Memory and Communication*, *70*(6–7), 611–636. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1108/GKMC-07-2020-0104 .

[8] Syed, A., Gul, N., Khan, H. H., Danish, M., Ul Haq, S. M. N., Sarwar, B., … Ahmed, W. (2021). The Impact of Knowledge Management Processes on Knowledge Sharing Attitude: The Role of Subjective Norms. *Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, *8*(1), 1017–1030. DOI: https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2021.vol8.no1.1017 .

[9] Chedid, M., Caldeira, A., Alvelos, H., & Teixeira, L. (2020). Knowledge-Sharing and Collaborative Behaviour: an Empirical Study on a Portuguese Higher Education Institution. *Journal of Information Science*, *46*(5), 630–647. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0165551519860464 .

[10] Kumar, M., Mamgain, P., Pasumarti, S. S., & Singh, P. K. (2024). Organizational IT Support and Knowledge Sharing Behaviour Affecting Service Innovation Performance: Empirical Evidence from the Hospitality Industry. *VINE Journal of Information and Knowledge Management Systems*, *54*(2), 256–279. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1108/VJIKMS-07-2021-0124 .

[11] Jian, Z. Q., Osman, M. A., & Li, L. (2023). The Effects of Relationship Quality and Knowledge Sharing on Service Innovation Performance: Organisational Learning as a Mediator. *International Journal of Information Technology and Management*, *22*(1–2), 1–12. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1504/IJITM.2023.130057 .

[12] Gebreyohans, G., T. Croasdell, D., & Meshesha, M. (2023). Factors Predicting Knowledge Sharing Behavior of Academic Staff. *SINET: Ethiopian Journal of Science*, *46*(1), 30–50. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4314/sinet.v46i1.3 .

[13] Koay, K. Y., Sandhu, M. S., Tjiptono, F., & Watabe, M. (2022). Understanding Employees' Knowledge Hiding Behaviour: The Moderating Role of Market Culture. *Behaviour and Information Technology*, *41*(4), 694–711. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/0144929X.2020.1831073 .

[14] Paiman, N.,Fauzi, M. A., Norizan, N., Abdul Rashid, A., Tan, C. N. L.,Wider, W.,Selvam, G. (2023). Exploring Personality Traits in the Knowledge-Sharing Behavior: The Role of Agreeableness and Conscientiousness Among Malaysian Tertiary Academics. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1108/JARHE-10-2023-0467 .

[15] Asbari, M., Purba, J. T., Hariandja, E. S., & Sudibjo, N. (2023). The Mediating Role of Dynamic Leadership Towards the Relationship Between Knowledge-Sharing Behaviour and Innovation Performance in Higher Education. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, *20*(11), 466–485. DOI: https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.22.11.24 .

[16] Fan, Z., & Beh, L. S. (2024, February 1). Knowledge Sharing Among Academics in Higher Education: A Systematic Literature Review and Future Agenda. *Educational Research Review*. Elsevier Ltd. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2023.100573 .

[17] Ajzen, I. (2020). The Theory of Planned Behavior: Frequently Asked Questions. *Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies*, *2*(4), 314–324. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/hbe2.195 .

[18] Negara, D. J., Ferdinand, F., Meitiana, M., Astuti, M. H., Anden, T., Sarlawa, R., & Mahrita, A. (2021). Knowledge Sharing Behavior in Indonesia: An Application of Planned Behaviour Theory. *Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, *8*(3), 1053–1064. DOI: https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2021.vol8.no3.1053 .

[19] Kucharska, W., & Erickson, G. S. (2023). A Multi-Industry and Cross-Country Comparison of Technology Contribution to Formal and Informal Knowledge Sharing Processes for Innovativeness. *Knowledge and Process Management*, *30*(3), 300–316. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/kpm.1755 .

[20] Mannie, A., Van Niekerk, H. J., & Adendorff, C. M. (2013). Significant Factors for Enabling Knowledge Sharing Between Government Agencies Within South Africa. *SA Journal of Information Management*, *15*(2). DOI: https://doi.org/10.4102/sajim.v15i2.569 .

[21] Yoon, S. W., & Park, J. G. (2023). Employee's Intention to Share Knowledge: The Impacts of Learning Organization Culture and Learning Goal Orientation. *International Journal of Manpower*, *44*(2), 231–246. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1108/IJM-01-2021-0004 .

[22] Yoon, S. W., & Park, J. G. (2023). Employee's Intention to Share Knowledge: The Impacts of Learning Organization Culture and Learning Goal Orientation. *International Journal of Manpower*, *44*(2), 231–246. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1108/IJM-01-2021-0004 .

[23] Galeazzo, A., & Furlan, A. (2019). Good Problem Solvers? Leveraging Knowledge Sharing Mechanisms and Management Support. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, *23*(6), 1017–1038. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-05-2018-0290 .

[24] Galeazzo, A., & Furlan, A. (2019). Good Problem Solvers? Leveraging Knowledge Sharing Mechanisms and Management Support. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, *23*(6), 1017–1038. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-05-2018-0290 .

[25] Galeazzo, A., & Furlan, A. (2019). Good Problem Solvers? Leveraging Knowledge Sharing Mechanisms and Management Support. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, *23*(6), 1017–1038. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-05-2018-0290 .

[26] Sundaresan, S., & Zhang, Z. (2022). AI-Enabled Knowledge Sharing and Learning: Redesigning Roles and Processes. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, *30*(4), 983–999. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-12-2020-2558 .

[27] Wu, Y., Hu, X., Wei, J., & Marinova, D. (2023). The Effects of Attitudes Toward Knowledge Sharing, Perceived Social Norms and Job Autonomy on Employees' Knowledge-Sharing Intentions. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, *27*(7), 1889–1903. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-06-2022-0468 .

[28] Al-Ajmi, Z., & Al-Busaidi, K. A. (2024). Mitigating Knowledge-Sharing Risks Among ICT Knowledge Workers in the Government Sector. *VINE Journal of Information and Knowledge Management Systems*, *54*(3), 616–637. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1108/VJIKMS-06-2021-0102 .

[29] Hosen, M., Ogbeibu, S., Lim, W. M., Ferraris, A., Munim, Z. H., & Chong, Y. L. (2023). Knowledge Sharing Behavior Among Academics: Insights from Theory of Planned Behavior, Perceived Trust and Organizational Climate. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, *27*(6), 1740–1764. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-02-2022-0140 .

[30] Mustika, H., Eliyana, A., Agustina, T. S., & Anwar, A. (2022). Testing the Determining Factors of Knowledge Sharing Behavior. *SAGE Open*, *12*(1). DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221078012 .

[31] Xu, L., & Li, Z. (2022). Factors Affecting the Knowledge Sharing Behaviors of University Teachers: An Empirical Study in China. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, *12*(1), 36–42. DOI: https://doi.org/10.18178/ijiet.2022.12.1.1584 .

[32] Blommerde, T. (2022). Service Innovation and Performance in Micro, Small, and Medium-Sized Organizations. *European Journal of Business and Management Research*, *7*(4), 46–54. DOI: https://doi.org/10.24018/ejbmr.2022.7.4.1510 .

[33] Kock, N., & Hadaya, P. (2018). Minimum Sample Size Estimation in PLS-SEM: The Inverse Square Root and Gamma-Exponential Methods. *Information Systems Journal*, *28*(1), 227–261. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/isj.12131 .

[34] Kock, N., & Hadaya, P. (2018). Minimum Sample Size Estimation In PLS-SEM: The Inverse Square Root and Gamma-Exponential Methods. *Information Systems Journal*, *28*(1), 227–261. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/isj.12131 .

[35] Hair, J. F., Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2019, January 14). When to Use and How to Report the Results of PLS-SEM. European Business Review. *Emerald Group Publishing* Ltd. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-11-2018-0203 .

[36] Hair, J. F., Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2019, January 14). When to Use and How to Report the Results of PLS-SEM. European Business Review. *Emerald Group Publishing* Ltd. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-11-2018-0203 .

[37] Chin, T. L., Yean, T. F., & Leow, H.-W. (2023). Probing Determinants of University Academicians' Knowledge Sharing Intention. *International Journal of Application on Economics and Business*, *1*(2), 532–542. DOI: https://doi.org/10.24912/v1i2.532-542 .