

Demographic Factors and Indonesian Knowledge Management Behaviours in Service Industries

Maria Grace Herlina^{a*}, Hardijanto Saroso^b, Lasmy^c, Darjat Sudrajat^d, Dicky Hida Syahchari^e, ^{a,b,c,d,e}Management Department, BINUS Business School Undergraduate Program, Universitas Bina Nusantara, Jakarta, Indonesia, Email: ^{a*}herlina01@binus.edu

Rapid changes in the world have affected all industrial sectors. One of them is a service industry that relies on knowledge-based activities to achieve sustainable competitive advantage. Knowledge workers are employees who increase the value of enterprises by producing, creating, developing, and applying knowledge at work, regardless of their educational background. During their tenure, they are able to solve problems creatively. Knowledge management behaviours are about organizational routine activities. Specifically, a knowledge management behaviour is an individual activity of collecting, managing, applying, sharing and updating knowledge, as a dynamic humanist process. The dimensions of knowledge management behaviours are creating, disseminating, collaborating, learning, applying, strengthening and recycling knowledge. The purpose of this research is to find out the differences among Indonesian knowledge workers in service industries in Jakarta based on demographic factors. A survey of 137 respondents was conducted using a questionnaire as the data collection method. The results show that there is a difference in the knowledge management of Indonesian knowledge workers based on gender. However, there were no differences in knowledge management of Indonesian knowledge workers based on education, tenure and age.

Key words: *Knowledge Management Behaviour, Knowledge Worker, Demographic Factors, Human Resources Management.*



Introduction

Rapid changes worldwide have impacted all industrial sectors, including service industries that rely heavily on knowledge-based activities. As a consequence, knowledge became a prominent element for organizations seeking to achieve a sustainable competitive advantage. Organizations are at the heart of knowledge-integration since they consist of people who have three key elements of human capital. They are intellectual capital, social capital, and organizational capital. All organizational activities related to the exchange of knowledge among individuals, groups, or organizations, such as information, skills, plans, innovation, ideas, goals, insights, or expertise, is exchanged among people, peers, community, friends, families, or organizations. Consequently, service industries must focus on ideas that can facilitate the sustainability of its organization. One of these ideas is to use the knowledge of its employees and members (Mohajan, 2019).

Knowledge workers are the most considerable resource for enterprises since they can bring more returns to the organization. Knowledge workers are defined as employees who are always looking for ways to solve problems creatively and to increase the values of their affiliated enterprise by producing, creating, developing, and applying knowledge at work, no matter their educational background (Jia & Fan, 2014; Pasher, 2011).

Most previous studies have focused on factors influencing knowledge management behaviours. Those can be categorized into three groups: individual, organizational and technological. Since organizations consist of people, an organization's performance depends on individual performance. The aggregated effects of individual behaviours are the primary determinants of an organization's success or failure in the long run (Ismail & Yusof, 2010; Jackson, 2003). Therefore, the purpose of this research is to provide a research-based insight on how demographic characteristics inform knowledge management behaviours among Indonesian knowledge workers in service industries.

Literature Review

The importance of knowledge as an organizational asset caught the attention of researchers in the late 1990s. In an organization, knowledge is a powerful resource since it comprises of a fluid mix of experience, information, and insight that provides a framework for new experiences (Mohajan, 2019). As mentioned previously, organizations consist of people that can be valued as human capital. All individual capabilities, inherent or learnt, can be defined as human capital as these capabilities can create or add values to organizations (Sharma & Jaiswal, 2018). Human capital consists of intellectual capital, social capital and organizational capital: intellectual capital consists of knowledge, skill, creativity and innovativeness; social capital consists of knowledge derived from networks and relationships, within and outside the organization; and organizational capital consists of knowledge that is stored in databases or

manuals, including confidential information. Knowledge in organizations is divided into two types: explicit and tacit. Tacit knowledge is the hands-on skills, experiences, best practices, know-how and so on. It is difficult to capture, communicate or share. Conversely, explicit knowledge is easily transferred, expressed and shared. Those are manuals, procedures, databases and reports. (Mohajan, 2019; Salicru & Candidate, 2007; Sharma & Jaiswal, 2018). At this stage, knowledge management is needed. (Rehman, Kamil, Mahmood, Salleh, & Amin, 2011).

Knowledge Management is the process of creating, managing and sharing the right information to the right person, at the right time and place. It is also about planning, organizing, motivating, and supervising people, processes, and systems in the organization. The processes of knowledge management involves knowledge acquisition, creation, storage, transfer, sharing, and utilization in order to effectuate better knowledge practices, improved organizational behaviours, and improved organizational performance (Johannessen & Johannessen, 2018). Knowledge management behaviours are about organizational routine activities that effectively practice and utilize people's competencies, experiences, expertise, skills, talents, thoughts, ideas, intuitions, commitments, innovations, and practices (Celep & Çetin, 2005; Darroch, 2003; Shamim, Cang, & Yu, 2017). Based on the literature review, it can be said that knowledge management behaviour is an individual activity of collecting, managing, applying, sharing, and updating knowledge. As a dynamic humanist process, it works in order to achieve organizational effectiveness and the optimization of knowledge as intangible firm-specific resources. The main dimensions of knowledge management are creating, sharing and updating knowledge. (Halawi, Aronson, & McCarthy, 2005; Ibragimova, D. Ryan, C. Windsor, & R. Prybutok, 2017).

Behaviour can be defined as an activity in terms of organizational behaviour, therefore, knowledge management behaviours can also be defined as knowledge-based activities. Based on the literature review on knowledge-based activities, there are eight dimensions of knowledge management behaviours: knowledge-based discovering, knowledge-based creating, knowledge-based disseminating, knowledge-based collaborating, knowledge-based learning, knowledge-based applying, knowledge-based strengthening, and knowledge-based recycling (Al-Zu'bi, 2011; Aliakbar, Yusoff, Hasnaa, & Mahmood, 2014; Bakhari Ismail & Mohammad Yusof, 2009; Boateng, Dzandu, & Agyemang, 2015; Chen & Huang, 2007; Chou & Ramser, 2018; Chun-Hsien, Fang-Pei, Chin-Yung, & Tao-Sheng, 2014; Dhabi, 2018; Donate & Guadamillas, 2015; F.A.Uriarte, 2008; Hsu, Min, & Chou, 2017; Hussein, Rosita, & Ayuni, 2019; Ismail & Yusof, 2010; Jia & Fan, 2014; Kianto, Sáenz, & Aramburu, 2017; Lin, 2011; Mallasi & Ainin, 2015; Nagamani et al., 2013; Nonaka & Toyama, 2005; Pangil & Nasurdin, 2008; Rehman et al., 2011; Rhee & Choi, 2017; Saide, 2016; Thomas, Kellogg, & Erickson, 2001)



Changes in demography are one of the challenging factors that an organization will likely face. It will also impact the organization's knowledge management effectiveness. However, there were only few studies that examine the impact of demographic factors on knowledge management behaviours. The demographic variables that have been studied are gender, age, working experience (tenure), education, and designation. Based on previous studies, gender suggests specific behaviour patterns between men and women. Men seek knowledge and feedback that impacts their performance and success in turn, while women consider seeking and sharing knowledge to be more beneficial to them. In this way, gender appears to influence knowledge management behaviour. In other words, there are differences between men and women in their effort to seek knowledge. Age is another demographic variable that impacts on knowledge management behaviours. The results of previous studies indicated that people younger age are more active in knowledge management behaviours. Tenure is also considered as the influential demographic factor on knowledge management behaviours. The previous result showed that a person with longer tenure is more active in knowledge management behaviour. Other studies also indicated that education somewhat affects knowledge management behaviour. Designation and tenure are other variables that had been studied besides gender, age and education level, in order to find out the impact of demographic factors on knowledge management behaviour. (Bakhari Ismail & Mohammad Yusof, 2009; Boateng, Dzandu, & Agyemang, 2015; Omar & Adruce, 2017; Pangil & Nasurdin, 2008; Nagamani et al., 2013). Based on the literature review, the research hypotheses are:

- H₁: Knowledge management behaviours differs among knowledge workers in terms of gender.
- H₂: Knowledge management behaviours differs among knowledge workers in terms of age.
- H₃: Knowledge management behaviours differs among knowledge workers in terms of education.
- H₄: Knowledge management behaviours differs among knowledge workers in terms of tenure.

Methodology

The research samples are knowledge workers who work in service industries located in Jakarta. The samples were taken using simple random sampling method. The research instrument was created based on literature reviews. Before collecting the data, the research instrument was tested using validity test and reliability test. The result of validity test using Pearson correlation explained that all indicators written on the questionnaire are valid and the result of reliability test using Cronbach's alpha is 0,970, which shows that the research instrument is reliable. The four research hypotheses will be tested using T-Test and One Way Anova with SPSS 22. Those are H₁: Knowledge management behaviours differs among knowledge workers in terms of gender. H₂: Knowledge management behaviours differs among knowledge workers in terms of age. H₃: Knowledge management behaviours differs among knowledge workers in terms of

education. H₄: Knowledge management behaviors differs among knowledge workers in terms of tenure.

Analysis and Discussions

This study was conducted in Jakarta, Indonesia on October 2019. The research respondents 137 knowledge workers of service industries in Jakarta Indonesia. Their characteristics are 25.5% work as a barista, 25.5% work as a beauty salon service staff, 25.5% work as a hotel's kitchen crew, and 23.4% works as a sales promotion staff. In addition, 89.3% of respondents are less than 25 years old, 10.2% of respondents are between 26 until 30 years old, 10.2% of respondents are between 31 until 40 years old, and 0.7% of respondents are more than 45 years old. Moreover, 56.9% are female respondents and 43.1 are male respondents. The last characteristics are 68.6% respondents high school graduates, 4.5% are diploma (D3) graduates and 27% are university undergraduates. The first hypotheses tested (H₁) knowledge management behaviours differs among knowledge workers in terms of gender. The result shows that if knowledge management behaviours among knowledge workers are differentiated in terms of gender, resulting in F of 1,166 at significance value of 0.007, which is significant at $\alpha < 0.05$ significant level 0,05 ($0,007 < 0,05$). This means that there are differences in knowledge management behaviours among knowledge workers in terms of gender. The second, third and fourth hypotheses were tested using one-way anova. The second hypotheses tested (H₂) knowledge management behaviours differs among knowledge workers in terms of age. The result shows that if knowledge management behaviours of knowledge workers are differentiated by age, resulting in F of 0.832 with the significance value of 0.479 is not significant at $\alpha > 0.05$ ($0,479 > 0,05$). This means that there are not any differences in knowledge management behaviours among knowledge workers in terms of age. The third hypotheses tested (H₃) knowledge management behaviours differs among knowledge workers in terms of education. The result shows that if knowledge management behaviours of knowledge workers are differentiated by education level, resulting in F of 0.896 with the significance value of 0.411. This value is not significant at $\alpha > 0.05$ ($0,411 > 0,05$). This means that there are not any differences in knowledge management behaviours among knowledge workers in terms of education. The fourth hypotheses tested (H₄) knowledge management behaviours differs among knowledge workers in terms of tenure. The result shows that if knowledge management behaviours of knowledge workers are differentiated by tenure, resulting in F of 1,866 with the significance value of 0.159. Likely the previous result analysis, this value is not significant at $\alpha > 0.05$ ($0,159 > 0,05$). This means that there are not any differences in knowledge management behaviours among knowledge workers in terms of tenure.

Before drawing any conclusions, researchers set five categories for conclusions about the Knowledge Management Behaviours examined. First was Deviant Knowledge Management

Behaviours. This behaviour can be described as a behaviour that does not lead to maximizing tools, techniques, processes, and strategies that support institutions in collecting, processing, applying, sharing and updating knowledge. The second is Unspecified Knowledge Management Behaviours. This refers to behaviours that do not specifically lead to maximizing tools, techniques, processes, strategies that support institutions in collecting, processing, applying, sharing, and updating knowledge. The third is Fragmentary Knowledge Management Behaviours, which refers to behaviours that do not completely lead to maximizing tools, techniques, processes, and strategies that support institutions in collecting, processing, applying, sharing, and updating knowledge. The fourth is Specified Knowledge Management Behaviours. This refers to behaviours that specifically lead to maximizing tools, techniques, processes, and strategies that support institutions in collecting, processing, applying, sharing and updating knowledge. The fifth is Well Qualified Knowledge Management Behaviours. This refers to behaviours that consistently lead to maximizing tools, techniques, processes, and strategies that support institutions in collecting, processing, applying, sharing and updating knowledge. Based on the confidence interval analysis with a significance level of 5%, it can be seen that a lower bound up to the upper bound of 51 up to 204 and the interval class is 30. A conclusion that can be drawn is knowledge workers tend to have well qualified knowledge management behaviours. It means that the knowledge workers behaviours consistently lead to maximizing tools, techniques, processes, strategies that support institutions in collecting, processing, applying, sharing and updating knowledge significantly at $\alpha < 0.05$.

Table 1: Knowledge Management Behaviours

Knowledge Management Behaviours	Number	Percentage
Deviant Knowledge Management Behaviours	1	0.7 %
Unspecified Knowledge Management Behaviours	8	5.9 %
Fragmentary Knowledge Management Behaviours	11	8.0 %
Specified Knowledge Management Behaviours	35	25.5 %
Well Qualified Knowledge Management Behaviours	82	59.9 %
TOTAL	137	100 %

The next research analysis will be based on demographic factors to find out the differences on knowledge workers' knowledge management behaviour. In terms of gender, female knowledge workers tend to have specified knowledge management behaviours. It means they specifically lead to maximizing tools, techniques, processes, strategies that support institutions in collecting, processing, applying, sharing and updating knowledge. Otherwise, male knowledge workers tend to have well qualified knowledge management behaviours. It means they consistently lead to maximizing tools, techniques, processes, strategies that support institutions in collecting, processing, applying, sharing and updating knowledge. This result can support the previous research which explained that men seek knowledge and feedback that can impact their performance and success. Therefore, they consistently participate in knowledge

management behaviours. In term of age, knowledge workers who are less than 25 years old, tend to have specified knowledge management behaviours. It means they specifically lead to maximizing tools, techniques, processes, strategies that support institutions in collecting, processing, applying, sharing and updating knowledge. On the other hand, knowledge workers who are more than 25 years old tend to have well qualified knowledge management behaviours. It means that their behaviour consistently leads to maximizing tools, techniques, processes, strategies that support institutions in collecting, processing, applying, sharing and updating knowledge. In term of education, knowledge workers who are high school graduates, university undergraduates and university postgraduates tend to have specified knowledge management behaviours. It means they specifically lead to maximizing tools, techniques, processes, strategies that support institutions in collecting, processing, applying, sharing and updating knowledge. Knowledge workers who are diploma graduates tend to have well qualified knowledge management behaviours. It means they consistently lead to maximizing tools, techniques, processes, strategies that support institutions in collecting, processing, applying, sharing and updating knowledge. In term of tenure, knowledge workers who work less than five years tend to have specified knowledge management behaviours. It means they specifically lead to maximizing tools, techniques, processes, strategies that support institutions in collecting, processing, applying, sharing and updating knowledge. While, knowledge workers who have worked for five to ten years tend to have well qualified knowledge management behaviours. It means they consistently lead to maximizing tools, techniques, processes, strategies that support institutions in collecting, processing, applying, sharing and updating knowledge. Lastly, knowledge workers who have worked for eleven to twenty years tend to have fragmentary knowledge management behaviours. It means they do not completely lead to maximizing tools, techniques, processes, strategies that support institutions in collecting, processing, applying, sharing and updating knowledge. This research result can enrich the research of Nagamani and Katyayani, as well as the research of Pangil. Existing scholarship suggests that gender does not significant influence knowledge management behaviour. This study, however, demonstrates that research knowledge management behaviours are significantly different in term of gender. In addition, results regarding tenure can support the research of Ismail and Yusof, as well as the research of Pangil who recorded a similar result. Knowledge management behaviours are not significantly different in term of tenure, education and age (Bakhari Ismail & Mohammad Yusof, 2009; Boateng, Dzandu, & Agyemang, 2015; Omar & Aduce, 2017; Pangil & Nasurdin, 2008; Nagamani et al., 2013).

Conclusions

To survive rapid changes service industries must focus more on the three key elements of human capital, that is, intellectual capital, social capital and organizational capital. This capital needs to be renewed and strengthened into intangible firm-specific resources that can increase the organizational values in terms of uniqueness and rarity. Based on the research results, it



can be concluded that the organization's members in spite of age, education, tenure should realize the importance of keeping knowledge as key resource for competitive advantage. As the backbone of any organization, human capital should interact and develop strong relationships, which would allow for maintaining knowledge, tacit as well as explicit, as invaluable capital. One of the key features of enabling employees to make use of organizational knowledge is the development of knowledge-based awareness. Those who are the leaders in knowledge management. Leaders must lead by example in regard to sharing knowledge and showing transparency and trustworthiness. This, of course, goes back to empowering and transformational leadership styles. While, not all people are born leaders anyone can become inspirational leaders through training and experience.

Another suggestion that can be offered is the development of knowledge-based awareness since there are still many people in the organization who, in order to make themselves an important asset for the organization, will keep their knowledge only for themselves. One reason for reluctance in knowledge-based activities is that most people feel afraid of sharing their knowledge with others since they are concerned about losing their personal knowledge asset and their importance as an organization member. By developing knowledge-based awareness, people will realize that, when disseminated, knowledge will not diminish but, uniquely, get richer and broader in the content shared. Knowledge-based behaviours make people continue to learn by seeking the latest knowledge (the most up to date). One other way to motivate knowledge management is by making periodic group activities, such as learning history methods, as the applied knowledge management behaviour. Finally, the behaviour of those who manage knowledge within an organization is critically important for the successful implementation of knowledge management initiatives and the sustainability of the firm, as their behaviour has a direct influence on the behaviour of other employees. One could say that we are influencers and are influenced by the environment in which we are situated. Thus, our behaviour has consequences beyond the boundaries of our own internal psyche.

This research still has limitations due to the research sectors and subjects. Therefore, it might be more beneficial to broaden the research variables on the education level, and examine how influential social behaviours and leadership might improve knowledge management behaviours and create sustainable competitive advantage.



REFERENCES

- Al-Zu'bi, H. A. (2011). Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Impacts on Knowledge Sharing: An Empirical Study. *International Business Research*, 4(3), 221–227. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ibr.v4n3p221>
- Aliakbar, E., Yusoff, R. Bin, Hasnaa, N., & Mahmood, N. (2014). *Determinants of Knowledge Sharing Behavior Determinants of Knowledge Sharing Behavior*. 29(February 2012), 208–215.
- Bakhari Ismail, M., & Mohammad Yusof, Z. (2009). Demographic Factors and Knowledge Sharing Quality among Malaysian Government Officers Communications of the IBIMA Demographic Factors and Knowledge Sharing Quality among Malaysian Government Officers. *Communications of the IBIMA*, 9, 1–8.
- Boateng, H., Dzandu, D. M., & Agyemang, F. G. (2015). The effects of demographic variables on knowledge sharing Article information : *Library Review*, 64(3), 216–228.
- Celep, C., & Çetin, B. (2005). Teachers' perception about the behaviours of school leaders with regard to knowledge management. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 19(2), 102–117. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513540510582408>
- Chen, C. J., & Huang, J. W. (2007). How organizational climate and structure affect knowledge management-The social interaction perspective. *International Journal of Information Management*, 27(2), 104–118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2006.11.001>
- Chou, S. Y., & Ramser, C. (2018). A multilevel model of organizational learning: Incorporating employee spontaneous workplace behaviors, leadership capital and knowledge management. *Learning Organization*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TLO-10-2018-0168>
- Chun-Hsien, L., Fang-Pei, N., Chin-Yung, P., & Tao-Sheng, C. (2014). A Study on the Correlations between Knowledge Sharing Behavior and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Catering Industry: The Viewpoint of Theory of Planned Behavior. *Anthropologist*, 17(3), 873–881.
- Darroch, J. (2003). Developing a measure of knowledge management behaviors and practices. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 7(5), 41–54. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13673270310505377>
- Dhabi, A. (2018). *Role of organisational culture , leadership and organisational citizenship behaviour on knowledge management Amna Ali Al Mansouri **, Sanjay Kumar Singh and



Mehmood Khan. 9(2), 129–143.

- Donate, M. J., & Guadamillas, F. (2015). An empirical study on the relationships between knowledge management, knowledge-oriented human resource practices and innovation. *Knowledge Management Research and Practice, 13(2)*, 134–148. <https://doi.org/10.1057/kmrp.2013.36>
- F.A.Uriarte, J. (2008). Introduction to Knowledge Management. *Trends in Enterprise Knowledge Management, 21–43*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470612132.ch1>
- Halawi, L. A., Aronson, J. E., & McCarthy, R. V. (2005). Resource-Based View of Knowledge Management for Competitive Advantage in an organization. *The Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management, 3(2)*, 75–86.
- Hsu, C. S., Min, H. T., & Chou, S. W. (2017). Understanding knowledge management behavior from a social exchange perspective. *International Conference on Research and Innovation in Information Systems, ICRIIS*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICRIIS.2017.8002492>
- Hussein, A. S., Rosita, N. H., & Ayuni, R. F. (2019). Knowledge Management Orientation Behaviour and Innovation. *International Journal of Sociotechnology and Knowledge Development, 11(1)*, 17–28. <https://doi.org/10.4018/ijskd.2019010102>
- Ibragimova, B., D. Ryan, S., C. Windsor, J., & R. Prybutok, V. (2017). Understanding the Antecedents of Knowledge Sharing: An Organizational Justice Perspective. *Informing Science: The International Journal of an Emerging Transdiscipline, 15(January)*, 183–205. <https://doi.org/10.28945/1694>
- Ismail, M., & Yusof, Z. (2010). The Impact of Individual Factors on Knowledge Sharing Quality. *Journal of Organizational Knowledge Management, 2010*, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.5171/2010.327569>
- Jackson, S. E. (2003). *Managing Knowledge for Sustained Competitive Advantage*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Jia, J., & Fan, L. (2014). Research Framework of Human Resource Development Based on Competency about Knowledge Enterprise. *International Journal of Business and Management, 3(11)*, 107–111. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v3n11p107>
- Johannessen, J.-A., & Johannessen, J.-A. (2018). Knowledge Management and Organizational Learning. *Knowledge Management as a Strategic Asset, 95–111*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-78769-659-420181005>



- Kianto, A., Sáenz, J., & Aramburu, N. (2017). Knowledge-based human resource management practices, intellectual capital and innovation. *Journal of Business Research*, 81(July), 11–20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2017.07.018>
- Lin, H. F. (2011). The effects of employee motivation, social interaction, and knowledge management strategy on KM implementation level. *Knowledge Management Research and Practice*, 9(3), 263–275. <https://doi.org/10.1057/kmrp.2011.21>
- Mallasi, H., & Ainin, S. (2015). Investigating Knowledge Sharing Behaviour in Academic Environment. *Journal of Organizational Knowledge Management*, 2015(2015), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.5171/2015.643253>
- MOHAJAN, H. K. (2019). Knowledge Sharing among Employees in Organizations. *Journal of Economic Development, Environment and People*, 8(1), 52. <https://doi.org/10.26458/jedep.v8i1.612>
- Nagamani, G., Katyayani, J., Padmavathi, S., Viswa, M., Pradesh, A., Padmavathi, S., ... Pradesh, A. (2013). Knowledge sharing practice among academicians : Assessing the role of demographic variables. *International Journal of Business Management & Research (IJBMR)*, 3(4), 113–124.
- Nonaka, I., & Toyama, R. (2005). The theory of the knowledge-creating firm: Subjectivity, objectivity and synthesis. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 14(3), 419–436. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icc/dth058>
- Omar, A. S. B. H., & Aduce, S. B. A. Z. (2017). The role of demographic variables on knowledge-sharing behaviour among academicians. *Journal of Telecommunication, Electronic and Computer Engineering*, 9(3–11), 111–114.
- Pangil, F., & Nasurdin, aizzat mohd. (2008). Demographics Factors and Knowledge Sharing Behavior Among R & D Employees. *Knowledge Management International Conference and Exhibition 2008*, 9(2), 128–133. <https://doi.org/10.7763/IJTEF.2014.V5.337>
- Pasher, E. T. R. (2011). *Knowledge Management* (10th ed.). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Rehman, M., Kamil, A., Mahmood, B., Salleh, R., & Amin, A. (2011). Review of Factors Affecting Knowledge Sharing Behavior. *2010 International Conference on E-Business, Management and Economics*, (January 2015), 223–227. Retrieved from <http://www.ipedr.com/vol3/46-M10011.pdf>
- Rhee, Y. W., & Choi, J. N. (2017). Knowledge management behavior and individual creativity: Goal orientations as antecedents and in-group social status as moderating contingency. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 38(6), 813–832. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2168>



- Saide, S. (2016). *Knowledge Sharing Behavior and Quality among Indonesian Workers*. 1–71.
- Salicru, S., & Candidate, D. B. A. (2007). Intellectual Capital and Company Performance – Literature Review and Research Opportunities in Australia This paper was presented at the 21st annual Australian and New Zealand Academy of Management Conference - ANZAM 2007 (Managing Our Intellectual and S. *Business*.
- Shamim, S., Cang, S., & Yu, H. (2017). Impact of knowledge oriented leadership on knowledge management behaviour through employee work attitudes. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 5192(May), 1–31. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2017.1323772>
- Sharma, K., & Jaiswal, N. (2018). Human Capital Management: An Emerging Human Resource Management Practice. *International Journal of Economics and Management Studies*, 5(3), 37–42. <https://doi.org/10.14445/23939125/ijems-v5i3p106>
- Thomas, J. C., Kellogg, W. A., & Erickson, T. (2001). The knowledge management puzzle: Human and social management. *IBM Systems Journal*, 40(4), 863–884.