

# Environmental Factors, Motivational Factors, and Individual Personality in the Relationship Model Framework of Knowledge Sharing Behavior

Ninik Probosari<sup>a,\*</sup>, Yuni Siswanti<sup>a</sup>, Herlina Dyah Kuswanti<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Management, Economics and Business Faculty, Universitas Pembangunan Nasional “Veteran” Yogyakarta, Indonesia

---

## ABSTRACT

This research aimed to analyze the relationship model of environmental factors, motivational factors, individual personality factors, and individual innovation capability in the term of knowledge sharing behavior. Environmental factors consist of organizational climate and Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), while motivational factor consist of trust, social capital, and job satisfaction. This research was implemented in two phases. First, we analyzed the relationship of motivational factors and environmental factors on knowledge sharing behavior. Second, we analyzed influence of environmental factors on individual innovation capabilities moderated by individual personality. Data was analyzed using hierarchical regression, multiple regression, and simple linear regression analysis. Sample was employees of Islamic banks in DIY. Results showed that the organizational climate, organizational citizenship behaviour, social capital, trust and job satisfaction affected knowledge sharing behavior positively. Results also showed that individual personality didn't moderate the relationship between environmental factors and knowledge sharing behavior, and that knowledge sharing behavior impacted individual innovation capability positively.

---

## ARTICLE INFO

*Keywords:*  
motivational factor,  
environmental factor, individual  
personality, knowledge sharing  
behavior, individual innovation  
capability.

*\*Corresponding author:*  
ninik1973@yahoo.co.id  
(Ninik Probosari)

*Article history:*

Received 22 05 2016

Revised 25 06 2016

Accepted 27 10 2016

*\*\*Previously Published in*  
EJEM, 2016, Volume 3  
number 3

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Managing knowledge become one of the important processes for companies in innovating. Knowledge is one of the most important factors in the current world economic perspective which is a major challenge for a company. Some organizations stated that to compete in the global competition they need to develop competencies and knowledge in the organization (Orr and Persson, 2003). One of the benefits of knowledge management is to support the learning process that may have an impact on the development of innovation capabilities through the creation of new knowledge (Tobing, 2007).

The most important part of knowledge management is how to support individuals in the organization to do knowledge sharing, to share what they know (Orr and Persson, 2003). Conceptually, knowledge sharing behavior is defined as the level of the extent to which a person actually doing knowledge sharing (Brock and Kim, 2002). Knowledge sharing can also be understood as the manner in which a person is willing to provide access to others about his/her knowledge and experience (Hansen and Avital, 2005).

There was a lot of researchers discuss the antecedents of knowledge sharing behavior and its consequences, but only few researchers who study organizational and motivational factors. Results of the researches were not enough to develop the complexity of the relationship in knowledge sharing behavior, so it did not give a lot of practical and theoretical contribution for business people and academics. According to Yoo and Torrey (2002), knowledge sharing behavior was influenced not only by the motivational factors but also the environmental factors. There are two variable in the environmental factors, organizational climate and Organizational Citizenships Behavior (OCB). Research results of organization climate are still debatable. Perception of organizational climate gives a crucial influence on knowledge sharing behavior within the organization. When an organization has a poor organizational climate for knowledge sharing behavior, it will be difficult for the organization to change. So, we need an organizational climate that is conducive for knowledge sharing behavior within an organization (Wang and Noe, 2010; Jing et al., 2008; Probosari and Kuswanti, 2013). But results of researches conducted by De Long and Fahey (2000) and Kankanhalli, Tan and Wei (2005) stated that organizational climate in limited infrastructure technology will not be conducive to knowledge sharing behavior.

Knowledge sharing behavior within the organization must be built from a strong will of the employees and need to be supported by the organization. Organizational Citizenships Behavior (OCB) is part of the organizational environment that encourages knowledge sharing behavior (Wasko and Faraj, 2005; Chiu et al., 2006; Yang and Farn, 2010). Probosari and Kuswanti (2013) stated that OCB would facilitate the development of relationships between employees, which in turn would lead to altruistic behavior. OCB is behavior and attitude of the employees who exceed the formal command of an organization's job descriptions, which are voluntary and not related to the reward system and can provide more benefits to the organization. Negative results obtained from research by Perry-Smith (2006) which stated that excessive altruistic behavior gave a negative effect on individual ability in seeking information. So, the inconsistency was found in the relationship between OCB and knowledge sharing behavior.

Research on the process of knowledge sharing based on the motivational factor is still rarely investigated and assessed. In this study, we put a new variable that has not been studied, but it has been reviewed and became directions for future research on the study of Wang and Noe, 2010. According to Wang and Noe (2010), one of the things that cause people to do knowledge sharing was job satisfaction. Is it true or not, it is still to be tested with research. So, this research tried to include job satisfaction as one of motivational factors variable. However, it does not mean there is no theory that predicts the

relationship of knowledge sharing and motivational factor. Motivational factor in this study differentiated in three dimensions, 1) social capital that was measured using instruments used by Chua (2002), 2) trust that was measured using instruments used by Zeitz et al. (1997), Mayer et al. (1995), and Kharabsheh (2007), and 3) job satisfaction that was measured using the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire and be based on research by Wang and Noe (2010). The effectiveness of the process of knowledge sharing must be based on a good relationship between employees based on social capital, trust and job satisfaction. Social capital is often interpreted differently. Social capital as norms and networks are making easy social interactions and transactions so that all the matters dealing with the community can be held easily. Social capital makes devolution to be good and also makes communication and the implementation of knowledge sharing becomes smooth and optimal (Collins and Smith, 2006; Chiu et al., 2006). Otherwise, results obtained from the research of Wasko and Faraj (2005) stated that there was a negative relationship between social capital (in this case reciprocity) and knowledge sharing behavior. This inconsistency requires empirical study on the background of different organizations.

Trust makes things easier (Fukuyama, 2003). Relationship based trust between employees is a prerequisite for the effectiveness of knowledge sharing process (Collins et al., 2006, Pasaribu, 2009). Although result of the research was partially showed a positive relationship between trust and knowledge sharing behavior (Sondergaard et al., 2007; Wu et al., 2007), some researchers argued the connectedness (Renzl, 2008). Bakker et al. (2006) stated that trust did not have significant relationship with knowledge sharing behavior. Some inconsistency results showed the relationship between trust and knowledge sharing behavior was not well developed, both empirically and theoretically. This was because research on trust as one of the motivational factors were rarely investigated.

Relationship between job satisfaction and knowledge sharing behavior have not ever been investigated. However, Wang and Noe (2010) predicted job satisfaction would be able to encourage knowledge sharing behavior. Therefore, Wang and Noe (2010) suggested to include these variables in subsequent studies. Departing from this idea, we examined empirically effect of job satisfaction on knowledge sharing behavior.

The relationship between organizational and motivational factors on the knowledge sharing behavior is reinforced/moderated by individual personality. The study on this relationship has been conducted by Wang and Noe (2010), but only few studies describing the relationship between them, including the research conducted by Lin (2007). Results of the research conducted by Constant et al., (1996); Cabrera and Cabrera (2006) and Lin (2007) stating that extrovert individuals tend to have better knowledge sharing capabilities compared to introvert individuals showed inconsistency with research conducted by Wasko and Faraj (2005) and Bordia et al. (2006). Therefore, this study put the individual personality variables as moderating variables.

Many researchs showed that implementation of knowledge sharing behavior affected the individual's ability to work (Lin, 2007; Du Plessis, 2007; Ussahawanitchakit, 2007; Aulawi et al.; 2009, Probosari

and Kuswanti, 2013). This was also applicable in the relationship between knowledge sharing behavior and employees absorptive capacity (Zahra and George, 2002; Liao et al., 2007; Probosari and Kusmantini, 2012). Knowledge sharing behavior would shape the great potential of the stock of knowledge possessed by employees to work together to form a new understanding. Knowledge sharing process was analogous to the transmission of message on the communication process, i. e. from the sender to the recipient.

On the basis of the explanation above, we did this research. This research was conducted in the banking sector. As a public organization in Indonesia, the presence of the banks in terms of their performance has not appeared (in Pasaribu, 2009). One contributing factor is the lack of implementation of the knowledge sharing within public organizations. The emergence of knowledge sharing in the banking sector also triggered by customer demands for their excellent service. This research was conducted in Islamic banks in the province of DI Yogyakarta. Based on research done by Danasworo (2009) and Cahyani (2011), customer service satisfaction index of Islamic banks in DI Yogyakarta were in scale of 3 (enough) of the 5 scale, indicating that the services provided were not satisfied enough, though market share and the growth of Islamic banks was quite high, reached 19.04%. This figure exceeds the growth of conventional banks which only reached 7.88% and People's Credit Bank which reached 13.13%.

This study was conducted to supply and enrich the theory of knowledge sharing behavior and also filling the gap research that has not been studied widely. Research examining the relationship model of knowledge sharing behavior was rare, especially that was implemented in the public organization. In the long term we expect it will give a significant effect on the role of HR for doing knowledge sharing behavior, especially in public organizations.

## **2. THEORY AND HYPOTHESES**

### **2.1. Relationship between Organizational Climate and Knowledge Sharing Behavior**

Organizational climate is the result of the interaction between the individual and the environment, where there is a hidden mechanism motive. He-feng (2007) stated that employees' perception on the environment had crucial influence on knowledge sharing within the organization. Knowledge sharing climate is related to culture. According to the Organ and Ryan (1995), organization climate could be a strong cause for the development of knowledge sharing within the organization. It also expressed by Wang and Noe, 2010; Jing et al., 2008; Probosari and Kuswanti, 2013. Their research results found that the organizational climate influenced the knowledge sharing behavior positively. Conducive organizational climate was an excellent conditions for the occurrence of knowledge sharing behavior.

H1: Organizational climate positively influence knowledge sharing behavior.

### **2.2. Relationship between OCB and Knowledge Sharing Behavior**

Extra role behavior also known as organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) or prosocial behavior. Smith et al. (in the Bragger et al., 2005) initially defined extra role behavior as a freedom of behavior in an organization that is not forced by the threat or sanction or dismissal.

Bateman and Organ (1983) stated that individuals who have higher levels of OCB would tend to share knowledge to other colleagues in the same organization for the common good. Then the employees who felt that they were free and not the victim would be more committed to the organization and would display many extra roles behavior, such as by displaying knowledge sharing behavior voluntarily to the other members of the organization (Wasko and Faraj, 2005; Susanti 2009; Yang and Farn, 2010; Probosari and Kuswanti, 2013).

H2: OCB positively influence knowledge sharing behavior.

### **2.3. Relationship between Individual Personality, Environmental Factors, and Knowledge Sharing Behavior**

Personality refers to individual differences in characteristic patterns of thinking, feeling and behaving. In general, study of personality focuses on two areas: first, understanding individual differences in certain personality characteristics, such as sociability or irritability; and second, understanding how the various parts of one's come together as a whole (American Psychologist Association).

The link between environmental and motivational factors towards knowledge sharing behavior is reinforced/moderated by individual personality. The study on this relationship has been conducted by Wang and Noe (2010). Only few studies describing the relationship between them, including the research conducted by Lin (2007). Research conducted by Cabrera and Cabrera (2006) and Lin (2007) stating that extrovert individuals tend to have better knowledge sharing capabilities compared to introvert individuals contradict the research conducted by Wasko and Faraj, 2005; and Bordia et al., 2006. Therefore, the study put the individual personality as moderating variables.

H3a: Individual personality moderates influence of environmental factors (organizational climate) on knowledge sharing behavior.

H3b: Individual personality moderates influence of environmental factors (OCB) on knowledge sharing behavior.

### **2.4. Relationship between Social Capital and Knowledge Sharing Behavior**

Prusak (2001) defined social capital as a collection of active relationships between people: trust, mutual understanding and shared values and behaviors that bind the members of a network and community which allows cooperation. The prerequisite for the effective knowledge sharing process was relationship between employees based on social capital (Nonaka, 1991), especially when collaboration in knowledge transfer contains a complex knowledge, such as knowledge transfer should be done face to face. In knowledge management, knowledge sharing is unlikely to occur without social capital, and if there is

no transparency in the dissemination of knowledge (Collins et al., 2006; Chiu et.al, 2006; Probosari and Kuswanti, 2013).

H4: Social capital positively influence knowledge sharing behavior.

## **2.5. Relationship between Trust and Knowledge Sharing Behavior**

According to Robbins (2006), trust is a positive expectation that others will not act opportunistically. Trust can stimulate the evolution of a stronger commitment in the relationship between employees, improve collaboration and create interest in mental capacity building among members of the organization (Fukuyama, 2003). Knowledge sharing is not possible to occur without trust, and if there is no transparency in the dissemination of knowledge (Sondergaard, 2007; Wu et al., 2007; Probosari and Kusmantini, 2012).

H5: Trust positively influence knowledge sharing behavior.

## **2.6. Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Knowledge Sharing Behavior**

Job satisfaction is a set of feelings and beliefs a person has about his/her job, that is related to positive and negative feelings (Yousef, 2000 in Muafi et al., 2014). According to the study of Wang and Noe (2010) job satisfaction was predicted to be able to encourage knowledge sharing behavior. Based on these predictions, Wang and Noe (2010) suggested to include these variables in subsequent studies. Based on that suggestion, this study examined empirically the effect of job satisfaction on knowledge sharing behavior.

H6: Job satisfaction positively influence knowledge sharing behavior.

## **2.7. Relationship between Knowledge Sharing Behavior and Individual Innovation Capability**

Aulawi et al. (2009) found that knowledge sharing behavior increase individuals' abilities to provide better performance. Results of the research suggested that knowledge sharing behavior gave positive effect in increasing individual innovation capability (Andrawina et al., 2008; Aulawi et al., 2009; Probosari and Kuswanti, 2013). Companies which are able to encourage its employees to share their knowledge to group or other organization members, will have a greater opportunity to improve the ability of employees to create new ideas and develop new business opportunities, which in turn, these activities will encourage the development of innovation capability (Darroch and McNaughton, 2002). It is like what Du Plessis (2007) found that tacit knowledge sharing gave positive effect on individual innovation capability.

H7: Knowledge sharing behavior positively influence individual innovation capability.

## **3. METHODS**

Population in this study were employees of Islamic banks in the province of Yogyakarta, Indonesia. We distribute 130 questionnaires to be filled out by respondents in the three Islamic banks, but only 87 respondents who had completed the data.

Sampling techniques in this study was purposive sampling method. Respondent must be match to the criteria we set: respondent had worked in the organization at least 2 years (according to the articles of the Office of Personal Management, 2005, the work period of 2 years is a period of work which is sufficient so that an individual is able to understand the working environment well) and the minimum position was officer (this position entrusted with the authority and responsibility to perform the authorization or approval of the transaction and/or have their own subordinates, as well as their exposure to accounting data is quite high).

Validity of all items used had a significance coefficient below 0.05, so it can be said that all the items was a valid. Reliability testing of all instruments showed that the values of Cronbach alpha were above 0.5. It means that all instrument variables was reliable.

#### 4. RESULTS

Respondents' characteristics are showed in Table 1. Descriptive statistics and intercorrelations among the study variables are provided in Table 2. We tested our hypotheses using hierarchical regression (hypothesis 1-3), the results is showed in Table 3 and Table 4; multiple regression (hyphotesis 4-6), the result is showed in Table 5; and simple linear regression (hypothesis 7), the result is showed in Table 6.

**Table 1:** Respondents' Characteristics

<b>Respondents' Characteristics</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Ages</b>		
20 – 30 yo	65	74.7
31 – 40 yo	14	16.1
41 – 50 yo	7	8.1
> 50 yo	1	1.1
<b>Years of service</b>		
2 – 5 years	50	57.5
6 – 9 years	21	24.1
10 – 13 years	9	10.3
14 – 17 years	7	8.1
<b>Sex</b>		
Male	42	48,3
Female	45	51,7
<b>Educations</b>		
High School	6	6.9
Bachelor	5	5.7
Bachelor of Honour	76	87.4

Total	87	100.0
-------	----	-------

**Table 2:** Descriptive Statistic and Correlation

Variable	Mean	SD	OC	SC	KSB	IIC	TR	JS	OCB	IP
OC	3.95	0.470	-							
SC	3.97	0.704	0.491**	-						
KSB	3.79	0.665	0.423**	0.751**	-					
IIC	3.96	0.441	0.516**	0.501**	0.510**	-				
TR	3.57	0.621	0.476**	0.539**	0.599**	0.512**	-			
JS	3.72	0.565	0.605**	0.568**	0.743**	0.495**	0.563**	-		
OCB	3.54	0.586	0.402**	0.517**	0.440**	0.515**	0.386**	0.365**	-	
IP	3.09	0.429	0.201	0.326**	0.437**	0.259*	0.334*	0.401**	0.395*	-

OC= Organizational Climate; SC=Social Capital; KSB= Knowledge Sharing Behavior; IIC=Individual Innovation Capability; TR=Trust; JS=Job Satisfaction; OCB=Organizational Citizenship Behavior; IP=Individual Personality

**Table 3:** Moderating Effect of Individual Personality on the Relationship between Organizational Climate and Knowledge Sharing Behavior, n=87

Step	Independent Variable	Standardized Coefficients (Beta)	t	Significance
Step 1	OC	0.423	4.306	0.000
	R	0.423		
	R <sup>2</sup>	0.179		
	F	18.542		0.000
Step 2	OC	0.026	0.198	0.844
	OC x IP	0.539	4.030	0.000
	R	0.559		
	R <sup>2</sup>	0.312		
	F	19.052		0.000

Dependent Variable : Knowledge Sharing Behavior  
OC = Organizational Climate, IP = Individual Personality

Table 3 shows organizational climate influenced knowledge sharing behavior. This is indicated by the value of Beta for organizational climate by 0.423 with a significance level of 0.000. Thus, organizational



climate positively influenced knowledge sharing behavior. The better the organizational climate, the better the knowledge sharing behavior. Thus, hypothesis 1 was supported.

Table 4 shows the value of Beta for OCB is 0.439 with a significance level of 0.000. So, OCB gave positive impact on knowledge sharing behavior. The better the OCB, the better the knowledge sharing behavior. Thus, hypothesis 2 was supported.

**Table 4:** Moderating Effect of Individual Personality on the Relationship between Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Knowledge Sharing Behavior, n=87

Step	Independent Variable	Standardized Coefficients (Beta)	t	Significance
Step 1	OCB	0.439	4.508	0.000
	R	0.439		
	R <sup>2</sup>	0.193		
	F	20.236		0.000
Step 2	OCB	-0.115	-0.624	0.534
	OCB x IP	0.639	3.462	0.001
	R	0.542		
	R <sup>2</sup>	0.294		
	F	17.470		0.000

Dependent Variable : Knowledge Sharing Behavior  
 OCB = Organizational Citizenship Behavior, IP = Individual Personality

Table 3 shows the individual personality’s Beta value is 0.539 with a significance level of 0.000. However, when considered, the occurrence of individual personality moderation actually cause the disappearing effect of organizational climate on knowledge sharing behavior, shown with a beta value of 0.026 at a significance level of 0.844. This means the individual personality did not moderate the relationship between organizational climate and knowledge sharing behavior. So, hypothesis 3a was not supported.

Table 4 shows individual personality’s Beta value is 0.639 with a significance level of 0.000. However, when considered in more detailed, the moderation of individual personality also caused the disappearing effect of OCB on knowledge sharing behavior, shown with a beta value of -0.115 at a significance level of 0.534. This means individual personality did not moderate the relationship between OCB and knowledge sharing behavior. Thus, hypothesis 3b was not supported.

**Table 5:** The Influence of Social Capital, Trust, and Job Satisfaction on Knowledge Sharing Behavior, n=87

Independent Variable	Standardized Coefficients (Beta)	t	Significance
Social Capital	0.445	5.983	0.000
Trust	0.122	1.641	0.105
Job Satisfaction	0.422	5.556	0.000
R	0.849		
R <sup>2</sup>	0.721		
F	71.386		0.000

Dependent Variable : Knowledge Sharing Behavior

Table 5 shows that social capital had a positive influence on knowledge sharing behavior, as shown by the Beta value of 0.445 with a significance level of 0.000. This means that social capital played a good role in the creation of superior resources through the sharing of knowledge. Thus, hypothesis 4 was supported.

Table 5 also shows the influence of trust on knowledge sharing behavior. Beta value of 0.122 with a significance level of 0.105 indicated that the impact was marginal. We still could conclude that hypothesis 5 was supported. The higher the trust, the more intense knowledge sharing behavior. Another result shows that hypothesis 6 stating job satisfaction influenced knowledge sharing behavior was also supported, as shown by the magnitude of job satisfaction's Beta value of 0.422 with a significance level of 0.000. The higher job satisfaction, the more intense the knowledge sharing behavior.

**Table 6:** The Influence of Knowledge Sharing Behavior on Individual Innovation Capability, n=87

Independent Variable	Standardized Coefficients (Beta)	t	Significance
Knowledge Sharing Behavior	0.511	5.475	0.000
R	0.511		
R <sup>2</sup>	0.261		
F	29.975		0.000

Dependent Variable : Individual Innovation Capability

Beta value of the influence of knowledge sharing behavior on individual innovation capability is 0.511 with a significance level of 0.000 (Table 6). This means that knowledge sharing behavior gave positive impact on individual innovation capability. The more intense knowledge sharing behavior, the higher the individual innovation capabilities. This supported hypothesis 7.

## 5. DISCUSSION

Results showed that organizational climate influence knowledge sharing behavior. The better the organizational climate, the better the knowledge sharing behavior. Thus, first hypothesis was supported.

This was consistent with the statement of Organ and Ryan (1995) that organizational climate can be the strong cause for the development of knowledge sharing behavior. It was also expressed by Wang and Noe, 2010; Jing et al., 2008 and Probosari and Kuswanti (2013). According to Ruggles (1998), a conducive organizational climate is needed in order to make the knowledge sharing behavior goes well in an organization.

Results of the effects of OCB on knowledge sharing behavior showed that there were positive influence in that relationship. Research of Bateman and Organ (1983) stated that individuals who have higher levels of OCB will tend to contribute knowledge to other colleagues in the same organization for the common good. Individuals who feel that they are free and not the victim would be more committed to the organization and would display many extra roles behaviors or OCB, such as by displaying knowledge sharing behavior voluntarily to other members of the organization (Wasko and Faraj, 2005; Susanti, 2009; Yang and Farn, 2010; Probosari and Kuswanti, 2013).

Result of this study failed to show moderating impact of individual personality on the relationship between motivational factors (organizational climate and OCB) on knowledge sharing behavior. Personality in this case refers to employees' extrovertness. The relationship between environmental factors on knowledge sharing behavior was not moderated by individual personality. This result support the previous study done by Wasko and Faraj (2005) and Bordia et al. (2006), but contradicted the research of Wang and Noe (2010), Cabrera and Cabrera (2006) and Lin (2007). So, it does not matter whether a person is introvert or extrovert, organizational climate and OCB will give the same positive impact on knowledge sharing behavior.

Result of this study also found that social capital has a positive impact on knowledge sharing behavior. The results of this study supported Nonaka (1991), Collins and Smith (2006), Chiu et al. (2006), Probosari and Kuswanti (2013). The relationship between employees based social capital is a prerequisite for the effectiveness of knowledge sharing process (Nonaka, 1991), especially when collaboration in knowledge transfer contains a complex knowledge, such as knowledge transfer that should be done by face to face. In knowledge management, knowledge sharing behavior is unlikely to occur without social capital, and if there is no transparency in the dissemination of knowledge (Collins et al., 2006; Chiu et al., 2006; Probosari and Kuswanti, 2013).

Trust can stimulate the evolution of a stronger commitment in the relationship between co-workers, improve collaboration and create interest in mental capacity building among members of the organization (Fukuyama, 2003). In knowledge management, the occurrence of knowledge sharing is not possible without trust, and if there is no transparency in the dissemination of knowledge (Sondergaard, 2007; Wu et al., 2007; Probosari and Kusmantini, 2012). Results of the previous researchs were supported by this study which found that the trust positively influence knowledge sharing behavior.

This study also showed that job satisfaction had a positive influence on knowledge sharing behavior. These results supported the study conducted by Wang and Noe (2010) where job satisfaction was predicted to be able to encourage knowledge sharing behavior.

The results also provide evidence that knowledge sharing behavior gave positive impact on the individual innovation capability. This research supported the research conducted by Aulawi et al. (2009). Knowledge sharing behavior increase individuals ability to provide the better performance. This result also reinforce the research done by Darroch and McNaughton (2002), Andrawina et al. (2008) and Probosari and Kuswanti (2013) finding that knowledge sharing behavior had positive effect in increasing individual innovation capability. Companies which are able to encourage its employees to share their knowledge into group or organization, will have the greater opportunity to improve employees' abilities to create new ideas and develop new business opportunities, which in turn, will encourage the development of innovation capability. This is consistent with what was stated by Du Plessis (2007) that tacit knowledge sharing gave had positive effect on individual innovation capability.

## **6. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATION**

There were some conclusion from this research. First, organizational climate, OCB, social capital, trust, and job satisfaction positively influenced knowledge sharing behavior, second, individual personality didn't moderate the influence of organizational climate on knowledge sharing behavior, third, individual personality didn't moderate the influence of OCB on knowledge sharing behavior; and forth, knowledge sharing behavior had positive and significant impact on individual innovation capability.

There are some implications of this study. First, organizations need to reconstitute a reasonable job targets that could be achieved by employees. Second, organizations need to raise awareness among employees about their job so that they can help each other or replace other employees who could not present when there is overtime work needed. Third, organizations need to improve communication among employees about their jobs / share information about data. Fourth, organization need to give space and opportunity for employees to be able to talk about the problems they faces with their supervisors. Fifth, organization need to enhance mutual respect among employees. Finally, organization needs to improve access to data sharing between employees so that they can provide maximum performance.

## **REFERENCES**

- Andrawina, L., Govindaraju, R., Samadhi, TMAA, and Sudirman, I. (2008), "Hubungan antara knowledge sharing capability, absorptive capacity, dan mekanisme formal: Studi kasus industri teknologi informasi dan komunikasi di Indonesia", *Jurnal Teknik Industri*, Vol. 10 No. 2, pp. 158-170.
- Aulawi, H., Govindaraju, R., Suryadi, K., and Sudirman, I. (2009). "Hubungan knowledge sharing behavior dan individual innovation capability", *Jurnal Teknik Industri*. Vol. 11. No. 2, 174-187.

- Bakker, M., Lendeers, R. Th. A. J., Gabbay, S. M., Kratzer, J., and Van Engelen, J. M. L. (2006), "*Is truth really social capital? Knowledge sharing in product development projects*", *The Learning Organization*, Vol. 13 No. 6, pp. 594-605.
- Bateman, T. S. and Organ, D. W., (1983), "Job satisfaction and good soldier: The relationship between affect employee citizenship", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 26 No.4, pp 587-595.
- Bock, G. W. and Kim Y. G. (2002), "Breaking the myths of rewards: An exploratory study of attitudes about knowledge sharing", *Information Resources Management Journal*, Vol. 15 No. 2, pp. 14-21.
- Bordia, P., Immer, B. and Abusah, D. (2006), "Differences in sharing knowledge interpersonally and via database", *European Journal of Work and Organization Psychology*, Vol. 15 No. 3, pp. 262-280.
- Bragger, J. D., Rodriguez, O., Kutcher, E. J., Indovino, L., Rosner, E. (2005). "Work-family conflict, work-family culture, and organizational citizenship behavior among teachers", *Journal of Business and Psychology*, Vol. 20 No. 2, pp. 222-235.
- Cabrera, A. and Cabrera, E. F., (2002), "Knowledge Sharing Dilemmas", *Organizational Studies*, Vol. 23 No. 5, pp. 687-710.
- Cahyani, P. D. (2011), "Tingkat kepuasan nasabah terhadap kualitas kinerja perbankan syariah: Studi pada Bank Muamalat Indonesia, *BNI Syariah, BTN Syariah dan BPD DIY Syariah Cabang Yogyakarta*", Master Thesis, UIN Sunan Kalijaga, Yogyakarta.
- Chiu, C. M., Hsu, M. H., and Wang E. T. G. (2006), "Understanding knowledge sharing in virtual communities", *Decision Support Systems*, Vol. 42 No. 3, pp. 1872-1888.
- Chua, A. (2002), "The influence of social capital on knowledge creation", *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, Vol. 3 No. 4, pp. 375-392.
- Collins, L. A., Smith, A. J., and Hanon, P. D. (2006), "Discovering entrepreneurship: An exploration of a tripartite approach to developing entrepreneurial capacities", *Journal of European Industrial Training*, Vol. 30 No. 3, pp. 188-205.
- Constant, D., Kiesler, S. and Sproull, L. (1994), "What's mine is ours or is it? A study of attitudes about information sharing", *Information Systems Research*, Vol. 5 No. 4, pp. 400-421.
- Danasmoro, A., (2009), "Analisis sistem antrian dan mutu pelayanan di BRI Syariah Cabang Yogyakarta sebagai upaya peningkatan kualitas pelayanan jasa", Master Thesis, Gadjah Mada University, Yogyakarta.
- Darroch, J. and McNaughton, R. (2002). "Examining the link between knowledge management and types of innovation", *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, Vol. 3 No. 3, pp. 210-222.
- De Long, D. W. and Fahey, L. (2000), "Diagnosing cultural barriers to knowledge management, academy of management executive", Vol. 14 No. 4, pp. 113-127.
- Du Plessis, M. (2007), "The role of knowledge management in innovation", *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 11 No. 4, pp. 20-29.

- Fukuyama, F. (2003), "Social Capital and Civil Society", paper prepared for delivery at the IMF Conference on Second Generation Reforms, October. Available: <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/seminar/1999/reforms/fukuyama.htm>.
- Hansen, S., and Avital, M. (2005). "Share and share a like: The social and technological influences on knowledge sharing behavior". *Sprouts: Working Papers on Information Environments, System and Organizations*. Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 1-19.
- He-feng, X. and Guoqing, M., (2007), "Study on the influence of organizational climate on informal knowledge sharing among staffs", *Studies in Science of Science*, Vol. 25 No. 2, pp. 306-311.
- Jing, Y., Xiaofen, J., Xiaofang, L., and Gongmin, B., (2008), "Knowledge Sharing Climate: A Literature Review", *Science of Science Management of S & T*, Issue 4, pp. 112-115.
- Kankanhalli, A., Tan, B.C.Y. and Wei, K. K., (2005), "Contributing knowledge to electronic knowledge repositories: an empirical investigation", *MIS Quarterly*, Vol. 29 No. 1, pp. 113-143.
- Kharabsheh, R. A. (2007), "A model of antecedents of knowledge sharing", *The Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 5 No. 4, pp. 419-426.
- Liao, S. H., Wu, C. F., and Chih, C. C. (2007). "Knowledge sharing, absorptive capacity, and innovation capability: an empirical study of Taiwan's knowledge intensive industries", *Journal of Information Science*, Vol. 33 No. 3, pp.1-20.
- Lin, F. H. (2007), "Knowledge sharing and firm innovation capability: an empirical study", *International Journal of Manpower*, Vol. 28 No. 3, pp. 315-322.
- Mayer, C. R., Davis, J. H. and Schoorman, F. D. (1995), "An integrative model of organizational trust", *The Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 20 No. 3, pp. 709-734.
- Muafi, Probosari, N., and Hartati, A. S. (2014), "Pola hubungan peran sumber daya manusia, sistem kerja berkinerja tinggi dan perilaku dalam kerangka arsitektur strategis sumber daya manusia", *Fundamental Research Report*, UPN "Veteran" Yogyakarta.
- Nonaka, I. (1991), *The Knowledge Creating Company*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Organ, D. W. and Ryan, K. (1995), "A meta analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of knowledge sharing", *Journal of Personal Psychology*, Vol. 48, pp. 775-802.
- Orr, E. and Persson, M. (2003). "Performance indicators for measuring performance of activities in knowledge management projects", *Master Thesis*, Department of Informatics, University of Gothenberg, Sweden.
- Pasaribu, M. (2009), *Knowledge Sharing*, Elex Media Komputindo, Jakarta.
- Perry-Smith, J. E. (2006), "Social yet creative: The role of social relationship in facilitating creativity", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 49 No 1, pp. 85-101.
- Probosari, N. and Kusmantini, T. (2012), "Anteseden perilaku *knowledge sharing* dan pengaruhnya terhadap *absorptive capacity* dengan mekanisme formal sebagai variabel pemoderasi", *Fundamental Research Report*, UPN "Veteran" Yogyakarta.

- Probosari, N. and Kuswanti, H. D. (2013), "Perilaku knowledge sharing: anteseden dan pengaruhnya terhadap kemampuan inovasi individual", *Jurnal Manajemen Bisnis*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 1-7.
- Prusak, L. (2001). "Where did knowledge management come from?" *IBM Systems Journal*, Vol. 40 No. 4, pp. 1002-1007.
- Renzl, B. (2008), "Trust in management and knowledge sharing", *Omega*, Vol. 36 No. 2, pp. 206-220.
- Robbins, S. P. (2006), *Perilaku Organisasi*, 10<sup>th</sup> Edition, translated by Pudjaatmaka, Indeks-Kelompok Gramedia, Jakarta.
- Soondergaard, S., Kerr, M., and Clegg C. (2007), "Sharing knowledge: Contextualising socio technical thinking and practice", *The Learning Organization*, Vol 14 No. 5, pp. 423-435.
- Susanti, R. (2009), "Pengaruh organizational citizenship behavior dan persepsi atas dukungan organisasi terhadap knowledge sharing dengan jenis kelamin sebagai moderator pada karyawan PT Telkom Indonesia Kandatel Yogyakarta", Master Thesis, Gadjah Mada University, Yogyakarta.
- Tobing, P. L. (2007). *Knowledge Management: Konsep, Arsitektur dan Implementasi*, Graha Ilmu, Yogyakarta.
- Ussahawanitchakit, P. (2007). "Innovation capability and export performance: An empirical study of textile business in Thailand", *International Journal of Business Strategy*, Vol 7, No. 1, pp. 1-9.
- Wang, S. and Noe, R. A. (2010), "Knowledge sharing: A review and directions for future", *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 20, pp. 115-131.
- Wasko, M. M. and Faraj, S. (2000), "It is what one does: Why people participate and help others in electronic communities of practice", *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, Vol. 9 No. 2-3, pp 155-173.
- Wu, W. L., Hsu, B. F. and Yeh, R. S., (2007), "Fostering the determinants of knowledge transfer: A team level analysis", *Journal of Information Science*, Vol. 33 No. 3, pp. 326-399.
- Yang, S. C. and Farn, C.K, ( 2010), "Exploring tacit knowledge sharing intention and behavior within workgroup from the perspectives of social capital and behavioral control", 11<sup>th</sup> Pacific-Asia Conference on Information System proceeding, 1 January 2007, AIS Electronic Library, Auckland, pp. 517-530.
- Yoo, Y. and Torrey, B. (2002), "National culture and knowledge management in a global learning organization" in Choo, C.W. (Ed), *The Strategic Management of Intellectual Capital and Organizational Knowledge*, Oxford University Press, New York, pp. 421-434.
- Zahra, S. A., and George, G. (2002). "Absorptive capacity: A review, reconceptualization, and extension", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 27, pp.185-203.
- Zeitz, G., Ritchie, J. E., and Johannesson, R. (1997), "An employee survey measuring total quality management practices and culture", *Group and Organizations Management*, Vol. 22 No. 4, pp. 414-444.