A Review on Self-Determination Factors and Knowledge Sharing Behavior with Perceived Organizational Support as Moderating Effect

Hassanul Firman Md Apandi   Nik Wan Nik Omar   Abdul Aziz Abdullah
Faculty of Business Management and Accountancy,Universiti Sultan ZainalAbdidin, Terengganu, Malaysia
Email: firman902@yahoo.com, nikwannma@unisza.edu.my, abdulazizum@gmail.com

Abstract
Knowledge sharing behavior has been acknowledged as a vital element in knowledge management in an organization. Baby boomers are the individuals within the organizations who recognized the importance of knowledge management for the success of their day to day organization function. Past studies have shown that individuals are still not interested to participate in knowledge sharing. The purpose of this review is to discuss the impact of self-determination factors toward knowledge sharing behavior among baby boomers in the public sector. A rigorous review of literature regarding knowledge sharing behaviour was undertaken. This review unveiled the preliminary self-determination conceptual framework which suggests a relationship among knowledge sharing behavior and four other individual factors. These factors are personality traits, intrinsic motivation, emotional intelligence, and sense of belonging. The outcome of this review is expected to provide the insights on the moderating effect of perceived organizational support which will be part of the main study.
Keywords:Knowledge Sharing Behavior; Self-determination Factors; Perceived Organizational Support

Introduction
In the highly demanding business world today, an organization's competitive edge almost depends on how well it can manage and deploy its (organizational) knowledge. Numerous literatures suggest that knowledge has become the focus of competitive advantage (Connor & Pralahad, 1996). In classical economies, the sources of wealth are land, labor, and capital and now the other source is knowledge (Badaracco, 1991). The most valuable assets in the 20th and 21st century company either for business or non-business organization are production equipment, knowledge workers and their productivity respectively (Drucker, 1999). Knowledge is said to be a valuable intangible asset for creating and sustaining advantages for individuals as well as for organizations (Baardsen, 2011). Sharing knowledge in organization is very important to enhance organizational performance and innovation (Noor & Salim, 2012; Thomas, 2005). Currently many countries in Europe, America, Africa, and Asia are facing the problem of brain drain where many workers who are knowledgeable and have high skills leave the organization. Knowledge is not being effectively shared throughout organizations (Keyes, 2008; Kwakye & Md Nor, 2011). Such that organization that fail to effectively share knowledge are clearly facing with problems such as confronting with low productivity (Fouzia Akram & Rahat Bokhari, 2011; Ngah & Jusoff, 2009), striving with competitive advantage (DeNisi et al., 2003), dealing with low innovation initiatives (Gold et al., 2001; Fen Lin, 2007), and the impact to organization's mission and strategic goals (Davidson et al., 2007). All these consequences are due to brain drain which occurs in the organization.

Since the phenomenon of Baby Boomers (BBs) has begun to be felt in most countries, brain drain due to retirement is the key issued to be addressed in this present research. This phenomenon will affect the efficiency and effectiveness of the organization if the knowledge possessed by those BB is passed over through sharing with remaining workers in the particular organization. The development of human capital, knowledge, and skills bring about economic value to an organization (Bohlander & Snell, 2007). The numbers of BB each year affects the size of the labor force, which has a direct impact on the economy's capacity to produce goods and services (Purcell, 2000). Based on "SWOT" analysis of Malaysia Strategic Plan 2010-2014, the first threat reported in that analysis is the retirement of knowledgeable workers in which major brain drain is being flushed out the organization. This situation hinders efforts to build a competitive organization (Malaysia Statistics Department, 2009) through knowledge sharing from the BB. The indicator shows something to worry about but not due to numbers of retirement. However, the real fear is, the discontinuity of knowledge in an organization because of ineffective knowledge sharing behavior by the knowledgeable workers (Ko et al., 2005; Noor & Salim, 2012) which is greatly needed by the organization. If the sharing of knowledge between BB and other workers occur effectively, then no concern or worry about retirement among public service employees.

Employees who are more enthusiastic and sincere in the process of knowledge sharing behavior are usually committed and motivated in their job. According to Wallace (1995), individuals who are more highly committed and sincere to their profession are also likely to be more intrinsically motivated by the work. However, employees who are not really interested to share their knowledge within the organization are less motivated in their works (Azudin et al., 2008; Ling et al., 2008; Boudreau et al., 2003). On the other hand,

selfish and self-serving reasons (Dunford, 2000; Szulanski, 1996), lack of communication skills (Riege, 2005; Srivastava, 2002), fear of losing power because knowledge is a sign of power and superiority to them (Dunford, 2000; Grandori & Kogut, 2002), lack of trust, lack of social networks, differences in culture, lack of time (Dunford, 2000; Grandori & Kogut, 2002), lack of awareness (Boudreau et al., 2003; Davenport et al., 1998), lack of interaction (Jain et al., 2006; Ling et al., 2008), fear of not receiving recognition (Ling et al., 2008; Syed Ikhsan & Rowland, 2004)**,** afraid to lose their valuable knowledge and also afraid to become redundant afterwards, feel that others will steal their ideas and reap the rewards rightly theirs or about ownership matters (Azudin et al., 2008; Bartol & Srivastava, 2002), and job security (Hislop, 2002; Kanfer & Ackerman, 2004) are the list of behavior and characteristics of not performing knowledge sharing**.** These characteristics and behavior would ultimately have a deeper impact on the desire to share knowledge with other employees in the organization.

When addressing sharing knowledge behavior, there are several important factors that need to be considered. It includes both organizational and individual factors, and some of these behaviors occur out of human control. According to Kankanhalli et al. (2005) and, Nelson and Winter (1982), individual factors are more crucial upon knowledge continuity in organizations   This gives primary emphasis to organizational routine as it is largely determined by individual behavior. Self-determination factors or individual factors are identified as important determinants of knowledge sharing behavior and the most important factors in knowledge creation and sharing, and key repositories of knowledge in organizations (Felin & Hesterly, 2007; Foss, 2007). It is a deeper understanding of a micro level in organization knowledge processes which "cannot be reached *in lieu of* a starting point in individuals" (Foss 2007).

In addition, Guthrie (2001), and Stovel and Bontis (2002) also believed the importance of self-determination factors or individual factors to the knowledge creation and sharing behavior. They indicated that employees are the major contributor to overall organizational effectiveness and knowledge management being an organization practice that is important for organization's competitive edge. In a different way, Du Plessis (2006) reminded that many organizations view knowledge management as a technical program with the typical plan of strategy, structure, processes and measures, often forgeting the basic and powerful element of individual factors in implementing knowledge management.

The individual differences are manifested in several ways such as personality, attitude, motivation, knowledge, skills and abilities (McClelland, 1973). It also described this characteristic as an underlying superior performance as competency. Based on Chiu et al., (2006), it is important to identify factors affecting knowledge sharing behavior in the public sector. That also includes demographic factors. Sullivan et al. (2002) stated that employee's demographic differences on work values can help to create a win-win outcome for all concerned. Several past studies also proposed that people in workgroups or organizations compare their individual factors such as commitment and motivation (Malhorta & Galletta, 2003), job tenure (Levy & Sharma, 1994; O'Hara et al., 1991; Shoemaker & Johlke, 2002), job satisfaction (Pettijohn & Pettijohn, 2002), motivational levels (Hoffman & Ingram, 1992; Pullins et al., 2000) and various types of personal dispositional factors (Brown et al., 2002; Giacobbe, 1991; Hurley, 1998; Widmier, 2002) as predictors of people's behavior. Indeed, loyalty and commitment of knowledge workers are becoming the most critical management problem for knowledge intensive industries (Alvesson, 2000), and needless to say, this is essential for a progressive knowledge based economy such as Malaysia (Tan, 2008). According to Yang and Wu (2008), socialization is a sharing of tacit knowledge, which is regarded as personal behavior; and activities in mind. In order to be able to share tacit knowledge, the interactions between individuals such as joining activities and face-to-face discussion are emphasized in this stage. This description indicates that internal individual factors provide enough impact on behavior.

In short researchers agreed that the basis of knowledge sharing is derived from the individual. The determinants of knowledge sharing include personality traits, intrinsic motivation, emotional intelligence and sense of belongings. They seemed to have a connection between knowledge sharing behavior among employees in organization and individuals factors. Thus, self-determination factors can be used to examine how far its impact on knowledge sharing behavior. Hence, the purpose of this review is to identify and establish relationship between self-determination factors and knowledge sharing behavior, where perceived organizational support deems to be the moderating or intervening factor. This review is also expected to further scrutinize the individual factors upon knowledge sharing behavior.

Knowledge Sharing Behavior
Knowledge Sharing Behavior (KSB) is very crucial for an organization to be functionally effective. It is one of the Knowledge Management (KM) initiatives if it to retain as a culture in an organization. KSB can be defined as individuals who distribute their acquired knowledge within a society (Ryu et al., 2003), a deliberate act that makes knowledge reusable by other people through knowledge transfer (Lee & Al-Hawamdeh, 2002). It is a process of giving and receiving knowledge (Hooff & Ridder, 2004), the act of exchanging ideas through

deliberations to create new knowledge (Hislop, 2002), and workers' contributing to increase performance and harnessing innovation (Chen, 2001). It is also a process where the individual exchange his or her knowledge and ideas through discussions to create new knowledge or ideas (Alam et al., 2009). Since BB are still working in the organization, the obligation to support organization through KSB is still needed and important. In this review, the context of individual KSB refers to BB' willingness to share the knowledge to other workers before retirement.

Personality Traits and Knowledge Sharing Behavior

Personality Traits (PT) are one of the most important factors in determining the behavior of knowledge sharing. PT can be referred as behavioral patterns that show stability over time and across situations (Cattell et al., 1970). According to the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of the American Psychiatric Association (2000), PT are "enduring patterns of perceiving, relating to, and thinking about the environment and oneself that are exhibited in a wide range of social and personal contexts." Traits and characteristics are similar to feature or quality. There is a continuing debate about how many different PT exist. It is expected that PT influence personal values and attitudes, as demonstrated in the empirical research conducted by Olver and Mooradian (2003) has demonstrated. The big five or five-factor model (FFM) offers an established framework for the application of PT to work behaviors, rather than a piecemeal search for potential personality correlates. The big FFM includes extraversion, conscientiousness, agreeableness, neuroticism and openness to experience (Benet-Martinez & John, 1998; Costa & McCrae, 1992; Digman, 1990). The field of personality was convinced as the best representation of trait structure for the past two decades by the FFM (Ozer & Benet-Martinez, 2006; John & Srivastava, 1999; Block, 1995; McCrae & John, 1992; Funder, 2001; Digman, 1990; Goldberg, 1990; John, 1990).

The big five include numerous narrower, more context-specific facets in a hierarchy of individual differences (John & Srivastava, 1999; McCrae, 2004), and have been identified in numerous empirical studies (Tupes & Christal, 1992) constituting the pattern of traits across individuals and are considered the fundamental dimensions of personality (McCrae & John, 1992). The FFM or big five model has become widely accepted by personality and industrial psychology researcher (Niehoff, 2006). Numerous researchers from many traditions such as Goldberg (1990), John and Srivastava (1999), Wasko and Faraj (2000, 2005), Ozer and Benet-Martinez (2006), Guadagno et al., (2008), Matzler et al., (2008), Gupta (2008), and Teh et al., (2011) were able to replicate the findings, thereby sustaining the theory of five basic dimensions of personality.

Salgado (1997) presents two factors of personality, openness and agreeableness, as predictors of training proficiency. In contrast, Lee and Klein (2002) demonstrate the impact of another factor of personality, conscientiousness, on learning. Barrick and Ryan (2003) review the literature which shows differently the connections between personality and work behavior, including many associations between personality and a range of outcomes, such as anti-social work behaviors, contextual performance, retention as well as learning. This is in line with Salgado (2003) as PT described the big five models do not only predict different facets of job performance, but they also affect a range of additional work outcomes, such as job satisfaction, job commitment, voluntary turnover, absenteeism and many more.

The big FFM also stressed most PT can be described in terms of five basic dimensions. It provides a well-accepted categorization that enhances understanding of the relation between personality and knowledge sharing behavior (Wang & Noe, 2010). The first element is neuroticism which is encompasses characteristics which include excessive worry, pessimism, low confidence, and tendencies to experience negative emotions. Because of their tendencies to interpret experiences under negative light, individuals who score high on neuroticism should be less likely to develop positive attitudes towards their behavior. Furthermore, due to lack of confidence and optimism, those who score high on neuroticism should be less likely to develop ambitions regarding their careers and to set performance and career goals accordingly (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Based on Teh et al. (2011), university students with higher levels of neuroticism have more favorable attitude towards online entertainment knowledge sharing behavior. Guadagno et al. (2008) found that people who are high in neuroticism are likely to be bloggers who express personal content using a blog, a new form of online self-presentation and self-expression. This is also consistent with Hamburger and Ben-Artzi (2000), in which neuroticism was negatively related to the use of social services like online chatting and forums in the internet (knowledge sharing behavior). People who are high in emotional stability are generally calm and even tempered in the way they cope with daily life (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Ones & Viswesvaran, 1997).

The second factor of behavior traits which is extraversion can be described as an individual who is comfortable with social relationships. Extroverts are viewed as warm, gregarious, assertive, active, and exhibiting positive emotion (Costa & McCrae, 1992), talkative, and relationship-orientation and action-oriented in group (Barrick & Mount, 1991). It is characterized by sociability, assertiveness, social dominance, ambition, tendencies towards action, sensation-seeking, and the experience of positive affect (Bozionelos, 2003). Those who report high scores on extraversion must be more likely to possess the need to occupy a central position in their knowledge sharing behavior so that they can satisfy their ambitious and domineering tendencies (Wisker,

2011). People who are high in extraversion are generally sociable, assertive, active, bold, energetic, adventuresome, and expressive. Hence, they should report higher scores on knowledge sharing behavior (Barrick et al., 2002). Teh et al. (2011) also found that university students with higher levels of extraversion have more favorable attitude towards online entertainment knowledge sharing behavior. This is further supported by Hamburger and Ben-Artzi's (2000) findings, in which extraversion was positively related to the use of leisure services in the internet.

The third factor of behavior traits is openness to experience which can be defined as the proactive seeking and appreciation of new experiences. It includes multiplicity of interests, receptivity of new ideas, flexibility of thought, inventiveness, and the tendency to develop idealistic ideas and goals. Individuals who score high on openness should be more likely to report involvement in their work, as their work can serve as the arena to entertain their curiosity, their appetite for exploring new perspectives, and their tendency to develop genuine interests for any activities they are committed in (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Based on Digman (1990), highly open people display intellectual curiosity, creativity, flexible thinking and culture, and thus they tend to have positive attitudes towards learning new things, and are keeners to engage in learning experience (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Cabrera et al. (2006) discovered that openness to experience is a strong predictor of knowledge sharing behavior because openness is a reflection of a person's curiosity and originality which in turn are predictors of seeking other people's insight. Therefore, it can be anticipated that individuals develop more expertise from openness to experience. According to Constant et al. (1996), individual with higher levels of expertise are more likely to give useful advice, whereas Wasko and Faraj (2000, 2005) said people with less expertise are likely to contribute less as they consider their expertise to be inadequate or lacking of experience. Meanwhile, Matzler et al. (2008) said that people with high openness are more engaged in contributing and seeking knowledge.

The other behavior trait is agreeableness which is defined as the number of sources from which an individual takes his or her norms for appropriate behavior (Costa & McCrae, 1992). An agreeable person will defer from many other people in terms of his or her attitudinal cues. Costa and McCrae (1992) describe an agreeable person as trustworthy, compliant, modest, and altruistic. Agreeableness is associated with altruism, friendliness and modesty, while low agreeableness includes antagonism, impression management and selfishness. Individuals tend to be committed in their work when they view work and career achievement as means for the maintenance and enhancement of their feelings of personal worth and esteem (Rabinowitz & Hall, 1977). People with high on agreeableness related to knowledge sharing behavior activities (Gupta, 2008; Matzler, 2008) are good natured, sympathetic, altruistic, forgiving, courteous, helpful, generous, cheerful, and cooperative (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Barrick et al., 1998; Liao & Chuang, 2004; Wit et al., 2002).

Another behavior trait is conscientiousness which refers to a characteristic involving goal focus, dutifulness, self-discipline, and competence (Costa & McCrae, 1992). According to Gupta (2008), conscientiousness is related to knowledge sharing behavior activities, while LePine and Van Dyne (2001) reported that conscientiousness is associated with willingness of knowledge sharing behavior. Result of Matzler's (2008) research also obviously shows there is a relationship between conscientiousness and knowledge sharing behavior. Several past studies (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Mount & Barrick, 1995; Salgado, 1997; Tokar et al., 1998) suggested that conscientiousness is the most potent and consistent correlation of job performance across all types of jobs and occupations. Conscientiousness has also been shown to improve organizational citizenship (Organ & Ryan, 1995).

The "big five" or FFM of personality represents taxonomy to parsimoniously and comprehensively describe human personality, whose validity is strongly supported by empirical evidence (Digman, 1990; Goldberg, 1993; McCrae & Costa, 1996). Due to this validity and wide acceptance, the big five has been extensively utilized in recent organizational and other applied research (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Hurtz & Donovan, 2000; Judge & Illies, 2002; Judge et al., 1999; Salgado, 1997). Therefore, it is important to establish the relationship between the big five traits and vital behavior variables including knowledge sharing. Work involvement reflects attitudes and values towards a particular aspect of life and, hence, it must relate to personality traits, as earlier (Lawler & Hall, 1970) and more contemporary writers (Elloy & Terpening, 1992) have suggested. Kanungo (1982) found work involvement refers to the extent to which an individual is generally interested in, identifies with, and is pre-occupied with one's work in comparison to other aspects of one's life. It reflects the significance individuals attach to having and performing work (Elloy & Terpening, 1992). Therefore, work involvement constitutes an important motivational variable that is of interest to organizations, especially in the new economy, which imposes the need for full mobilization of the human resources (Gore, 2001).

In sum, based on the past findings, it clearly shows that there is a relationship between PT and sharing of knowledge behavior. What is more interesting is that PT could be tested on people who want to retire, particularly to employees in developing countries such as Malaysia. So, with this, it can be seen to what extent that BB can contribute to organization by sharing knowledge. How does PT influenced them in the sharing of knowledge? Do all these personal characteristics have the same effects on the sharing of knowledge, or vice

versa? The next sub-sections will be the discussion on the relationship of the five (5) personality traits with the first part on the deliberation of the relationship between intrinsic motivation and knowledge sharing behavior.

Intrinsic Motivation and Knowledge Sharing Behavior

Intrinsic motivation (IM) is the inherent tendency to seek out novelty and challenges, to extend and exercise one's capacities, to explore and to learn; for interest and enjoyment and the inherent satisfaction in the specific behavior (Malhotra & Galletta, 2003). This argument has been manifested in many empirical studies that show intrinsic motivation promotes highly valued behavioral outcomes such as creativity (Amabile, 1993), quality (Kruglanski et al., 1971), and learning (Vallerand & Bissonnette, 1992; Vansteenkiste et al., 2004). It seems reasonable to expect that IM will have the same positive effect on knowledge sharing behavior as other learning activities. According to Vroom and Deci (1970), performance-based rewards are not enough to motivate employees to perform effectively on their job. Intrinsically motivated employees can derive satisfaction from doing an effective job per se: ''they can become ego-involved with their jobs, emotionally committed to doing them well and take pride from evidence that they are effective in furthering the objectives of the company''. Individual who are more highly committed to their profession are also likely to be more intrinsically motivated by the work (Wallace, 1995).

IM is an important factor in facilitating the best practice of tacit knowledge (Calder & Staw, 1975; Ko et al., 2005; O'Dell & Grayson, 1998; Osherloh & Frey, 2000). By sharing their knowledge, individuals can be satisfied with the confidence in their ability to contribute to the organization or to help others (Bock et al., 2005; Constant et al., 1994; Kankanhalli et al., 2005; Wasko & Faraj, 2000). Individuals may contribute knowledge to the community because they feel that helping others in solving problems is interesting and they derive feelings of intrinsic enjoyment by doing so (Davenport & Prusak, 1998; Kankanhalli et al., 2005; Wasko & Faraj, 2005).

Szulanski et al. (2004) suggested that motivational forces are derived from individual belief structures and institutional structures. BB or seniors need to be motivated in order to share their knowledge and experience with juniors and newcomers (Von Krogh, 1998; Yang, 2007). Individuals are intrinsically motivated when they seek enjoyment, interest, satisfaction, or self-expression in the work itself (Amabile, 1993). Dyer and McDonough (2001) affirmed that success or failure of Knowledge Management Systems is often affected by employee motivation and commitment. In contrast Malhotra and Galletta (2003) claimed that motivation and commitment perform an important role in successfully implementing knowledge management systems (as antecedents). For them, the development of organizational knowledge culture should be characterized by high levels of commitment and motivation.

Osterloh and Frey (2000) findings revealed that IM should facilitate the sharing of tacit knowledge. O'Dell and Grayson (1998) and Ko et al. (2005) said that intrinsic motivation is important to sharing best practices. Intrinsic motivation to engage in knowledge sharing behavior implies that employees find the activity itself interesting, enjoying, and stimulating (Foss, 2009). In a broader perspective, research within social psychology argues that individuals, who are intrinsically motivated, are proactive and get involved in activities in order to promote their own personal growth (Deci & Ryan, 2000). In fact, several scholars argue that IM matters especially for knowledge sharing behavior (Cabrera et al., 2006; Lin, 2007; Osterloh & Frey, 2000). For example, Osterloh and Frey (2000) advance that employees who are intrinsically motivated to share knowledge will participate more in knowledge sharing behavior activities and refrain from the free-riding often associated with public goods compared to employees who are externally motivated. Empirically, the impact of motivational factors such as development, and enjoyment, often associated with intrinsic motivation, are consistently argued to enhance knowledge sharing behavior (Bock et al., 2005; Burgess, 2005; Cabrera et al., 2006; Lin, 2007). The subsequent sub-section is the in-depth discussion on how the relationship between emotional intelligence and KSB was established.

Emotional Intelligence and Knowledge Sharing Behavior

Emotional Intelligence (EI) is a relatively new construct (Zeidner et al., 2004) and it is increasingly recognized as an important element in effecting people's behavior. EI is a set of abilities and skills that can be improved (Chang, 2008). Serra (2009) described EI as ability, capacity, skill, or self-perceived ability to identify, assess, and manage the emotions of one's self, of others, and of groups. People who possess a high degree of EI know themselves very well and are also able to sense the emotions of others. They are friendly, resilient, and optimistic. According to Salovey and Mayer (1990), EI is the ability to monitor one's own and others' feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one's thinking and actions.

On the other end, EI is a part of social intelligence but distinguished from cognitive intelligence. According to Cherniss (2000), EI focuses on feeling and behavior whereas cognitive intelligence discusses more about facts and knowledge. This is in accordance with the view of Bar-On et al. (2000) as they said that EI is a non-cognitive intelligence which is defined as an array of emotional, personal and social abilities and skills that influence an individual's ability to cope effectively with environmental demands and pressures. EI involves the

ability to recognize personal feelings and emotions and those of others and to use that information to resolve conflicts, solve problem, and improve interactions with others. It reflects one's ability to interact with others in a positive manner and normally looked as the final determinant of business's success (Brown, 1999). In addition, Mayer et al. (2000) explained that EI has four levels of hierarchical skills which range in complexity in terms of how individual identify, manage and use emotions.

Emotions influence what people think about, how people think, and are essential for people to make appropriate decisions, take the best possible action to solve problems, cope with change, and succeed (Caruso & Salovey, 2004). According to Goleman (1998), EI can be defined as the ability to distinguish feelings, to motivate ourselves, and to manage emotions in ourselves and in our relationships. His definition includes such meanings as self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skills. Even though the scholars have different understanding and definition of EI, the definitions within the field of EI tends to be complementary rather than contradictory. EI can reflect how an individual's potential for mastering the skills of self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and relationship management translates into success in the workplace (Goleman, 2001). Based on Salovey and Mayer (1990), EI involves abilities that are categorized into five domains. They are self-awareness, managing emotions, motivating oneself, empathy, and handling relationship which have implications for students' performance in tertiary institutions. It is likely that EI will assist people having low happiness and low satisfaction and high depression in developing appropriate behaviors and attitudes in respect of their work.

All theories within the EI paradigm seek to understand how individuals perceive, understand, utilize and manage emotions in an effort to predict and foster personal effectiveness (Ciarrochi et al., 2000). Most literatures agreed that EI is a positive factor which contributes to more positive behaviors including academic performance, heath, social support, job performance, social adjustment and career development, life satisfaction, psychological wellbeing, and occupational success (Bar-On, 1997 & 2005; Barling et al., 2000; Beauvais, et al., 2011; Carmeli et el., 2003; Caruso et al., 2002; Dimitriades, 2007; Engelberg & Sjoberg, 2004; George, 2000; Goleman, 2001; Kloumakou, 2007; Mayer et al., 2008; Rosete & Ciarrochi, 2005; Salami, 2004; Salami & Ogundokun, 2009; Salovey & Mayer, 1990; Schutte et al., 1998; Tagliavia et al., 2006). EI will also have a positive influence on team member KSB (Braun, 2005) related to tacit knowledge sharing behavior (Kadir & Hazman, 2011). Research by Mayer (1997) and Goleman (1998) proposed that EI accounts for success at home, school, and work, enabling individuals to become more cooperative, effective team members and leaders and also enabling them to build their technical skills and intelligence for jobs at all levels. Meanwhile, Boyatzis et al. (2000) described the competencies that enable people to demonstrate intelligence use of their emotions in managing themselves and working effectively with others. Yet another relationship between another self-determination factor which is sense of belonging and KSB seems relevant to be put forth in the next sub-section.

Sense of Belonging and Knowledge Sharing Behavior

Sense of belonging (SB) can be defined as recognition and acceptance of a member by other members in a group or organization (Anant, 1969). He also suggested that there was a contrary relationship between belonging and anxiety. Based on Maslow (1954) and Thoits (1982), SB is a human need. It is very important in creating a unique union organization. Spirit and SB to an organization will influence the behavior of an individual. This means, to achieve what we want, we need the internal factors that are influencing our behavior and movements. SOB among the members of organization can be a springboard in achieving the goals and aspirations that we do. SOB is fundamental to members' identification with a group and has numerous consequences for behavior (Turner et al., 1987).

Based on Bollen and Hoyle (1990), individuals' SOB to a group (organization) is associated with membership in that group which is likely to be positive related for most members of the groups. SB in a sense of ownership is a unique phenomenon of feeling and relationship. For them, the SB is the experience of personal involvement in the system or environment so that people feel they are an integral part of the system or the environment. Meanwhile, SB is a state of connection between a person and the environment; multidimensional phenomenon that may be viewed from the varied perspectives of psychological, sociological, physical, emotional, social, or spiritual of the individual that defines a person (Hagerty et al., 1992; Hagerty et al., 1993). It is a specific process of relatedness and presented an analysis of the concept, positing it to be an important element for mental health and social well-being (Hagerty et al., 1996). SB also has socially constructed meaning and provides a sense of security (Andersen et al., 2000). Lack of SB is strongly associated with loneliness and depression (Choenarom et al., 2005, Hagerty et al., 1992).

Based on Barbara et al. (2007), the desire to belong to a group or organization influences an individual's behavior well before he or she is actually a member of the group. Wei (2010) said that knowledge sharing behavior cannot be forced or mandated. It should occur as an enjoyment by enforcing their SB. SB is seen as connectedness that portrays the dynamic nature of human existence. Therefore, the role of SB to interpersonal relationships and the well-being of individuals, family, and community are emphasized (Hill, 2006).

According to Vande Walle et al. (1995), SB influences altruistic spirit through organizational commitment and thus affects knowledge sharing behavior. Whereas, Yoo et al. (2002), McMillan and Chavis (1986) agreed that sense of community can be considered as another important factor affecting the virtual knowledge sharing behavior process and can be defined as the sense of belongingness in a community that a member feels and a shared confidence in how much they matter to each other and that their needs are met through commitment to each other. Sense of community causes a common perception of knowledge that is possessed and preserved by the community (Wasko & Faraj, 2000). A strong SOB leads to a more recognition on KSB that causes feelings of intrinsic satisfaction (Sharratt & Usoro, 2003).

The relationships of the four (4) self-determination factors which are PT, IM, EI and SB with KMB have raised the issue on how Perceived Organizational Support (POS) can act as the moderating variable to KMB. The next section deliberates on how the relationships among PT, IM, EI, SB, POS and KMB are interestingly linked.

Perceived Organizational Support as Moderating Variable

Lew (2009) clarifies that POS does not only have a direct influence on organizational commitment, but can also be a moderating element to others. He also suggested that the employees will repay the organization which supported them with stronger commitment and develop a sense of felt obligation to reciprocate the organization's support by caring about the organization's wellbeing and helping to achieve its objectives. Based on Phelps et al. (2008), they found POS moderately affects the relationship between job satisfaction and intent to stay for recently retrained employees. Besides, a number of prior studies have agreed that POS has also been functioning as a moderator. For example, Duke et al. (2009) investigated the interactive effects of perceptions of organizational support on two emotional labor outcomes which are job satisfaction and job performance. They found that there is an interactive effect between emotional labors and POS significantly predicts both job satisfaction and job performance.

Meanwhile, Erdogan and Enders (2007) discovered that POS had significant effect on the intermediary between the two variables. The positive relationship between Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) and job satisfaction was stronger when supervisors had high POS. Zhou and George (2001) reported that creativity in dissatisfied employees was highest when continuance commitment and POS for creativity were both high. Moreover, De Carlo et al., (1997) also found that the relationship between salespersons' expectancies and performance was moderated by attributions of organizational support. In a study of the relationship between AIDS patient exposure and nurse negative mood by George et al., (1993), they reported that high levels of POS allowed nurses to minimize distress more effectively.

Aquino and Griffeth (1999) stated that there is a relationship between PT and perceived organizational support (POS). PT might influence POS by affecting employee behaviors, and consequently treatment by the organization. Positive affectivity might lead to expansive and friendly behaviors, which would cause the employee to make a favorable impression on others and would result in a more effective working relationship with coworkers and supervisors. On the other hand, aggressive or withdrawal behaviors resulting from negative affectivity could inhibit the development of favorable working relationships, reducing POS. Based on Lycnh et al. (1999), POS affected the relationship between employees' reciprocation wariness and their job performance. Eisenberger et al. (1986) argued that individuals evaluate the behavior of organizational agents towards them. Workers are often sensitive to environmental and organizational constraints which limit the ability to provide them. Better treatment from the organization will foster a good enthusiasm and characters to the workers.

Summary

The purpose of this review is to establish and evaluate the relationship between four (4) elements categorized under Self-Determination Factors (SDFs) and Knowledge Sharing Behavior (KSB). These independent variables are Personality Trait (PT), Intrinsic Motivation (IM), Emotional Intelligence (EM) and Sense of Belonging (SB), while Perceived Organizational Support (POS) roles as intervene factor.

The expected result should unveiled the extend of the support for the notion that BBs' SDFs play the major and crucial role towards KSB with the moderating effect of POS. In this context, if organizations want their BBs to engage in knowledge-sharing activities, they should take into account individual factors so that their employees, primarily the BBs are more committed, willing and keen to share their knowledge, experience and expertise. Finally it is envisaged that this review would provide an insight of the framework on how BBs SDF can contribute to the KSB where POS played an intervening role.

References

Alam, S. S., Abdullah, Z., Amir Ishak, N., & Mohd.Zain, Z. (2009). Assessing Knowledge sharing behavior Behavior among Employees in SMEs: An Empirical Study. International Business Research, 2, 2, 115-122.
Allen, P. (2004). Welcoming Y. Benefits Canada, 28,9, 51-53.

Anant, S. S. (1969). A cross-cultural study of belongingness, anxiety, and self-sufficiency. ActaPsychologia, 31, 4, 385-393.

Andersen, S., Chen, S., & Carter, C. (2000). Fundamental human needs: Making social cognition relevant. Psychological Inquiry, 11, 4, 269-275. Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. (1988). Structural Equation Modeling in Practice: A Review and Recommended Two-Step Approach. Psychological Bulletin, 103, 3, 411-423.

Alvesson, M. (2000). Social identity and the problem of loyalty in knowledge-intensive companies. Journal of Management Studies, 37, 8, 1101-1123.

Amabile, T. M. (1993). Motivational synergy: Towards new conceptions of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation in the workplace. Human Resource Management Review. 3, 185-201.

Aquino, K., & Griffeth, R. W. (1999). An exploration of the antecedents and consequences of perceived organizational support: A longitudinal study. Unpublished manuscript, University of Delaware and Georgia State University.

Azudin, N., Ismail, M. N., & Taherali, Z. (2008). Knowledge sharing behavior among workers: a study on their contribution through informal communication in Cyberjaya, Malaysia. Knowledge Management & E-Learning: An International Journal, 1, 2.

Badaracco, J. L. (1991). The Knowledge Link: How Firms Compete Through Strategic Alliances, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA, 109.

Baardsen., S. (2011). The importance of knowledge sharing behavior. (2011). The International Year of Forests: European and global forests – which way for the future?

Barbara, M. N., Brenda J. L., & Philip R. N. (2007). Peer Group Membership and a Sense of Belonging: Their Relationship to Adolescent Behavior Problems. Adolescence, 42, 166, 241-263.

Bar-On, R. (2000). Emotional and social intelligence: Insights from the Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i). In R. Bar-On and J. D. A. Parker (Eds.), Handbook of emotional intelligence. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bar-On, R. (2005). Emotional intelligence and subjective wellbeing. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Barrick, M. R; Stewart, G. L, & Piotrowski, M. (2002). Personality and job performance: Test of the mediating effects of motivation among sales representatives. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87, 1, 43-51.

Barrick, M. R., & Ryan A. M. (2003). Personality and work: Reconsidering the role of personality in organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Beauvais, A. M., Brady, N., O'Shea, E. R., & Quinn Griffin, M. T. (2011). Emotional intelligence and nursing performance among nursing students.Nurse Education Today, 31, 396–401.

Benet-Martinez, V., & John, O. P. (1998). Los CincoGrandes across cultures and ethnic groups: Multitrait-multimethod analyses of the Big Five in Spanish and English. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75, 729-750.

Block, J. (1995). A contrarian view of the five-factor approach to personality description. Psychological Bulletin, 117, 187-215.

Bock, G. W., Zmud, B., Kim, Y. G., & Lee. L. N. (2005). Behavioral intention formation in knowledge sharing behavior: examining the roles of extrinsic motivators, social-psychological forces, and organizational climate, MIS Quarterly, 29, 1, 87–111.

Bollen, K. A., & Long, J. S. (1993). Testing Structural Equation Models. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Boudreau, J., Hopp, W., McClain, J. O., &. Thomas, L. J. (2003). On the interface between operations and human resources management. Manufacturing Service Operation Management, 5, 3, 179-202.

Boyatzis, R., Goleman, D. & Rhee, K. (2000). Clustering competence in EI: Insights from the emotional competence inventory (ECI). Retrieved October 23, 2004, from http://www.eiconsortium.org.

Braun, F. C. (2005). Factors of Knowledge sharing behavior in Information Technology Project Teams.Submitted as fulfillment of the conceptual research component requirement for the degree of EDM (Executive Doctor of Management).

Brown, A., Spencer, D., & Slater, G. (2002). Driven to abstraction? Critical realism and the search for the "inner connection" of social phenomena, Cambridge Journal of Economics, 26, 6, 773-788.

Burgess, D. (2005). What motivates employees to transfer knowledge outside their work unit? Journal of Business Communication, 42, 4, 324-48.

Cabrera, Á., Collins, W. C., & Salgado, J. F. (2006). "Determinants of Individual Engagement in Knowledge sharing behavior", International Journal of Human Resource Management, 17, 2, 245-264.

Carmeli, A. (2003). The relationship between emotional intelligence and work attitudes, behavior and outcomes: An examination among senior managers. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 18, 8, 788-813.

Caruso, D. R., Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (2002). Relation of an Ability Measure of Emotional Intelligence to Personality. Journal of Personality Assessment, 79, 2, 306-320.

Caruso, D. R. & Salovey, P. (2004). The emotionally intelligent manager. San Francisco,CA: Jossey-Bass

Cattell, R. B. (1965). The scientific analysis of personality, Baltimore, MD: Penguin.

Chang, K. B. T. (2008). Can we improve emotional intelligence? Addressing the positive psychology goal of enhancing strengths. In J. C. Cassady, & M. A. (Eds), Eissa, Emotional intelligence: Perspectives on educational and positive psychology. New York: Peter Lang, 25-45.

Cherniss, C. (2000). Emotional Intelligence: What it is and why it Matters. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, New Orleans, LA, April 15, 2000.

Ciarrochi, J. V., Chan, A. Y. C , & Caputi, P. (2000). A critical evaluation of the emotional intelligence construct. Personality and Individual Differences, 28, 539-561.

Chiu, C. M., Hsu, M.H., & Wang, E.T.G. (2006). Understanding knowledge sharing behavior in virtual communities: An integration of social capital and social cognitive theories". Journal of Decision Support Systems, 42, 1872-1888.

Choenarom, C., Williams, R. A., & Hagerty, B. M. (2005). The Role of Sense of Belonging and Social Support on Stress and Depression in Individuals with Depression. Archives of Psychiatric Nursing, 19, 1, 18–29.

Davenport, T. H., De Long, D. W., & Beers, M. C. (1998). Successful Knowledge Management Projects. Sloan Management Review, 39, 2, 43-57.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. Psychological Inquiry, 11, 227–268.

DeCarlo, T., Teas, R., & McElroy, J. (1997). Salesperson performance attribution processes and the formation of expectancy estimates. Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management, 17, 1–17.

DeNisi, A. S., Hitt, M. A., & Jackson, S. E. (2003). The Knowledge Based Approach to Sustainable Competitive Advantage. New York: Oxford University press.

Dimitriades, Z. S. (2007). Managing emotionally intelligent service workers: Personal and positional effects in the Greek context. Journal of European Industrial Training, 31, 3, 223–240.

Du Plessis. M. (2006). The Impact of Organizational Culture on Knowledge Management, Chandos Publishing (Oxford) Limited.Empirical research. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Dunford, R. (2000). Key challenges in the search for the effective management of knowledge in management consulting firms, Journal of Knowledge Management, 4,. 4, 295-302.

Duke, A. B., Goodman, J. M., Treadway, D. C., & Breland, J. W. (2009). Perceived organizational support as a moderator of emotional labor/outcomes relationships. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 39, 1013–1034.

Dyer, G., & McDonough, B. (2001). The State of KM. Knowledge Management, 4, 5.31-36.

Erdogan, B., & Enders, J. (2007). Support from the top: supervisors' perceived organizational support as a moderator of leader-member exchange to satisfaction and performance relationships. Journal of Applied Psychology, 92, 321−330.

Felin, T., & Hesterly, W. S. (2007). The Knowledge-Based View, Nested Heterogeneity, and New Value Creation: Philosophical Considerations on the Locus of Knowledge. The Academy of Management Review, 32, 195-218.

Fen Lin, H (2007). Knowledge sharing behavior and firm innovation capability:an empirical study. International Journal of Manpower, 28, 3/4, 315-332.

Foss, N. (2007). The Emerging Knowledge Governance Approach: Challenges and Characteristics, Organization, 14, 1, 27-50.

FouziaAkram., & Dr. RahatBokhari. (2011). The Role of Knowledge sharing behavior on Individual Performance, Considering the Factor of Motivation-The Conceptual Framework, International Journal of Multidisplinary Sciences and Engineering, 2, 9. 44-48.

Funder, D. (2001). Personality, Annual Review of Psychology, 52, 197-221.

George, I. M., Reed, T. F., Ballard, K. A., Colin, I., & Fielding, I. (1993). Contact with AIDS patients as a source of work-related distress: Effects of organizational and social support. Academy of Management Journal, 36, 157-171.

Gold, A. H., Malhotra, A., & Segars, A. H. (2001). Knowledge management: an organizational capabilities perspective. Journal of management Information System, 18, 1, 185-214.

Goleman, D. (1998). Working with emotional intelligence. New York: Bantam Books.

Goleman, D (2001). Emotional intelligence: Issues in paradigm building. In C. Cherniss& D. Goleman (Eds.), The Emotionally Intelligent Workplace. 13-26., Jossey-Bass: San Francisco.

Gore, N. (2001). What's all this mobilizing about?, Canadian HR Reporter, 14, 21, 17-19.

Grandori, A., & Kogut, B. (2002).Dialogue on Organization and Knowledge. Organization Science, 13, 224-232.

Gupta, B. (2008).Role of Personality in Knowledge sharing behavior and Knowledge Acquisition Behavior. Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology, 34, 1, 143-149.

Guthrie, J. (2001). High-involvement work practices and employee turnover and productivity: Evidence from New Zealand. Academy of Management Journal, 44, 1, 180–190.

Hair, J. F., Black, B., Babin, B., Anderson, R. E., &Tatham, R. L. (2006), Multivariate Data Analysis (6th ed.), NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Hamburger, Y. A., & Ben-Artzi, E. (2000). The relationship between extraversion and neuroticism and the different uses of the Internet. Computers in Human Behavior, 16, 4, 441-449.

Hatfield, S. L. (2002). Understanding the four generations to enhance workplace management. AFP Exchange, 22,4, 72-75.

Hill, D. L. (2006). Sense of Belonging as Connectedness, American Indian Worldview,and Mental Health. Archives of Psychiatric Nursing, 20, 5, 210–216.

Hislop, D. (2002). Managing knowledge and the problem of commitment, The Third European Conference on Organisational Knowledge, Learning, and Capabilities, Astir Palace, Athens, 5-6 April, 2002, [online], Available: http://www.dcs.napier.ac.uk/~hazelh/esis/hazel2.pdf.

Holmes-Smith, P., Coote, L., & Cunningham, E. (2006). Structural Equation Modelling: From the Fundamentals to Advanced Topics. Melbourne: SREAMS.

Hooff, B. V. D,.& Ridder, J. A. D. (2004). Knowledge sharing behavior in context: the influence of organizational commitment, communication climate and CMC use on knowledge sharing behavior, Journal of Knowledge Management, 8, 6, 117 – 130.

Hurtz, G.M., & Donovan, J.J. (2000), "Personality and job performance: the big five revisited". Journal of Applied Psychology, 85, 869-879.

Jain, K., Singh, K. l, Sandhu, M., Sidhu, K. & Gurvinder. (2006). Knowledge sharing behavior Among Academic Staff: A Case Study of Business Schools in Klang Valley, Malaysia, Available at: www.ucsi.edu.my/jasa/2/papers/08A.pdf

John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999), "The big five trait taxonomy: history, measurement, and theoretical perspectives", in Pervin, L.A. and John, O.P. (Eds), Handbook of Personality, Guilford Press, New York, NY.

Judge, T. A. and Ilies, R. (2002), "Relationship of personality to performance motivation: a meta-analytic review", Journal of Applied Psychology, 87, 797-807.

Judge, T. A., Higgins. C. A., Thoresen, C. J., & Barrick, M. R. (1999), "The big five personality traits, general mental ability, and career success across the life span". Personnel Psychology, 52, 621-52.

Kadir, K. O., & Hazman, S. A. (2011). The Influence of Emotional Intelligence on Tacit Knowledge sharing behavior in Service Organizations. Copyright © 2011, IGI Global. Copying or distributing in print or electronic forms without written permission of IGI Global is prohibited.

Kanfer, R., & Ackerman, P. L. (2004). Aging, Adult Development, and Work Motivation.Academy of Management Review, 29, 3, 440–458.

Kankanhalli, A., Tan, B. C. Y., and Wei, K.-K. (2005). Contributing knowledge to electronic knowledge repositories: an empirical investigation. MIS Quarterly, 29, 1, 113-143.

Keyes, J. (2008). Identifying the Barriers to Knowledge sharing behavior in Knowledge Intensive Organizations.Ph.D.

Kwakye, U. O., & MdNor, K. (2011). American Journal of Economics and Business Administration, 3,1, 66-72.

Lee, C. K., & Al-Hawamdeh. S. (2002). Factors impacting knowledge sharing behavior, Journal of Information and Knowledge Management, 1, 49-56.

Lee, S., & Klein, H. J. (2002). Relationships between conscientiousness, self-efficacy, self-deception, and learning over time. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87, 1175–1182.

LePine, J. A., & Van Dyne, L. (2001). Voice and cooperative behavior as contrasting forms of contextual performance: Evidence of differential relationships with big five personality characteristics and cognitive ability. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86, 325-336.

Lew, T. Y., (2009). The Relationships between Perceived Organizational Support, Felt Obligation, Affective Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intention of Academics working with Private Higher Educational Institutions in Malaysia. European Journal of Social Sciences, 9, 72-87.

Liao, H., & Chuang, A. (2004). A multilevel investigation of factors influencing employee service performance and customer outcomes. Academy of Management Journal, 47, 41–58.

Lin, C. P. (2007). To Share or Not to Share: Modeling Tacit Knowledge sharing behavior, Its Mediators and Antecedents. Journal of business ethics. 70, 411-428.

Ling, C. W., Sandhu, M. S., & Jain, K. K (2008). Knowledge sharing behavior in an American multinational company based in Malaysia. Journal of Workplace Learning, 21, 2, 125-142

Malhorta, Y. &Galletta F. D. (2003). Role of Commitment and motivation in Knowledge Management System Implementation: Theory, Conceptualization, and Measurement of Antecedents of Success. Proceedings of the 36th Hawaii International Conference on System Science.

Matzler, K., Renzl, B., Muller, J., Herting, S. &Mooradian, T.A., (2008).PTand knowledge sharing behavior. Journal of Economic Psychology, 29, 301-313.

McCrae, R. R. (2004). Human nature and culture: a trait perspective. Journal of Research in Personality, 38, 3-14.

Ngah, R. &Jusoff., K. (2009). Tacit Knowledge sharing behavior and SMEs' Organizational Performance. International Journal of Economics and Finance, 1, 1, 216-220.

Noor, N. M, &Salim, J. (2012). The influence of individual, organizational and Technological factors on knowledge sharing behavior in private sector in Malaysia.

Olver, J. M., & Mooradian, T. A. (2003). "PT and personal values: a conceptual and empirical integration". Personality and Individual Differences, 35, 109-125.

Ones, D. S., & Viswesvaran, C. (1997). Personality determinants in the prediction of aspects of expatriate job success. In D. M. Saunders (Series Ed.) & Z. Aycan (Vol. Ed.), New approaches to employee management: Vol. 4. Expatriate management: Theory and research (pp. 63–92). Stamford, CT: JAI Press.

Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. Personnel Psychology, 48, 775-803.

Osterloh, M., & Frey, B.S. (2000). Motivation, knowledge transfer, and organizational forms. Organization Science, 11, 538–550.

Ozer, D. J., & Benet-Martínez, V. (2006). Personality and the prediction of consequential outcomes. Annual Review of Psychology, 57, 401–421.

Phelps, J, A., Heilmann, S. G., Holt, D. T., & Leach, S. E. (2008). Moderating Perceived Organizational Support on the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intentions for recently retrained usafenglisted members. Proceedings of ASBBS, 15, 1.

Pullins, E. B., Haugtvedt, P., Dickson, P. R., Fine, L. M., &Lewicki, R. J. (2000). Individual differences in intrinsic motivation and the use of cooperative negotiation tactics. The Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing, 15, 466-478.

Punch, K. F. (1998). Introduction to Social Research: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches. London: Sage.

Salami, S. O. (2004). Affective characteristics as of determinants of academic performance of school-going adolescents: Implication for Counseling and practice. Sokoto Educational Review, 7, 145--160.

Salami, S. O., &Ogundokun, M.O. (2009).Emotional intelligence and self-efficacy as predictors of academic performance. Perspectives in Education, 25, 3, 175-185.

Salgado, J. F. (2003). Predicting job performance using FFM and non-FFM personality measures. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 76, 323-346.

Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. Imagination, Cognition, and Personality, 9, 185-211.

Sandhu, M. S., Jain, K. K., & Ahmad, U. K. (2011). International Journal of Public Sector Management. Knowledge sharing behavior among public sector employees: evidence from Malaysia, 24, 3, 206-226.

Saunders, M., Lewis, P., &Thornhill, A. (2003). Research Method for Business Student, Sydney, Prentice Hall.

Sekaran, U. (2003). Research methods for business (4th ed). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Serrat, O. (2009). Understanding and Developing Emotional Intelligence.http://www.adb.org/documents/information/knowledge-solutions/understanding-developing-emotional-intelligence.pdf

Sharratt, M., & Usoro, A. (2003). Understanding knowledge-sharing in online communities of practice. Electronic Journal on Knowledge Management, 1, 2, 187-196.

Stovel, M., & Bontis, N. (2002). Voluntary turnover: Knowledge management. Journal of Intellectual Capital, 3, 3, 303–322.

Sullivan, W., R. Sulliva., & B. Buffton. (2002). Aligning Individual and Organizational Values to Support Change. Journal of Change Management, 2, 3, 247–254.

Syed-Ikhsan, S. O. S, & Rowland, F. (2004). Benchmarking knowledge management in a public organisation in Malaysia.Benchmarking: An International Journal, 11, 3, 238-266.

Szulanski, G., Cappetta, R., & Jensen, R. J. (2004). When and how trustworthiness matters: Knowledge transfer and the moderating effect of causal ambiguity.Organization Science, 15, 600−613.

Tabachnick, B. G., &Fidell, L. S. (2001). Using Multivariate Statistics (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Tagliavia, N. A., Tipton, D. J., Giannetti, V. J., &Mattei, T. (2006). An investigation of the correlation between pharmacy students' level of professionalism and emotional intelligence (EI). Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of College of Pharmacy, Sheraton San Diego Hotel & Marina, San Diego, California, USA.

Tan, F. M. (2008). Organizational Support as the Mediator of Career-Related HRM Practices and Affective Commitment: Evidence from Knowledge Workers in Malaysia. Research and Practice in Human Resource Management, 16, 2, 8-24.

Teh, P. L., Yong, C. C., Chong, C. W., & Yew, S. Y (2011). Do the Big Five Personality Factors affect knowledge sharing behaviorbehavior? A study of Malaysian universities. Malaysian Journal of Library & Information Science, 16, 1, 47-62.

Thomas, D. (2005). Where HR is a hot property. Personnel Today, May, P9.

Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987). Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Vansteenkiste, M., Simons, J., Lens, W., Sheldon, K.M. and Deci, E.L. (2004). Motivating learning, performance, and persistence: The synergistic effects of intrinsic goal contents and autonomy-supportive contexts.Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 87, 246–60.

Wasko, M., & 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, 9, 2/3, 155-73.

Wasko, M. M., & Faraj, S. (2005). Why should I share? Examining social capital and knowledge contribution in electronic networks of practice. MIS Quarterly, 29, 1, 35–57.

Wei, L. W. (2010). Knowledge sharing behavior in organization: an empirical investigation.

Witt, L. A., Burke, L. A., Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (2002). The interactive effects of conscientiousness and agreeableness on job performance.Journal of Applied Psychology, 87,164-169.

Work Study. (2002). Economic downturn raises motivational issues, Work Study, 2, 98.

Yang, H. L. & Wu, T. C. T. (2008). Knowledge sharing behavior in an organization. Technological Forecasting & Social Change, 75, 1128–1156.

Yin, R. (1994). Case study research: Design and methods (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.

Yoo, W. S., Suh, K. S., & Lee, M. B. (2002). Exploring factors enhancing member participation in virtual communities, Journal of Global Information Management, 10, 3, 55-71.

Zeidner, M., Matthews, G., & Robert, D. R. (2004). Emotional Intelligence in the Workplace: A Critical Review. Applied Psychology: An International Review, 53, 3, 371-399.

The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open-Access hosting service and academic event management. The aim of the firm is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the firm can be found on the homepage:
http://www.iiste.org

CALL FOR JOURNAL PAPERS

There are more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals hosted under the hosting platform.

Prospective authors of journals can find the submission instruction on the following page: http://www.iiste.org/journals/ All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Paper version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

MORE RESOURCES

Book publication information: http://www.iiste.org/book/

Academic conference: http://www.iiste.org/conference/upcoming-conferences-call-for-paper/

IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digtial Library , NewJour, Google Scholar