

Tacit Knowledge Sharing in Micro, Small, and Medium-Sized Enterprises: Antecedents and Its Mediators

I Made Artha Wibawa^{1*}, Ni Putu Santi Suryantini², I Gusti Bagus Honor Satrya³ 

^{1,2,3} Management Department, Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Udayana, Denpasar, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received April 13, 2023

Revised April 17, 2023

Accepted September 20, 2023

Available online November 25, 2023

Kata Kunci:

Berbagi pengetahuan diam-diam, komitmen organisasi, pengaruh interpersonal, sikap kerjasama, keadilan organisasi

Keywords:

Tacit knowledge sharing, organizational commitment, interpersonal influence, cooperation attitudes, organizational justice



This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.

Copyright © 2023 by Author. Published by Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha.

ABSTRAK

Berbagi pengetahuan sebagai bagian dari sumber pengetahuan, terutama pengetahuan diam-diam, adalah bentuk pengetahuan yang paling transparan dan subyektif, pendorong penting untuk mempertahankan posisi kompetitif dan keberlanjutan organisasi. Keengganan untuk berbagi pengetahuan dipandang sebagai tidak etis, yang dapat menghambat kelangsungan hidup suatu organisasi. Pengetahuan ini menyediakan sumber daya manusia dengan kemampuan bertahan hidup yang berkualitas, unggul, dan jangka panjang. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menguji anteseden dan mediator berbagi pengetahuan Tacit. Penelitian ini merupakan penelitian kuantitatif dengan jumlah penduduk sebanyak 393 UMKM di Provinsi Bali. Metode pengumpulan sampel menggunakan rumus Solvin dan simple random sampling untuk mendapatkan 389 sampel. Responden adalah manajemen, dengan instrumen penelitian kuesioner skala Likert 1-5. Analisis menggunakan PLS-SEM dan diproses dengan software SmartPLS 2.0. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa berbagi pengetahuan diam-diam berpengaruh pada interpersonal dan kepercayaan pada rekan kerja, dengan variabel mediator dipercaya pada rekan kerja. Penelitian ini menyiratkan komunikasi menciptakan efektivitas dan efisiensi waktu sehingga dapat meningkatkan kepercayaan dan mendorong niat untuk bekerja sama dan berbagi pengetahuan secara diam-diam.

ABSTRACT

Knowledge sharing as part of the source of knowledge, especially tacit knowledge, is the most transparent and subjective form of knowledge, an important driver for maintaining a competitive position and organizational sustainability. Reluctance to share knowledge is seen as unethical, which can hamper the survival of an organization. This knowledge provides human resources with qualified, superior, and long-term survival capabilities. This study aims to examine the antecedents and mediators of Tacit knowledge sharing. This research is a quantitative study with a population of 393 MSMEs in Bali Province. The sample collection method used the Solvin formula and simple random sampling to obtain 389 samples. Respondents are management, with a Likert scale questionnaire research instrument 1-5. Analysis using PLS-SEM and processed with SmartPLS 2.0 software. The results of the study show that tacit knowledge sharing has an effect on interpersonal and trust in co-workers, with the mediator variable being trusted in co-workers. This research implies communication creates effectiveness and time efficiency so as to increase trust and encourage the intention to cooperate and share knowledge secretly.

1. INTRODUCTION

Knowledge is a valuable intangible resource that is the key to competitive. Knowledge is also seen as a typical form of day-to-day interaction in business organizations. An effective ethics program involves sharing knowledge about often perplexing issues related to human behavior and changing values in business organizations. These SMEs are important worldwide due to their economic and social importance, accounting for nearly 90% of all businesses, 70% of employment and 50-60% of value added in OECD countries (Horvat et al., 2016; Sartori et al., 2020). The knowledge economy is not an ethic in which innovation aims to protect its own interests, but an ethic based on knowledge sharing itself. Knowledge sharing makes organizations more competitive in the market. Otherwise, reluctance to share knowledge should be viewed as an important ethical issue as it affects the survival of the organization (Crane & Bontis, 2014; A. Thomas & Gupta, 2022a). As effective management of these resources is one of

*Corresponding author.

E-mail: arthawibawa@unud.ac.id (I Made Artha Wibawa)

the ethical challenges facing society today, organizations must determine what factors facilitate or hinder important knowledge sharing within the organization (Curtis & Taylor, 2018; Mohammed & Kamalanabhan, 2020a). Post-industrial societies focus on the use of intellectual capital and immaterial knowledge (Fayyaz et al., 2020; Ganguly et al., 2019). Therefore, different levels of knowledge are considered as part of the knowledge resources of business organizations (Goswami & Agrawal, 2018; A. Thomas & Gupta, 2022b). The form of knowledge related to comprehension or learning is tacit knowledge, which is the most transparent and subjective form of knowledge (Gaur et al., 2019; Zhao et al., 2022). Therefore, efforts to predict tacit knowledge sharing have become an important issue in both academia and business. Efforts to share knowledge tacitly can be defined as part of attitudes towards prosocial organizational behavior. Prosocial attitudes reflect the general tendency of people to expect good outcomes not only for themselves but also for their peers and their organizations (Mohammed & Kamalanabhan, 2020b; Yu et al., 2013). The tacit sharing of knowledge is undoubtedly a desirable general management goal in business organizations (Curtis & Taylor, 2018; Mohammed & Kamalanabhan, 2020a).

Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs) are the drivers of economic growth based on the people's economy and a crucial role in societies (Arsawan et al., 2020; Hanifah et al., 2020). The development of MSMEs in Bali is currently increasing. MSMEs are very strategic because of their great potential in driving economic activities as well as being the foundation of income sources for improving people's welfare. Data from the Central Statistics Agency (BPS) in 2020 shows that 98 percent of Indonesian people are in small and medium-scale businesses. This shows a considerable proportion, where in the same year, 97 percent of the total workforce was absorbed in this sector, with the entire workforce and contribution to Gross Domestic Product (GDP) reaching 54–57 percent. The large proportion and power, as well as the workforce, does not mean it does not face obstacles. Several aspects are still obstacles, including the capital, technology and information, market access, professionalism of human resources, and company management. Tacit knowledge is personal, developed through challenging experiences, and formulated and communicated. Tacit knowledge is not expressed in written form but something that is in the minds of people who work in an organization. According to Polanyi, tacit knowledge is: (1) Cannot be shared; (2) It is something that is more known than conveyed; (3) Often consists of habits and culture that cannot be determined alone; (4) Cannot be codified, but can only be transferred or acquired from experience Describes what (facts) and know why (science); (5) Involves learning and skills; (6) Formed in groups and organizational relationships, core values, assumptions, and beliefs, are challenging to identify, store, quantify and, map out. Commitment has three forms that can be divided: (1) Affective commitment is related to the emotional relationship of employees to the organization. This indicator is measured from respondents' perceptions of feeling proud to be part of the organization, happy to spend a career in the organization, and feeling that the problems faced by the organization are also for employees; (2) Continuance commitment is related to employees' awareness of the losses if they leave the organization. This indicator is measured from respondents' perceptions of feeling difficult to leave the organization, having few options to leave the organization, and their lives will be very disturbed if they leave the organization; (3) Normative commitment describes a feeling of attachment to remain in the organization. This indicator is carved from respondents' perceptions of the value of loyalty to the organization, and it is unethical to switch to another organization (Marta et al., 2021; Meyer & Allen, 1997). The indicators used in measuring organizational commitment are as follows: 1) affective commitment, 2) sustainable commitment, and 3) normative commitment (Aras et al., 2022; Meyer & Allen, 1997). Co-workers' personality plays a vital role in fostering trust in the organization. To be trusted, someone in an organization absolutely must have integrity and honesty. They must care about ethics and morals, have a firm stand, always try to keep their promises, and be fully committed to the organization's progress. But integrity alone is certainly not enough. Employees must have the appropriate talent, attitude, knowledge, skills, and style. In other words, employees must have the required competencies. Next is the willingness to assume responsibility in the organization. This kind of employee will not easily find a scapegoat if things go wrong. They focus more on what is wrong, not who is wrong. The concern is positively correlated with trust. Employees should be able to get work done when they feel tired, anxious, frustrated, and demotivated. Facing such conditions of followers, it takes employees who are able to rise. This kind of employee will be able to build emotional closeness with his co-workers and vice versa. There are two forms of organizational justice: (1) Distributive Justice; distributive justice refers to employees' perceptions of fairness with rewards and other valuable outcomes distributed within the organization. Perceptions of distributive justice affect individual satisfaction with various job-related outcomes such as pay, job duties, recognition, and opportunities for advancement; (2) Procedural justice, Procedural fairness is an individual's perception of fairness used to determine various performances. For example, an employee's performance is evaluated by someone

familiar with the job. When workers perceive high procedural fairness, they will be more motivated to participate in activities, follow the rules, and perceive relevant outcomes as fair. But if workers feel procedural injustice, they tend to withdraw from opportunities to participate, pay less attention to rules and policies, and perceive the relevant results as unfair (Griffin et al., 2014).

This study aims to provide a theoretical understanding of the framework for tacit knowledge sharing, which was developed using organizational commitment and trust in colleagues as important mediators. So that it can be obtained a proper understanding of the formation, mediator, and antecedent of knowledge sharing using tacit knowledge sharing variables, which in turn helps achieve the success of tacit knowledge sharing. This study has several specific objectives to be achieved, including predicting and explaining the influence of organization-person influence and personal influence on organizational commitment. Predict and explain the influence of organization-person, personal, and interpersonal influence on trust in co-workers. Analyzing whether the organizational commitment is able to mediate organization-person influence and personal influence on its effect on Tacit Knowledge Sharing. Analyze whether trust in co-workers is able to mediate organization-person influence, personal influence, and interpersonal influence on their impact on Tacit Knowledge Sharing.

2. METHODS

This study consisted of MSME in Bali Province. Data from the Cooperative Office of Bali Province totaled 28,156 MSME. The sampling method used proportional random sampling with the sloven formula to obtain 395 samples. Representative respondents came from MSEM employees. Employees are considered to have individual cognitive and technical knowledge, as well as high personal qualities so that they can identify tacit knowledge in MSEM. Data collection was carried out by distributing questionnaires via Google forms and direct visits to be carried out in 2021. The conceptual framework of this study examines the relationship between tacit knowledge and its determinants such as: distributive justice, cooperation attitude, instrumental ties, expressive ties, organizational commitment, and trust in co-workers. Tacit knowledge is the dependent variable, Organizational Commitment, and Trust in Co-workers as mediating variables. Distributive Justice, Cooperation Attitude, Instrumental Ties, Expressive Ties as independent variables. Relationships between variables are developed based on empirical studies. Measurement of variables shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Construct measurement

Variables		Measurment	Sources	
Organization-person influence (X1)	Distributive Justice (X1.1)	Reward for contribution (X1.1.1)	(Imamoglu et al., 2019; Kim et al., 2021; Stofberg et al., 2022)	
		Reward for productivity (X1.1.2)		
		Reward for Performance (X1.1.3)		
	Procedural Justice (X1.2)	Employee decision-making procedures (X1.2.1)		
Personal influence (X2)	Cooperation Attitude	Leadership decision-making procedures (X1.2.2)	(Caldwell & Ndalamba, 2017; Herold et al., 2007)	
		Disapproval filing procedure (X1.2.3)		
		Accurate information collection procedures for leaders (X1.2.4)		
		Work engagement (X2.1),		
Interpersonal Influence (X3)	Instrumental Ties (X3.1)	Employee cooperation (X2.2)	(Dang-Pham et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2022)	
		Employees' satisfaction (X2.3)		
		Employees' perceptions (X2.4)		
		Exchanging advice (X3.1.1)		
	Expressive Ties (X3.2)	Help each other (X3.1.2)		(Dang-Pham et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2022)
		Good association (X3.1.3)		
		Team work (X3.1.4)		
		Knowing co-workers personally (X3.2.1)		
Organizational Commitment (M1)		level of flexibility in talking employees (X3.2.2)	(Carmon et al., 2010;	
		friendship during work breaks (X3.2.3)		
		consulting intensities between employees (X3.2.4)		
		willingness of employees to do more		

Variables	Measurmenet	Sources
Trust in co-workers (M2)	for the organization (M1.1)	Imamoglu et al., 2019)
	Employee concern (M1.2)	
	employee satisfaction (M1.3)	
	Employee pride over organizational level (M1.4)	
	Employee pride as part of the organization (M1.5)	
	shared values between employees and the organization (M1.6)	
	employee perceptions of the organization compared to other organizations (M1.7)	
Trust in co-workers (M2)	trust in colleagues (M2.1)	(Caldwell & Ndalamba, 2017; Mohammed & Kamalanabhan, 2020a; Saad & Elshaer, 2020)
	coworker reliability (M2.2)	
	the ability to complete work by coworker (M2.3)	
	coworker loyalty (M2.4)	
	co-worker's belief in the organization (M2.5)	
Tacit knowledge (Y)	shared work experience (Y.1)	(Goswami & Agrawal, 2018; Mohammed & Kamalanabhan, 2020b)
	share expertise (Y.2)	
	share ideas about work (Y.3)	
	share tips and tricks related to work (Y.4)	

To examine the construct using the Linkerd scale 1 (strongly disagree) - 5 (strongly agree). This study uses two analysts, namely descriptive and inferential. Descriptive analysis using SPSS describes respondents' responses to question items related to research variables. Inferential analysis is intended to test hypotheses and produce a fit model, and uses Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) with a variance-based or component-based approach with Partial Least Square (PLS) (F. Hair Jr et al., 2014).

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Results

Description of Research Variables

This study uses a Partial Least Square (PLS) analysis approach to test and analyze previously stated research hypotheses. The results of the analysis of the empirical research model using the Partial Least Square (PLS) analysis tool produce the influence between variables as follows: Based on Figure 1, the following Table 2 can be arranged, which shows the relationship between the following research variables.

Table 2. Research Hypothesis Test Results

	<i>originalsample estimate</i>	<i>Standard deviation</i>	<i>t - Statistic</i>	Explanation
Expressive Ties (X32) -> Trust in Co-workers(M2)	0.393342	0.388838	5.723617	Signifikan
Instrumental Ties (X31) -> Trust in Co-workers (M2)	0.501974	0.507822	6.623630	Signifikan
Distributive Justice (X11) -> Trust in Co-workers (M2)	0.011800	0.005407	0.173001	Unsignifikan
Distributive Justice (X11) -> Organizational Commitment (M-1)	-0.002922	0.024916	0.022228	Unsignifikan
Procedural Justice (X12) -> Organizational	-0.068430	-0.069998	0.802036	Unsignifikan

	<i>originalsample estimate</i>	<i>Standard deviation</i>	<i>t - Statistic</i>	Explanation
Commitment (M2)				
Procedural Justice (X12) -> Organizational Commitment (M-1)	0.051117	0.014710	0.279535	Unsignifikan
Trust in Co-workers (M2) -> Tacit Knowledge Sharing (Y)	0.547807	0.520433	2.897536	Signifikan
Organizational Commitment (M-1) -> Tacit Knowledge Sharing (Y)	0.238399	0.277762	1.621437	Unsignifikan
Cooperation Attitude (X2) -> Trust in Co-workers(M2)	-0.038524	-0.026759	0.485602	Unsignifikan
Cooperation Attitude (X2) -> Organizational Commitment (M-1)	0.068586	0.034448	0.412974	Unsignifikan

Based on Table 2, the results of hypothesis testing with the PLS approach resulted in a direct influence path coefficient of Organizational Commitment on Tacit Knowledge Sharing with values of 0.238 and t-statistics of 1.621. The t-statistics value of 1.621 is less than 1.96 (t-critical value), indicating that the effect of Organizational Commitment on Tacit Knowledge Sharing is insignificant. Thus, the hypothesis that Organizational Commitment positively and significantly impacts Tacit Knowledge Sharing is rejected. This indicates that Organizational Commitment does not substantially affect Tacit Knowledge Sharing for MSME employees. The results of hypothesis testing with the PLS approach resulted in a direct influence path coefficient of Trust in colleagues on Tacit Knowledge Sharing with a β value of 0.548 and t-statistics 2.897. The t-statistics value of 2.897 is more than 1.96 (t-critical value), indicating that the effect of trust in co-workers on tacit knowledge sharing is significant. Thus, the hypothesis that trust in co-workers positively and significantly affects Tacit Knowledge Sharing is accepted. This indicates that increasing trust in co-workers will be able to increase Tacit Knowledge Sharing among MSME employees and vice versa.

The results of hypothesis testing with the PLS approach resulted in a direct influence path coefficient of distributive justice on organizational commitment with a value of -0.003 and t-statistics 0.022. If the t-statistics value of 0.022 is less than 1.96 (t-critical value), then the effect of distributive justice on organizational commitment is not significant. Thus, the hypothesis that distributive justice has a significant positive impact on organizational commitment is rejected. This means that distributive justice does not significantly affect the organizational commitment of MSME employees. The results of hypothesis testing with the PLS approach produce a direct influence path coefficient of distributive justice on trust in co-workers with a value of 0.012 and t-statistics 0.173. If the t-statistics value of 0.173 is less than 1.96 (t-critical value), then the effect of distributive justice on trust in work is not significant. Thus, the hypothesis that distributive justice has a significant positive impact on trust in co-workers is rejected. This means that distributive justice does not significantly affect the trust in co-workers of MSME employees. The results of hypothesis testing with the PLS approach produce a direct effect path coefficient of procedural justice on organizational commitment with a value of 0.051 and t-statistics 0.280. If the t-statistics value of 0.280 is less than 1.96 (t-critical value), then the effect of procedural justice on organizational commitment is not significant. Thus, the hypothesis that procedural justice has a significant positive impact on organizational commitment is rejected. This means that procedural justice does not significantly affect the organizational commitment of MSME employees. The results of hypothesis testing with the PLS approach produce a direct effect path coefficient of procedural justice on trust in co-workers with a β value of -0.068 and t-statistics 0.802. If the t-statistics value of 0.802 is less than 1.96 (t-critical value), then the effect of procedural justice on trust in co-workers is not significant. Thus, the hypothesis that procedural justice significantly positively affects trust in co-workers is rejected. This means that procedural justice does not significantly affect the trust in co-workers of MSME employees. The results of hypothesis testing with the PLS approach resulted in a path coefficient of direct influence of Cooperation Attitude on Organizational Commitment with a value of 0.069 and t-statistics 0.412. If the t-statistics value of 0.412 is less than 1.96 (t-critical value), then the effect of Cooperation Attitude on Organizational Commitment is insignificant. Thus, the hypothesis that the Attitude of Cooperation has a significant positive impact on Organizational Commitment is rejected. This means that

the Attitude of Cooperation does not significantly affect the Organizational Commitment of MSME employees. The results of hypothesis testing with the PLS approach produce a path coefficient of direct influence on the Attitude of Cooperation on Trust in colleagues with a value of -0.039 and t-statistics 0.486. If the t-statistics value of 0.486 is less than 1.96 (t-critical value), then the effect of Cooperation Attitude on Trust in co-workers is insignificant. Thus, the hypothesis states that the attitude of cooperation has a significant positive impact on trust in co-workers is rejected. This means that the attitude of cooperation does not significantly affect the trust in co-workers of MSME employees.

The results of hypothesis testing with the PLS approach resulted in a path coefficient of direct influence of instrumental ties (instrumental ties) on trust in co-workers with a β value of 0.502 and t-statistics 6.624. The t-statistics value of 6.624 is more than 1.96 (t-critical value), indicating that the effect of instrumental bonding on trust in co-workers is significant. Thus, the hypothesis that instrumental bonding positively and significantly affects trust in co-workers is accepted. This indicates that an increase in instrumental ties will increase the trust of colleagues in MSME employees and vice versa. The results of hypothesis testing with the PLS approach resulted in a path coefficient of direct influence of expressive ties (Expressive ties) on trust in co-workers with a β value of 0.393 and t-statistics 5.723. The t-statistics value of 5.723 is more than 1.96 (t-critical value), indicating that the effect of expressive bonding on trust in co-workers is significant. Thus, the hypothesis that expressive bonds positively and significantly impact trust in co-workers is accepted. This indicates that an increase in expressive ties will be able to increase trust in co-workers in MSME employees and vice versa.

Discussion

The influence of organization-person influences and personal influence on organizational commitment

Testing the influence of organization-person influence, which consists of distributive justice and procedural justice on organizational commitment, shows insignificant results. Likewise, the effect of personal influence as measured by the attitude of cooperation on organizational commitment shows insignificant results. This indicates that neither organization-person nor personal influence significantly affects organizational commitment to MSMEs employees. This is because there is still a discrepancy between wages and the responsibilities received by MSME employees where they work, as shown by research indicator X1.1.1 (I believe that the wages I receive accurately reflect my contribution to the company). This statement reflects that MSME employees perceive that wages and the work they do have a balance and are at the standard wages in the study locations. In addition, employees feel that if employees work more productively, it does not necessarily increase returns that are commensurate with their productivity, which shows from the station indicator X1.1.3 (The wages I receive from the company follow my performance level). However, this is contrary to the existence of injustice in the rewards received by MSME employees in the form of non-financial rewards for employees who are more productive. This reflects the research indicator X1.1.2 (productive employees get relatively high praise from the company). This is because, only productive employees are extra appreciated by the company, while on the other hand employees who are less productive are not given motivation and encouragement to be better. This is what causes the influence of organizational-people and personal influences on organizational commitment does not have a significant effect on this research. The lack of personal influence between employees in MSMEs causes conditions of competition among employees to increase and tacit knowledge sharing will decrease.

This study develops the results of previous research which state that justice is an important issue based on ethical perceptions in exchange relationships and emphasizes one's perception of the task tasks that belong to someone else (Caldwell & Ndalamba, 2017; Primeaux et al., 2003). To increase commitment in the organization, justice becomes an antecedent to employee behavior or attitudes at work and trust in other organizational members (Chen et al., 2022; Khan et al., 2022). Other researchers have distinguished between procedural and distributive justice when discussing organizational justice (Grimmelikhuijsen & Klijn, 2015; Grootelaar & van den Bos, 2018). Distributive justice reflects the perceived fairness of the outcomes received by employees, while procedural justice relates to perceptions of fairness about the procedures used to determine those outcomes. In this case, distributive justice can predict organizational commitment (Yean, 2016; Zayer & Benabdelhadi, 2020). In particular, the effect of different levels of perceived distributive justice on organizational commitment was more significant in conditions of low perceived procedural justice than under conditions of high perceived procedural justice (Grimmelikhuijsen & Klijn, 2015; Grootelaar & van den Bos, 2018). The level of wages, the regulation of wages, and the distribution of tasks (a form of distributive justice) are positively associated with organizational commitment. The story of wages, the regulation of wages, and the distribution of tasks (a form of distributive justice) are positively related to organizational commitment (Bansal, 2016; Vosse &

Aliyu, 2018). In addition, organizational justice theory provides a framework for exploring and understanding employees' feelings of trust or distrust in others. More broadly, the perception of distributive justice is based on comparison with others and feelings of trust. It is, therefore, likely to be influenced by the relative treatment of others and the more general availability of opportunities within the organization (Caldwell & Ndalamba, 2017; Vaughan - Smith, 2013). Higher levels of trust tend to occur when the distribution of organizational outcomes is considered fair (Yean, 2016; Zayer & Benabelhadi, 2020).

The influence of organization-person influence, personal influence, and interpersonal influence on trust in co-workers

The significant influence of interpersonal influence on trust in co-workers is due to the large contribution of indicator statement X3.1.2, related to the assistance offered by coworkers during working hours, which increases trust in coworkers. In addition, good association among co-workers (X3.1.3) and good team building in coordination within the company (X3.1.4) results in a high score of personal relationship indicators between employees in MSMEs (X3.2.1). MSMEs employees were able to identify well in groups, how to establish close contact with other employees to work together (a form of instrumental bonding), and willing to share their knowledge regarding the work being carried out. This leads to a strong willingness to trust colleagues based on their mutual benefit. Such instrumental relationships through social identity often led to homophiles because people are more likely to trust others who share similar missions, attributes, values, and perceptions. Therefore, friendship is another factor for individuals to trust their co-workers (expressive relationship).

The results of this study develop research on social network relationships that are formed after individuals get to know their co-workers and facilitate knowledge sharing by providing mutual support, exchange of information, and a common platform for setting shared expectations (Hemsley & Mason, 2013; Intezari et al., 2017). Although not empirically tested in previous studies, the mediation of trust between interpersonal relationships (a form of social network bonding) and knowledge sharing has been proven by previous research which shows that social network ties are significant to do in sharing knowledge through trust mediation (Fayyaz et al., 2020; Gamlath & Wilson, 2022; E. F. Thomas et al., 2016). Social network theory has distinguished social network relationships between instrumental and expressive bonds. Individual instrumental relationships arise in performance and facilitate the transfer of physical, informational, or financial resources to their team members, while expressive bonds offer friendship and social support (Kadam, Balasubramanian, et al., 2021; Kadam, Rao, et al., 2021). Most social network relationships among employees have instrumental and expressive features. Social identity theory explains why workplace partnerships (e.g., instrumental relationships) and friendships (e.g., expressive relationships) are essential to individuals and why some people value such social relationships differently from other (Crane & Bontis, 2014; A. Thomas & Gupta, 2022a). Friendship and social support are components of expressive bonding (Crane & Bontis, 2014; A. Thomas & Gupta, 2022a). Individuals tend to trust their co-workers who offer them friendship and social support. This shows that expressive relationships have an effect on trust in co-workers. In other words, individuals who build close friendships with co-workers create potential sub-groups that are most likely to generate trust between individuals and their co-workers through their expressive interactions. This proves that trust in co-workers is the link between interpersonal influence and tacit knowledge sharing (Annansingh et al., 2018; Gamlath & Wilson, 2022).

The Influence of Organization-Person Influence and Personal Influence on Tacit Knowledge Sharing Through Organizational Commitment

The results of the description of the research variables also support the rejection of the research hypothesis, which states that employees are willing to put in more effort beyond what is usually expected for the company's success (M1.1) as a result of the imbalance between wages and responsibilities received by MSME employees in their place. In addition, there is no belief in company values that are similar to values that are personally felt by employees (M1.6) causing organizational commitment to have no significant effect on tacit knowledge sharing among MSME employees. Another thing that causes this insignificant effect is the employee's perception that the company where they work is not the best company of all the workplaces they may work for (M1.7). This shows that the organizational commitment of MSME employees is low due to an imbalance between wages and responsibilities received by MSME employees in their place, and there is no similarity between corporate values and personal values held by MSMEs employees. This is lead will have an effect if there is a workplace that MSMEs employees think is better than the current workplace, then they will move to a new workplace. The results of this study continue similar research which states that individuals with emotional

attachment to their organizations tend to share their knowledge (Epitropaki, 2013; Schmidt, 2016). Every time they realize that if they share knowledge in their environment, an individual will feel valued, and their knowledge will be used to benefit their organization ultimately. Individuals who strongly commit to their organization attach great importance to their organizational members and their relationships with other members (Dutta & Rangnekar, 2023; Rahman et al., 2017). A person's organizational commitment tends to facilitate their intention to share tacit knowledge with other members that will benefit the organization in the long run. Organizational commitment is closely related to the context of the sales force with various supporting variables, including those directly associated with co-workers (Anglin et al., 2022; Schepers & Van der Borgh, 2020). In addition, a strong organizational commitment creates a belief that the organization has the right to information and knowledge that has been created or owned (Hansen & Jørgensen, 2022; Summers & Chillas, 2021).

The Influence of Organization-Person Influence, Personal Influence, and Interpersonal Influence on Tacit Knowledge Sharing Through Trust in Co-workers

Testing the hypothesis of organization-person influence and personal influence on trust in co-workers gets results that do not have a significant effect. Meanwhile, testing the hypothesis of interpersonal influence on tacit knowledge sharing through trust in colleagues shows a significant positive relationship. This means that trust in co-workers is only a mediator of interpersonal influence on its effect on tacit knowledge sharing. The results of the description of the research variables also support this significant effect. This can be seen from the perception of MSME employees, who stated that they considered their co-workers trustworthy (M2.1) and their co-workers were reliable people to work properly (M2.2). Good communication between MSMEs employees leads to better trust and cooperation within the company. the tendency of mutual assistance between workers increases work effectiveness and time efficiency in working on MSMEs. This perception encourages MSME employees to share tacit knowledge. In addition, the perception of co-workers as people who give high trust (M2.5) also contributes significantly to interpersonal influence on tacit knowledge sharing through trust in co-workers. This study develops research stating that trust expresses a belief that a person or institution will be fair, reliable, ethical, competent, and non-threatening (Caldwell & Ndalamba, 2017; Vaughan - Smith, 2013). Therefore, individuals' trust in their co-workers comes from the perception of the quality of their interactions with co-workers, such as ethics, morality, integrity, reliability, and competence (Bao & Wang, 2021; Zhang et al., 2015). Trust is also emphasized as a knowledge-sharing prerequisite. The trust exists when individuals feel that their co-workers have such quality of trust and believe that co-workers will repay them by doing the same when they share knowledge with others. Tacit knowledge sharing is a form of sharing power with others, so it requires trust for someone to do this with their co-workers. Trust can reduce perceived uncertainty, facilitate risk-taking behavior, and encourage a constructive orientation (Bao & Wang, 2021; Zhang et al., 2015). These findings significantly enrich the scientific literature by highlighting supporting factors and mediators in the process of sharing tacit knowledge at smaller business scales. The implications of this research not only have an impact on theoretical understanding, but also have practical relevance in improving the efficiency and operational effectiveness of MSMEs. However, this study has limitations in terms of generalization because it focuses on specific MSMEs. These constraints can affect the representativeness of results in a broader business context. In addition, resource and time constraints may have limited sample diversity, requiring caution in generalizing findings. As a recommendation for future research, it is recommended to conduct further research involving variations in MSMEs from different sectors and locations to strengthen the external validity of the research results. Also, considering the use of broader research methods can provide a more comprehensive view of the phenomenon of tacit knowledge sharing among MSMEs.

4. CONCLUSION

The conclusions of this study indicate that the antecedent of tacit knowledge sharing in MSMEs employees is interpersonal influence and trust in co-workers, with the mediator variable being trusted in co-workers. Organizational commitment is not a mediator variable of tacit knowledge sharing, as well as organization-person influence and personal influence, which are not antecedents of MSMEs employees. This research implies that communication creates effectiveness and time efficiency so as to increase trust and encourage the intention to cooperate and share knowledge secretly. It is important for MSMEs to foster individual trust in colleagues because it is a prerequisite for sharing knowledge, because trust can reduce perceived uncertainty, facilitate risk-taking behavior, and encourage a constructive orientation.

5. ACKNOWLEDGE

Thank you for Institute Research and Community Service (LPPM) for research grant and Udayana University for providing this research opportunity.

6. REFERENCES

- Anglin, A. H., Kincaid, P. A., Short, J. C., & Allen, D. G. (2022). Role Theory Perspectives: Past, Present, and Future Applications of Role Theories in Management Research. *Journal of Management*, 48(6), 1469–1502. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01492063221081442>.
- Annansingh, F., Howell, K. E., Liu, S., & Baptista Nunes, M. (2018). Academics' perception of knowledge sharing in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 32(6), 1001–1015. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-07-2016-0153>.
- Aras, R. A., Rahmadani, A. R., Nurkhalifa, N., & Rahmiani, N. (2022). Job Stress Impact on Nurse's Organizational Commitment and The Role of Work Life Balance. *Jurnal Manajemen Bisnis*, 9(1), 204–214. <https://doi.org/10.33096/jmb.v9i1.136>.
- Arsawan, I. W. E., Koval, V., Rajiani, I., Rustiarini, N. W., Supartha, W. G., & Suryantini, N. P. S. (2020). Leveraging knowledge sharing and innovation culture into SMEs sustainable competitive advantage. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 71(2), 405–428. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-04-2020-0192>.
- Bansal, A. (2016). Employee trust dynamics during organizational change: A context of mergers and acquisitions. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Business Administration*, 8(1), 55–69. <https://doi.org/10.1108/APJBA-08-2015-0075>.
- Bao, Z., & Wang, D. (2021). Examining consumer participation on brand microblogs in China: perspectives from elaboration likelihood model, commitment-trust theory and social presence. *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing*, 15(1), 10–29. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JRIM-02-2019-0027>.
- Caldwell, C., & Ndalamba, K. K. (2017). Trust and being “worthy”—the key to creating wealth. *Journal of Management Development*, 36(8), 1076–1086. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-09-2016-0169>.
- Carmon, A. F., Miller, A. N., Raile, A. N., & Roers, M. M. (2010). Fusing family and firm: Employee perceptions of perceived homophily, organizational justice, organizational identification, and organizational commitment in family businesses. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, 1(4), 210–223. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfbs.2010.10.003>.
- Chen, D., Lin, Q., Yang, T., Shi, L., Bao, X., & Wang, D. (2022). Distributive Justice and Turnover Intention Among Medical Staff in Shenzhen, China: The Mediating Effects of Organizational Commitment and Work Engagement. *Risk Management and Healthcare Policy*, 15, 665–676. <https://doi.org/10.2147/RMHP.S357654>.
- Crane, L., & Bontis, N. (2014). Trouble with tacit: developing a new perspective and approach. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 18(6), 1127–1140. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-02-2014-0061>.
- Curtis, M. B., & Taylor, E. Z. (2018). Developmental mentoring, affective organizational commitment, and knowledge sharing in public accounting firms. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 22(1), 142–161. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-03-2017-0097>.
- Dang-Pham, D., Pittayachawan, S., & Bruno, V. (2017). Applying network analysis to investigate interpersonal influence of information security behaviours in the workplace. *Information and Management*, 54(5), 625–637. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2016.12.003>.
- Dutta, A., & Rangnekar, S. (2023). Promoting concern for team members in Indian enterprises through personal interaction: mediating through a preference for teamwork and co-worker support. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, 10(4), 582–600. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOEPP-05-2022-0103>.
- Epitropaki, O. (2013). A multi-level investigation of psychological contract breach and organizational identification through the lens of perceived organizational membership: Testing a moderated-mediated model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34(1), 65–86. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1793>.
- F. Hair Jr, J., Sarstedt, M., Hopkins, L., & G. Kuppelwieser, V. (2014). Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM). *European Business Review*, 26(2), 106–121. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-10-2013-0128>.
- Fayyaz, A., Chaudhry, B. N., & Fiaz, M. (2020). Upholding knowledge sharing for organization innovation efficiency in Pakistan. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 7(1), 4. <https://doi.org/10.3390/joitmc7010004>.
- Gamlath, S., & Wilson, T. (2022). Dimensions of student-to-student knowledge sharing in universities. *Knowledge Management Research & Practice*, 20(4), 542–556.

- <https://doi.org/10.1080/14778238.2020.1838961>.
- Ganguly, A., Talukdar, A., & Chatterjee, D. (2019). Evaluating the role of social capital, tacit knowledge sharing, knowledge quality and reciprocity in determining innovation capability of an organization. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 23(6), 1105–1135. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-03-2018-0190>.
- Gaur, A. S., Ma, H., & Ge, B. (2019). MNC strategy, knowledge transfer context, and knowledge flow in MNEs. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 23(9), 1885–1900. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-08-2018-0476>.
- Goswami, A. K., & Agrawal, R. K. (2018). A reflection on knowledge sharing research: patterns and trends. *VINE Journal of Information and Knowledge Management Systems*, 48(3), 352–372. <https://doi.org/10.1108/VJIKMS-08-2017-0049>.
- Griffin, R. W., Phillips, J. M., & Gully, S. M. (2014). *Organizational Behavior: Managing People and Organizations*.
- Grimmelikhuijsen, S., & Klijn, A. (2015). The effects of judicial transparency on public trust: Evidence from a field experiment. *Public Administration*, 93(4), 995–1011. <https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12149>.
- Grootelaar, H. A., & van den Bos, K. (2018). How Litigants in Dutch Courtrooms Come to Trust Judges: The Role of Perceived Procedural Justice, Outcome Favorability, and Other Sociolegal Moderators. *Law and Society Review*, 52(1), 234–268. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lasr.12315>.
- Hanifah, H., Halim, H. A., Ahmad, N. H., & Vafaei-Zadeh, A. (2020). Can internal factors improve innovation performance via innovation culture in SMEs? *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 27(1), 382–405. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-06-2018-0174>.
- Hansen, A. V., & Jørgensen, A. P. (2022). Employee-ownership: Exploring the Potentials of Practicing a Democratic Ideal. *International Business Research*, 16(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ibr.v16n1p1>.
- Hemsley, J., & Mason, R. M. (2013). Knowledge and Knowledge Management in the Social Media Age. *Journal of Organizational Computing and Electronic Commerce*, 23(1–2), 138–167. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10919392.2013.748614>.
- Herold, D. M., Fedor, D. B., & Caldwell, S. D. (2007). Beyond change management: a multilevel investigation of contextual and personal influences on employees' commitment to change. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4), 942. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.4.942>.
- Horvat, J., Sharma, K., & Bobek, S. (2016). Key factors for knowledge management: pilot study in IT SMEs. *FIIB Business Review*, 5(3), 32–40. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2455265820160306>.
- Imamoglu, S. Z., Ince, H., Turkcan, H., & Atakay, B. (2019). The Effect of Organizational Justice and Organizational Commitment on Knowledge Sharing and Firm Performance. *Procedia Computer Science*, 158, 899–906. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2019.09.129>.
- Intezari, A., Taskin, N., & Pauleen, D. J. (2017). Looking beyond knowledge sharing: an integrative approach to knowledge management culture. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 21(2), 492–515. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-06-2016-0216>.
- Kadam, R., Balasubramanian, S., Kareem Abdul, W., & Jabeen, S. S. (2021). Predicting organizational citizenship behavior in a multicultural environment: The role of cultural intelligence and cultural distance. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 21(3), 602–624. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14705958211051510>.
- Kadam, R., Rao, S. A., Abdul, W. K., & Jabeen, S. S. (2021). Cultural intelligence as an enabler of cross-cultural adjustment in the context of intra-national diversity. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 21(1), 31–51. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470595821995857>.
- Khan, Q. I., Bashir, M., Ali, M., & Javaid, A. (2022). Mediating Role of Perceived Fairness between Organizational Commitment, Organizational Trust and Work Engagement of Female Faculty Members of Public Sector Universities in Punjab, Pakistan. *Journal of Accounting and Finance in Emerging Economies*, 8(2), 365–370. <https://doi.org/10.26710/jafee.v8i2.2386>.
- Kim, J. S., Milliman, J. F., & Lucas, A. F. (2021). Effects of CSR on affective organizational commitment via organizational justice and organization-based self-esteem. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 92(September 2020), 102691. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2020.102691>.
- Marta, I. A., Supartha, I., Dewi, I. G. A. M., & Wibawa, I. (2021). Job enrichment, empowerment, and organizational commitment: The mediating role of work motivation and job satisfaction. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 8(1), 1031–1040. <https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2021.vol8.no1.1031>.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the Workplace: Theory, Research and Application*.
- Mohammed, N., & Kamalanabhan, T. J. (2020a). Interpersonal trust and employee knowledge sharing behavior: Creative performance as the outcome. *VINE Journal of Information and Knowledge*

- Management Systems*, 50(1), 94–116. <https://doi.org/10.1108/VJIKMS-04-2019-0057>.
- Mohammed, N., & Kamalanabhan, T. J. (2020b). Tacit knowledge seeking from teammates: unravelling the role of social capital. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 28(3), 765–790. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-07-2019-1845>.
- Primeaux, P. S. M., Karri, R., & Caldwell, C. (2003). Cultural insights to justice: A theoretical perspective through a subjective lens. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 46, 187–199.
- Rahman, U. U., Rehman, C. A., Imran, M. K., & Aslam, U. (2017). Does team orientation matter? Linking work engagement and relational psychological contract with performance. *Journal of Management Development*, 36(9), 1102–1113. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-10-2016-0204>.
- Saad, S. K., & Elshaer, I. A. (2020). Justice and trust's role in employees' resilience and business' continuity: Evidence from Egypt. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 35, 100712. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2020.100712>.
- Sartori, J. T., Frederico, G. F., Freitas, M. D. C. D., & Júnior, R. M. (2020). Specificities of SMEs relevant to knowledge management: a systematic literature review. *International Journal of Business Excellence*, 22(1), 83–97. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJBEX.2020.109212>.
- Schepers, J. J., & Van der Borgh, M. (2020). A Meta-Analysis of Frontline Employees' Role Behavior and the Moderating Effects of National Culture. *Journal of Service Research*, 23(3), 255–280. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670520918669>.
- Schmidt, G. B. (2016). How Adult Attachment Styles Relate to Perceived Psychological Contract Breach and Affective Organizational Commitment. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 28, 147–170. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10672-016-9278-9>.
- Stofberg, R., Bussin, M., & Mabaso, C. M. (2022). Pay transparency, job turnover intentions and the mediating role of perceived organizational support and organizational justice. *Employee Relations: The International Journal*, 44(7), 162–182. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-02-2022-0077>.
- Summers, J., & Chillias, S. (2021). Working in employee-owned companies: The role of economic democracy skills. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 42(4), 1029–1051. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0143831X19835319>.
- Thomas, A., & Gupta, V. (2022a). Tacit knowledge in organizations: Bibliometrics and a framework-based systematic review of antecedents, outcomes, theories, methods and future directions. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 26(4), 1014–1041. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-01-2021-0026>.
- Thomas, A., & Gupta, V. (2022b). The role of motivation theories in knowledge sharing: an integrative theoretical reviews and future research agenda. *Kybernetes*, 51(1), 116–140. <https://doi.org/10.1108/K-07-2020-0465>.
- Thomas, E. F., McGarty, C., & Mavor, K. (2016). Group interaction as the crucible of social identity formation: A glimpse at the foundations of social identities for collective action. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 19(2), 137–151. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430215612217>.
- Vaughan-Smith, K. (2013). Harnessing the strategic power of trust. *Strategic Direction*, 29(5), 3–5. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02580541311316514>.
- Vosse, B. J. F., & Aliyu, O. A. (2018). Determinants of employee trust during organisational change in higher institutions. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 31(5), 1105–1118. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOCM-05-2017-0203>.
- Wang, C., Yuan, T., & Feng, J. (2022). Instrumental ties or expressive ties? Impact mechanism of supervisor–subordinate ties based on enterprise social media on employee performance. *Journal of Enterprise Information Management*, 35(3), 866–884. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEIM-06-2021-0238>.
- Yean, T. F. (2016). Organizational justice: A conceptual discussion. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 219, 798–803. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.05.082>.
- Yu, Y., Hao, J. X., Dong, X. Y., & Khalifa, M. (2013). A multilevel model for effects of social capital and knowledge sharing in knowledge-intensive work teams. *International Journal of Information Management*, 33(5), 780–790. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2013.05.005>.
- Zayer, C., & Benabdelhadi, A. (2020). The consequences of the perceived organizational justice: a holistic overview. *International Journal of Accounting, Finance, Auditing, Management and Economics*, 1(3), 91–108. <http://www.ijafame.org/index.php/ijafame/article/view/119>.
- Zhang, K. Z., Benyoucef, M., & Zhao, S. J. (2015). Consumer participation and gender differences on companies' microblogs: A brand attachment process perspective. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 44, 357–368. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2014.11.068>.
- Zhao, S., Liu, X., Andersson, U., & Shenkar, O. (2022). Knowledge management of emerging economy multinationals. *Journal of World Business*, 57(1). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2021.101255>.