



# Person-Organization Fit, Knowledge Sharing Behaviour, and Innovative Work Behaviour: A Self-determination Perspective

Sugeng Wahyudi, Udin Udin<sup>1</sup>, Ahyar Yuniawan & Edy Rahardja,  
Diponegoro University, Indonesia.

This study investigates the link between person-organization fit, knowledge sharing behaviour, and innovative work behaviour. Using self-determination theory, this study hypothesizes that person-organization fit positively influences innovative work behaviour through knowledge sharing behaviour. A total of 221 respondents of Indonesian universities participates in this study. The results of structural equation modelling (SEM) show that the proposed hypotheses are supported. This study concludes that person-organization fit and knowledge sharing behaviour positively influence innovative work behaviour.

**Keywords:** Person-organization fit, Knowledge sharing behaviour, Innovative work behaviour, Self-determination perspective

---

<sup>1</sup> Corresponding author email: [udin\\_labuan@yahoo.com](mailto:udin_labuan@yahoo.com)



## **Introduction**

In the last 3 decades, consultants and organizational practitioners have been more concerned about the innovative work behaviour of employees. This is believed to support organizational success (J. De Jong & Den Hartog, 2010). Therefore, organizations always strive to foster and develop innovative employee work behaviour in order to achieve a sustainable competitive advantage (Afsar & Badir, 2017).

Innovative work behaviour of employees is very important for organizational survival and effectiveness. This is especially true for a rapidly changing organizational environment, where employees think and apply innovative ideas to respond to changes in the work environment (Pieterse, Van Knippenberg, Schippers, & Stam, 2010). In this context, employees can improve organizational performance by using their ability to generate innovative ideas and use them as building blocks to improve products, services, and work processes better (J. P. De Jong & Den Hartog, 2007).

Complex work innovation requires a variety of cognitive and affective efforts from employees to produce new ideas that are interesting and apply them to their work (Janssen, Van de Vliert, & West, 2004). To achieve this, employees need to spend their time, thoughts and energy beyond formal work and also have a high person-organization fit (Afsar & Badir, 2016). This is thought to be able to produce a higher level of innovative work behaviour.

Based on the review of the literature, there are contradictory findings related to the relationship between person-organization fit and innovative work behaviour. The results conducted by Afsar and Badir (2017); Afsar, Cheema, and Bin Saeed (2018); Wojtczuk-Turek and Turek (2016) found that person-organization fit had a significant effect on innovative work behaviour. While the results of Huang, Cheng, and Chou (2005); Jin, McDonald, and Park (2018); Van Loon, Vandenabeele, and Leisink (2017) found that person-organization fit had no significant impact on innovative work behaviour.



Van Loon et al. (2017) further suggested that by looking at the insignificant influence between person-organization fit on innovative work behaviour, a future study could replicate research in different contexts to test the consistency of existing findings. Therefore, this study aims to investigate the influence of person-organization fit on innovative work behaviour with knowledge sharing behaviour as a mediating variable.

Knowledge sharing behaviour is indeed very important for the work innovation process. To display innovative work behaviour, employees need to interact with each other to obtain and disseminate their knowledge. Employees who share knowledge in organizations, they tend to be involved in innovative work behaviours because of compatibility with organizational values so as to create stronger interpersonal relationships and social ties, where employees can access and utilize resources embedded in the organization to generate new ideas and apply them to encourage innovative job performance (Li, 2010). Thus, the main purposes of this study are to investigate the influence of (1) person-organization fit on innovative work behaviour; (2) person-organization fit on knowledge sharing behaviour; and (3) knowledge sharing behaviour on innovative work behaviour.

## **Literature Review and Hypotheses Development**

### **Innovative Work Behaviour**

Organizations rely heavily on employees to continue innovating so they can achieve competitive power and rapid market changes. With increasing pressure to develop new products and services quickly and efficiently, organizations continue to strive to encourage employee work innovation to be better for maintaining and improving long-term performance (Van Burg, Berends, & Van Raaij, 2014). Innovative work behaviour refers to a series of behaviours about the introduction of new ideas that are important and useful to be developed and implemented with the aim of improving employee performance and also organizational performance (J. P. De Jong & Den Hartog, 2007).

King and Anderson (2002) argue that innovative work behaviour is different from creativity which focuses on the discovery and creation of new ideas. Creativity as a process of starting



new and useful ideas, while innovative work behaviour includes a series of activities aimed at the introduction, development, modification, adoption, and implementation of existing ideas. Innovative work behaviour usually does not only include exploration of opportunities in generating new ideas but also includes behaviours that are directed at implementing change and new knowledge or improving work processes to achieve individual performance and organizational performance (J. P. De Jong & Den Hartog, 2008).

Innovative work behaviour involves a series of activities such as critical thinking, recognizing potential and existing problems, exploring opportunities, identifying performance gaps, and seeking new methods and procedures. This is followed by realization-oriented behaviour such as social activities to obtain approval, increase support, and then test, implement and commercialize creative ideas in organizational settings, commonly known as the implementation of ideas (J. De Jong & Den Hartog, 2010).

According to Janssen (2000), innovative work behaviour consists of three interrelated behaviours, namely: (1) idea generation; (2) idea promotion; and (3) idea realization. Janssen (2000) further asserts that innovative work behaviour is “discretionary behaviour” that is not included in formal job descriptions or roles that are explicitly defined. In the same vein, Ramamoorthy, Flood, Slattery, and Sardesai (2005) also support this view and state that discretionary behaviour is not guaranteed by the organizational system of reward and recognition. Therefore, Ramamoorthy et al. (2005) conclude that the tendency to engage in discretionary behaviour can lead to increased effectiveness of teams and organizations, and encourage superior performance.

Employees with high innovative work behaviour can quickly and precisely respond to the work environment, propose new ideas and provide services and products (Afsar et al., 2018). Therefore, to effectively encourage innovative work behaviour in the organization, the organization needs to facilitate and support the person-organization fit (Afsar, 2016; Afsar et al., 2018).



### **Knowledge Sharing Behaviour**

The organization considers knowledge as a core resource for generating competitiveness. Therefore, organizations try to create value-added through sustainable knowledge management (Lee & Hong, 2014).

Knowledge management is at the core of all learning organizations, which create relationships between employees, customers, and suppliers that support the demand and dissemination of information. Based on the existing literature, for example (Nonaka, 2008; Rowley, 2000), knowledge management can be explained operationally as a process (1) knowledge acquisition (i.e. gathering and identifying useful information), (2) organizing knowledge (i.e., enabling employees to obtain organizational knowledge), (3) knowledge leverage (i.e., exploiting and applying useful knowledge), (4) knowledge sharing (i.e., disseminating knowledge to the entire organization), and (5) organizational memory (i.e., storing knowledge in repositories).

This study focuses on aspects of knowledge sharing, wherein knowledge management, individual knowledge will increase to organizational knowledge when shared, which adds value to the organization as a whole. Knowledge sharing is indeed very important for the successful implementation of knowledge management, and in particular, knowledge sharing is a prerequisite for work innovation and organizational innovation (T. Kim & Lee, 2012).

Knowledge sharing refers to providing information and knowledge to help and collaborate with others to solve problems, develop new ideas, or implement work policies or procedures (Cummings, 2004). Knowledge sharing can also be defined as a culture of social interaction, which involves exchanging knowledge, experience, and skills of employees through all departments or organizations (Lin, 2007).

Knowledge sharing occurs when someone is willing to learn (i.e., gathering knowledge) and helping (i.e., contributing knowledge) to others in developing new abilities. Knowledge sharing is a process in which individuals exchange knowledge and together create new knowledge. That is, knowledge sharing is the process of communication between two or more individuals



involving “*acquisition*” (i.e., gathering knowledge) and “*provision*” (i.e., contributing knowledge) (Usoro, Sharratt, Tsui, & Shekhar, 2007).

Knowledge sharing process refers to how organizational employees share experiences related to work, expertise, knowledge, and information contextually with other colleagues (Lin, 2007). This process is very important in transferring individual knowledge to organizational knowledge. This definition of knowledge sharing implies that every knowledge sharing process consists of “*bringing*” (i.e., donating) knowledge and “*getting*” (i.e., collecting) knowledge.

Knowledge sharing can be achieved through people and technology after the process of created knowledge, identified knowledge, and captured knowledge to be disseminated around the organization. Zhou and Li (2012) highlight this by stating that knowledge management practices are most important because they realize all the opportunities and challenges associated with managing intangible and invisible assets (i.e., in the form of knowledge). While technology can help in capturing and distributing knowledge, so emphasis must be placed on the organization. Koh and Kim (2004) emphasize that in order for an organization to succeed in knowledge management, it is very important to have an organizational environment that supports knowledge creation, knowledge distribution, and knowledge sharing to keep achieving competitive advantage.

### **Person-Organization Fit**

Adjusting employees to the organizational environment so that they become ‘best-fitting’ is the key to organizational success (Lam, Huo, & Chen, 2018). No organization wants to make their employees worse. Therefore, organizations always try to create high compatibility between employees and organizations so that it does not incur large costs to find replacement candidates in the organization.

Person-organization fit refers to conformity between individual values and organizational values. According to Kristof-Brown and Billsberry (2012), person-organization fit refers to conformity between individuals and organizations, which emphasizes the extent to which individuals and organizations share the same characteristics and/or meet each other's needs.



Person-organization fit is generally defined as the compatibility of values, knowledge, skills, abilities, and personalities between individuals and the entire organization (Hoffman & Woehr, 2006).

High person-organization fit provides a better understanding of organizational expectations and individual realization of their unique tasks (Gregory, Albritton, & Osmonbekov, 2010). Employees with a strong sense of person-organization fit will more improve cognitive and proactive in the organization than employees with the low person-organization fit. Employees will often remember and accurately process information when their values are consistent with the organization's specific scheme.

Ambrose, Arnaud, and Schminke (2008) explore how the compatibility of employees' ethical values and organizational ethical climate influences job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The results of their research show that the compatibility of ethical values of employees and the ethical climate of organizations is closely related to higher levels of commitment and job satisfaction. Therefore,

***H1: Person-organization fit positively influences innovative work behaviour***

***H2: Person-organization fit positively influences knowledge sharing behaviour***

Related to the relationship between knowledge sharing and innovative work behaviour, knowledge sharing is seen as a process of exchanging information relating to tasks, knowledge, and feedback regarding work procedures or products to create new knowledge/ideas, deal with problems, and achieve common goals (S. Wang & Noe, 2010). Because knowledge is a very important organizational resource, which promotes sustainable competitive advantage, knowledge sharing is considered a fundamental means by which employees make a positive contribution to the realization of innovation among employees and among teams (for example, by increasing high innovation capabilities), which leads to sustainable organizational development.

Encouraging employees to share knowledge regarding their work with other members of the organization that is actively suggesting new ideas for organizations and transforming new ideas

into work realization will further enhance innovative work behaviour. This is in accordance with the findings of several researchers who concluded that knowledge sharing has a significant effect on innovative work behaviour (Afsar, 2016; W. Kim & Park, 2017; Sulistiyani, Udin, & Rahardja, 2018; C. Wang & Hu, 2017). Thus,

*H3: Knowledge sharing behaviour positively influences innovative work behaviour*

## **Materials and Methods**

### **Population and Sample**

Population is a set of all possible people or objects and elements that become a measure for a conclusion (Fink, 2015). The population of this study is all civil servant lecturers from 3 state universities (e.g., Halu Oleo University, Sembilanbelas November University and Kendari State Islamic Institute) totaling 961 people.

The sampling method of this study is using "purposive sampling" that is by paying attention to the characteristics of the population to be used as samples (such as, a minimum work period of 4 years and already have qualified work experience). Therefore, the total sample is 221 people.

### **Measurement**

*Person-organization fit* is measured by using 3 indicators (e.g., the compatibility of personal values with organizational values related to concern for others, compatibility of personal values with organizational values related to honesty, and compatibility of personal values with organizational values related to justice). The measurement of person-organization fit is adapted from Vilela, González, and Ferrín (2008).

*Knowledge sharing behaviour* is measured by using 3 indicators (e.g., sharing information with colleagues, telling colleagues about things that are useful, and giving new ideas to colleagues). The measurement of knowledge sharing behaviour is adapted from T. T. Kim and Lee (2013).

*Innovative work behaviour* is measured using 4 indicators (e.g., enthusiastic about innovative ideas, introducing innovative ideas into work practices, finding new approaches in carrying out

work, and producing appropriate solutions to work problems). The measurement of innovative work behaviour is adapted from J. De Jong and Den Hartog (2010).

### Data Analysis

For hypothesis testing, data analysis in this study employs Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) with Amos 22 software. SEM is a powerful analytical method that has more advantages other association analysis, such as regression (Ghazali & Latan, 2015).

### Results and Discussions

The results of data analysis with Amos 22 indicate that the data is normally distributed. This can be seen in Table 1 that the value of skewness and kurtosis is below 2,58.

**Table 1** Assessment of Normality

Variable	min	max	skew	c.r.	kurtosis	c.r.
KS1	3,000	7,000	-,224	-1,358	-,721	-2,187
KS2	3,000	7,000	-,139	-,843	-,622	-1,889
KS3	3,000	7,000	-,334	-2,026	-,736	-2,232
PO3	3,000	7,000	-,405	-2,459	,706	2,144
PO2	3,000	7,000	-,398	-2,415	,008	,023
PO1	3,000	7,000	-,353	-2,145	,371	1,125
IWB4	3,000	7,000	-,412	-2,502	-,281	-,851
IWB3	3,000	7,000	-,342	-2,078	,146	,443
IWB2	4,000	7,000	-,260	-1,576	-,830	-2,519
IWB1	4,000	7,000	-,304	-1,844	-,679	-2,060
Multivariate					7,941	3,810

In Table 2 shows that the data of this study have very good validity because the value of the loading factor of each construct is above 0.6.

**Table 2** Standardized Loadings

			Estimate
PO1	<---	Person-organization fit	,755
PO2	<---	Person-organization fit	,866
PO3	<---	Person-organization fit	,638
KS1	<---	Knowledge sharing behaviour	,959
KS2	<---	Knowledge sharing behaviour	,916
KS3	<---	Knowledge sharing behaviour	,932
IWB1	<---	Innovative work behaviour	,844
IWB2	<---	Innovative work behaviour	,896
IWB3	<---	Innovative work behaviour	,794
IWB4	<---	Innovative work behaviour	,933

Results of data analysis show that the value of Chi-square = 34,630; df = 32; Probability = 0,343; Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) = 0,019; CMIN/DF = 1,082; Goodness of Fix Index (GFI) = 0,971; Adjusted Goodness of Fix Index (AGFI) = 0,949; Tucker Lewis Index (TLI) = 0,998; Comparative Fix Index (CFI) = 998; and Normed Fix Index (NFI) = 0,979. All of these items indicate a good fit model.

**Table 3 Hypotheses Testing**

			Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P
Person-organization fit	→	Innovative work behaviour	,082	,089	,982	,326
Person-organization fit	→	Knowledge sharing behaviour	,398	,117	5,238	***
Knowledge sharing behaviour	→	Innovative work behaviour	,211	,054	2,684	,007

Note: \*\*\* significance level 5%

H1 states that person-organization fit will positively influence innovative work behaviour. Table 3 show that person-organization fit does not influence innovative work behaviour (*estimate* = 0,082; *S.E* = 0,089; *C.R* = 0,982;  $\rho > 0,05$ ). Therefore hypothesis 1 is rejected. This

may indicate that in the workdays of employees in completing the structural job, they spend a lot of time on relatively difficult activities so there is no increase in innovative work behaviour. Furthermore, employees also reduce job demands and they have more time to rest alone, without social interaction with other people in the organization. This is contradicting to self-determination perspective, where employees are motivated, internalized and in harmony with themselves, they have the quality of human functions that involve the experience of choice at work (Khan et al., 2018).

H2 states person-organization fit will positively influence knowledge sharing behaviour. Table 3 show that person-organization fit positively influences knowledge sharing behaviour (*estimate* = 0,398; *S.E* = 0,117; *C.R* = 5,238;  $\rho < 0,05$ ). Thus, hypothesis 2 is supported.

H3 states knowledge sharing behaviour will positively influence innovative work behaviour. Table 3 show that knowledge sharing behaviour positively influences innovative work behaviour (*estimate* = 0,211; *S.E* = 0,054; *C.R* = 2,684;  $\rho < 0,05$ ). Therefore hypothesis 3 is also supported.

A high person-organization fit of employees will be satisfied with their duties and intrinsically motivated, where those who are intrinsically motivated will display higher innovative behaviour (J. P. De Jong & Den Hartog, 2007). Employees with a strong sense of fit will return the organizational support and justice shown to them by displaying positive work behaviour. Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, and Johnson (2005) show that a high person-organization fit helps employees to conduct behaviours that are beneficial to the organization.

Person-organization fit has been declared to be the most important antecedent of organizational outcomes, where employees who have concurrence with the organization will show extra-role behaviour, innovative work behaviour, and knowledge sharing among employees (Afsar, 2016; Afsar & Rehman, 2015; Hon & Leung, 2011). Person-organization fit is very important to maintain employees who are flexible, inspired and committed (Afsar & Rehman, 2015). A high level of fit between employees and organizations will increase the creation of meaningful ideas/suggestions for change in the workplace (Werbel & DeMarie, 2005).



Knowledge sharing is discerned as a knowledge management process, which aims to provide knowledge where such knowledge is needed, thus contributing to the achievement of sustainable competitive advantage (S. Wang & Noe, 2010). Knowledge sharing plays an important role in generating new ideas and is considered one of the most important knowledge management processes.

T. T. Kim and Lee (2013) in their study found that knowledge collecting and knowledge donating had a significant positive effect on the innovative work behaviour of employees working in five-star hotels, Korea. Likewise, Hu, Horng, and Sun (2009) emphasize that knowledge sharing among employees is a determining factor in the emergence of innovative work for international tourist hotel employees in Taiwan.

By referring to self-determination theory, where autonomous motivation is based on the values that exist in the minds of employees that lead to a passion for work and ongoing efforts to gain knowledge and disseminate it to others. This is believed to be able to create innovative work behaviour among employees in the organization (W.-T. Wang & Hou, 2015).

### **Summary and Conclusion**

This paper has examined the link between person-organization fit, knowledge sharing behaviour, and innovative work behaviour. This study has revealed that the direct influence of person-organization fit on innovative work of behaviour empirically is not proven. Therefore, future research should strive to explore a causal relationship through experimental or longitudinal studies.

The findings of this study have important implications for research and managerial practice. Most importantly, this study uses a self-determination perspective to understand the relationship between person-organization fit, knowledge sharing behaviour, and innovative work behaviour. The role of mediation is supported of knowledge sharing behaviour on the relationship between person-organization fit and innovative work behaviour.



In practice, this study can be used to inform all organizational policies particularly in Indonesian universities. Strong positive relationships between person-organization fit and knowledge sharing behaviour on innovative work behaviour show that innovative work behaviour is likely to increase when there is higher knowledge sharing behaviour among employees. Therefore, the process of recruiting employees must be more selective by relying on person-organization fit.

### Reference:

- Afsar, B. (2016). The impact of person-organization fit on innovative work behaviour: the mediating effect of knowledge sharing behaviour. *International journal of health care quality assurance*, 29(2), 104-122.
- Afsar, B., & Badir, Y. (2017). Workplace spirituality, perceived organizational support and innovative work behaviour: The mediating effects of person-organization fit. *Journal of workplace Learning*, 29(2), 95-109.
- Afsar, B., Cheema, S., & Bin Saeed, B. (2018). Do nurses display innovative work behaviour when their values match with hospitals' values? *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 21(1), 157-171.
- Afsar, B., & Rehman, M. (2015). The relationship between workplace spirituality and innovative work behaviour: The mediating role of perceived person-organization fit. *Journal of Management, Spirituality & Religion*, 12(4), 329-353.
- Ambrose, M. L., Arnaud, A., & Schminke, M. (2008). Individual moral development and ethical climate: The influence of person-organization fit on job attitudes. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 77(3), 323-333.
- Cummings, J. N. (2004). Work groups, structural diversity, and knowledge sharing in a global organization. *Management science*, 50(3), 352-364.
- De Jong, J., & Den Hartog, D. (2010). Measuring innovative work behaviour. *Creativity and innovation management*, 19(1), 23-36.
- De Jong, J. P., & Den Hartog, D. N. (2007). How leaders influence employees' innovative behaviour. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 10(1), 41-64.
- De Jong, J. P., & Den Hartog, D. N. (2008). Innovative work behaviour: Measurement and validation. *EIM Business and Policy Research*, 1-27.



- Fink, A. (2015). *How to conduct surveys: A step-by-step guide*: Sage Publications.
- Ghazali, I., & Latan, H. (2015). Partial Least Squares: Konsep, Teknik dan Aplikasi menggunakan Program Smart PLS 3.0. *Semarang: Badan Penerbit UNDIP*.
- Gregory, B. T., Albritton, M. D., & Osmonbekov, T. (2010). The mediating role of workplace spirituality on the relationships between P–O fit, job satisfaction, and in-role performance. *Journal of business and psychology*, 25(4), 639-647.
- Hoffman, B. J., & Woehr, D. J. (2006). A quantitative review of the relationship between person–organization fit and behavioural outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 68(3), 389-399.
- Hon, A. H., & Leung, A. S. (2011). Employee creativity and motivation in the Chinese context: The moderating role of organizational culture. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 52(2), 125-134.
- Hu, M.-L. M., Horng, J.-S., & Sun, Y.-H. C. (2009). Hospitality teams: Knowledge sharing and service innovation performance. *Tourism management*, 30(1), 41-50.
- Huang, M.-P., Cheng, B.-S., & Chou, L.-F. (2005). Fitting in organizational values: The mediating role of person-organization fit between CEO charismatic leadership and employee outcomes. *International Journal of Manpower*, 26(1), 35-49.
- Janssen, O. (2000). Job demands, perceptions of effort-reward fairness and innovative work behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and organizational psychology*, 73(3), 287-302.
- Janssen, O., Van de Vliert, E., & West, M. (2004). The bright and dark sides of individual and group innovation: A special issue introduction. *Journal of organizational behaviour*, 25(2), 129-145.
- Jin, M. H., McDonald, B., & Park, J. (2018). Does Public Service Motivation Matter in Public Higher Education? Testing the Theories of Person–Organization Fit and Organizational Commitment Through a Serial Multiple Mediation Model. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 48(1), 82-97.
- Khan, I. U., Hameed, Z., Yu, Y., Islam, T., Sheikh, Z., & Khan, S. U. (2018). Predicting the acceptance of MOOCs in a developing country: Application of task-technology fit model, social motivation, and self-determination theory. *Telematics and Informatics*, 35(4), 964-978.



- Kim, T., & Lee, G. (2012). A modified and extended Triandis model for the enablers–process–outcomes relationship in hotel employees' knowledge sharing. *The Service Industries Journal*, 32(13), 2059-2090.
- Kim, T. T., & Lee, G. (2013). Hospitality employee knowledge-sharing behaviours in the relationship between goal orientations and service innovative behaviour. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 34, 324-337.
- Kim, W., & Park, J. (2017). Examining structural relationships between work engagement, organizational procedural justice, knowledge sharing, and innovative work behaviour for sustainable organizations. *Sustainability*, 9(2), 205.
- King, N., & Anderson, N. (2002). *Managing innovation and change: A critical guide for organizations*: Cengage Learning EMEA.
- Koh, J., & Kim, Y.-G. (2004). Knowledge sharing in virtual communities: an e-business perspective. *Expert systems with applications*, 26(2), 155-166.
- Kristof-Brown, A. L., & Billsberry, J. (2012). *Organizational fit: Key issues and new directions*: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kristof-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D., & Johnson, E. C. (2005). Consequences of individuals' fit at work: a meta-analysis of person-job, person-organization, person-group, and person-supervisor fit. *Personnel psychology*, 58(2), 281-342.
- Lam, W., Huo, Y., & Chen, Z. (2018). Who is fit to serve? Person–job/organization fit, emotional labor, and customer service performance. *Human Resource Management*, 57(2), 483-497.
- Lee, H. S., & Hong, S. A. (2014). Factors affecting hospital employees' knowledge sharing intention and behaviour, and innovation behaviour. *Osong public health and research perspectives*, 5(3), 148-155.
- Li, W. (2010). Virtual knowledge sharing in a cross-cultural context. *Journal of knowledge management*, 14(1), 38-50.
- Lin, H.-F. (2007). Knowledge sharing and firm innovation capability: an empirical study. *International Journal of Manpower*, 28(3/4), 315-332.
- Nonaka, I. (2008). *The knowledge-creating company*: Harvard Business Review Press.



- Pieterse, A. N., Van Knippenberg, D., Schippers, M., & Stam, D. (2010). Transformational and transactional leadership and innovative behaviour: The moderating role of psychological empowerment. *Journal of organizational behaviour*, 31(4), 609-623.
- Ramamoorthy, N., Flood, P. C., Slattery, T., & Sardesai, R. (2005). Determinants of innovative work behaviour: Development and test of an integrated model. *Creativity and innovation management*, 14(2), 142-150.
- Rowley, J. (2000). From learning organisation to knowledge entrepreneur. *Journal of knowledge management*, 4(1), 7-15.
- Shahab, M. A., Sobari, A., & Udin, U. (2018). Empowering Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Mediating Roles of Psychological Empowerment and Emotional Intelligence in Medical Service Industry. *International Journal of Economics & Business Administration (IJEBA)*, 6(3), 80-91.
- Sulistiyani, E., Udin, & Rahardja, E. (2018). Examining the Effect of Transformational Leadership, Extrinsic Reward, and Knowledge Sharing on Creative Performance of Indonesian SMEs. *Quality-Access to Success*, 19(167), 63-67.
- Usoro, A., Sharratt, M. W., Tsui, E., & Shekhar, S. (2007). Trust as an antecedent to knowledge sharing in virtual communities of practice. *Knowledge Management Research & Practice*, 5(3), 199-212.
- Van Burg, E., Berends, H., & Van Raaij, E. M. (2014). Framing and interorganizational knowledge transfer: A process study of collaborative innovation in the aircraft industry. *Journal of Management Studies*, 51(3), 349-378.
- Van Loon, N. M., Vandenabeele, W., & Leisink, P. (2017). Clarifying the relationship between public service motivation and in-role and extra-role behaviours: The relative contributions of person-job and person-organization fit. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 47(6), 699-713.
- Vilela, B. B., González, J. A. V., & Ferrín, P. F. (2008). Person–organization fit, OCB and performance appraisal: Evidence from matched supervisor–salesperson data set in a Spanish context. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 37, 1005-1019.
- Wang, C., & Hu, Q. (2017). Knowledge sharing in supply chain networks: Effects of collaborative innovation activities and capability on innovation performance. *Technovation*.



- Wang, S., & Noe, R. A. (2010). Knowledge sharing: A review and directions for future research. *Human resource management review*, 20(2), 115-131.
- Wang, W.-T., & Hou, Y.-P. (2015). Motivations of employees' knowledge sharing behaviours: A self-determination perspective. *Information and Organization*, 25(1), 1-26.
- Werbel, J. D., & DeMarie, S. M. (2005). Aligning strategic human resource management and person–environment fit. *Human resource management review*, 15(4), 247-262.
- Wojtczuk-Turek, A., & Turek, D. (2016). The significance of perceived social-organization climate for creating employees' innovativeness: The mediating role of person-organization fit. *Management Research Review*, 39(2), 167-195.
- Zhou, K. Z., & Li, C. B. (2012). How knowledge affects radical innovation: Knowledge base, market knowledge acquisition, and internal knowledge sharing. *Strategic Management Journal*, 33(9), 1090-1102.