

Secrets in the shadows: Unmasking tacit knowledge hiding and hoarding through the lens of trust

Darren Wiggins, College of Computing, AI, and Cybersecurity, Nova Southeastern University, United States, dlwiggins@gmail.com

Ling Wang, College of Computing, AI, and Cybersecurity, Nova Southeastern University, United States, lingwang@nova.edu

Abstract

Knowledge Hiding is the intentional withholding of knowledge from colleagues, often driven by a lack of trust. It manifests as rationalized hiding, evasive hiding, or playing dumb; the latter two are particularly detrimental to workplace trust. Organizations invest in promoting Tacit Knowledge and Explicit Knowledge sharing to enhance teamwork, problem-solving, and workplace relationships. Recent studies emphasize the importance of understanding the characteristics of Tacit Knowledge and Explicit Knowledge, as well as the motivations behind Knowledge Hiding and Knowledge Hoarding. This study aimed to identify key factors influencing individuals' decisions to share Tacit Knowledge or engage in Knowledge Hiding and Knowledge Hoarding. Using an 11-stage Survey Design methodology, data were collected from 285 Knowledge Management professionals across five countries in North America and Europe. Participants represented a diverse range of industries and organizational sizes, providing a broad perspective on knowledge behaviors. Results indicated participant awareness of and engagement in Knowledge Hiding, Knowledge Hoarding, and Knowledge Sharing. They recognized that Tacit Knowledge holders made deliberate sharing decisions based on factors like trust, sincerity, and expertise. Additionally, organizational culture, incentives, and perceived risks played a role in these decisions, with some respondents highlighting the impact of competitive environments and personal career advancement. The study highlighted the need for future research to include leadership influences on Knowledge Hiding, Knowledge Hoarding, and trust and distrust in the workplace.

Keywords: Knowledge hiding, knowledge hoarding, knowledge sharing, tacit knowledge, behavioral intention, trust.

Introduction

Knowledge Hiding involves intentionally concealing knowledge due to distrust, such as evasive behaviors (Connelly et al., 2012). This distrust creates a negative culture, impeding effective Knowledge Sharing (Bari et al., 2020; Tian et al., 2021). Evasive hiding is the most detrimental form of Knowledge Hiding, hindering collaboration (Bari et al., 2020). Knowledge Hoarding involves accumulating data, unlike intentional Knowledge Hiding (Banagou et al., 2021). Knowledge Hoarding deliberately withholds information, indirectly causing mistrust (Bilginoğlu, 2018). Individuals use Knowledge Hoarding and Knowledge Hiding when threatened or protecting themselves (de Garcia, 2020). While Knowledge Hoarding and Knowledge Hiding are detrimental

behaviors triggered by threats, they are also protective (Bilginoğlu, 2018; de Garcia, 2020). Though Knowledge Hiding intentionally conceals requested information and Knowledge Hoarding withholds unrequested information, both require further study, especially regarding Tacit Knowledge sharing (de Garcia, 2020). Trust is a critical factor in Knowledge Sharing behaviors. Peng (2013) identified interpersonal trust as a key influence on knowledge protection and willingness to share. The role of trust between coworkers and distrust with supervisors in reducing Knowledge Hoarding and Knowledge Hiding while promoting Knowledge Sharing requires further research (Arain et al., 2020; Connelly et al., 2012; Pradhan et al., 2019). Further research should explore the types of Tacit Knowledge or Explicit Knowledge being hidden, motivations, and the impact of trust (Ali & Sagsan, 2021; Pradhan et al., 2019; Singh, 2019). It is also vital to explore individual decision-making based on psychological factors and territoriality, as these influence Knowledge Sharing dynamics and contribute to Knowledge Hoarding and Knowledge Hiding.

Problem Statement

Defining study goals and data collection methods are fundamental (Rea & Parker, 2014). A quantitative survey gathered views on Knowledge Hoarding and Knowledge Hiding concerning Tacit Knowledge (Peng, 2013). Standardized questions reduced bias (Brace, 2013) to uncover antecedents (e.g., mistreatment, trust) of Knowledge Hoarding and Knowledge Hiding constructs (Connelly et al., 2012; Oliveira et al., 2021). Peng (2013) suggested research lacked detail, confirming Tacit Knowledge as the origin of Knowledge Hiding. Unlike well-documented Explicit Knowledge, Tacit Knowledge is hard to articulate and share, residing in individuals' minds. Its personal nature gives it unique value (Gubbins & Dooley, 2021; Peng, 2013; Singh, 2019). Understanding interactions may reveal how Tacit Knowledge, trust, and Knowledge Sharing (Gubbins & Dooley, 2021). This study assessed four main Research Questions (RQ) investigating individuals' understanding and motivation to engage in Knowledge Hoarding, Knowledge Hiding, and Tacit Knowledge sharing. It explored their motivation to share Tacit Knowledge and examined the behavioral characteristics of Knowledge Hiding, Knowledge Hoarding, trust, and Tacit Knowledge sharing. This study identified factors encouraging both Tacit Knowledge and Explicit Knowledge sharing.

- RQ1: How well do individuals understand the behaviors of knowledge hiding or knowledge hoarding in the workplace?
- RQ2: What motivators lead an individual to share tacit knowledge with others in the workplace?
- RQ3: Which behavioral characteristics influence an individual's decision to exhibit behaviors of knowledge hiding, knowledge hoarding, or not to share tacit knowledge?
- RQ4: Which motivators of trust facilitate tacit knowledge sharing?

This paper narrowed its focus on RQ4 to identify how trust constructs influence Knowledge Hoarding and Knowledge Hiding within organizations. Exploring an individual's trust levels when deciding to exhibit Knowledge Hoarding and Knowledge Hiding versus Tacit Knowledge sharing may contribute to Knowledge Sharing.

Review of Literature

Individuals recognize Knowledge Sharing, Knowledge Hoarding, and Knowledge Hiding as common workplace problems. A literature review explored Knowledge Sharing, Knowledge Hiding, Knowledge Hoarding, the role of trust, and the importance of Tacit Knowledge.

Knowledge Sharing

Knowledge exchange is vital for organizational success, as it reduces rework, fosters innovation, enhances assets, and improves productivity (de Garcia et al., 2020; Oliveira et al., 2021; Pradhan et al., 2019). Furthermore, this process ensures knowledge capture for future use (de Garcia et al., 2020; Gubbins & Dooley, 2021; Oliveira et al., 2021). Integrating Tacit Knowledge into Knowledge Sharing accelerates learning and innovation, especially when experienced individuals depart (de Garcia et al., 2020; Oliveira et al., 2021). Despite leadership support to educate, motivate, and promote Knowledge Sharing (Oliveira et al., 2021; Pradhan et al., 2019), its success is limited by individual knowledge behaviors (Oliveira et al., 2021).

Knowledge Hoarding

Researchers defined Knowledge Hoarding is defined as intentionally accumulating knowledge, often due to self-interest and fear of losing power (Aljawarneh et al., 2022; Banagou et al., 2021; Khalid et al., 2020). Unlike Knowledge Hiding, which is a direct response to a request, Knowledge Hoarding is self-motivated (Banagou et al., 2021; Serenko, 2020). Experiencing ostracism can increase Knowledge Hoarding behaviors (Khalid et al., 2020). A lack of effective Knowledge Sharing processes and working in silos further encourages this behavior by fostering competition and mistrust (Bilginoğlu, 2018). Knowledge hoarding can be “tyranny disguised as humility” because it reduces information visibility and prevents others from benefiting (Bilginoğlu, 2018). Although seemingly selfless, Knowledge Hoarding is harmful and may undermine the Knowledge Hoarding's influence and damage trust.

Knowledge Hiding

Over a decade ago, Connelly et al. (2012) highlighted the need for more research on Knowledge Hiding compared to Knowledge Sharing. Understanding the motivators and behaviors behind Knowledge Hiding has since become a focus, with ongoing research exploring its various aspects across organizations and academia (Connelly et al., 2012; Koay & Lim, 2022; Wang & Dong, 2022; Wen et al., 2022). Despite recent Knowledge Hiding publications, Connelly et al. (2012)'s definition of Knowledge Hiding as intentionally concealing knowledge due to distrust remains foundational. Their work explores competition, communication, and leadership's role in Knowledge Hiding, and their identified Knowledge Hiding characteristics (playing dumb, evasive hiding, rationalized hiding) (Connelly et al., 2012) are still relevant. Connelly et al. (2012) explained that Knowledge Hiding is a deliberate action undertaken by an individual or a group to withhold or obscure knowledge from others. This behavior is often driven by certain perceived assumptions, misinformation, or distrust (Connelly et al., 2012).

Tacit Knowledge

Oliviera et al. (2021)'s literature review provided a framework for understanding Knowledge Hiding and Knowledge Hoarding. Of the 50 articles reviewed by Oliveira et al. (2021), only six explored how Tacit Knowledge or Explicit Knowledge contribute to these phenomena (Feng & Wang, 2019; Hernus et al., 2019; Peng, 2013; Singh, 2019; Skerlavaj et al., 2018; Wang et al., 2018). Although these studies differed in focus, they commonly aimed to understand the factors driving individuals to hoard or hide knowledge. Tacit knowledge is hard to articulate due to its experiential, internalized nature (Leonard & Sensiper, 1998), described as “embrained, embodied, and embedded” (Rechberg, 2020, p. 16), requiring organizations to translate it into leverageable Explicit Knowledge. Unlike Tacit Knowledge, Explicit Knowledge is easily explained and transferred (Gamble, 2020). Organizations struggle to access Tacit Knowledge organically because it is not contractually shared, especially if knowledge seekers are unaware of its scope (Lanke, 2018). Adverse working conditions, with a lack of trust, decrease the likelihood of Knowledge Sharing, leading to Knowledge Hoarding or Knowledge Hiding (Rechberg, 2020). Academics are more likely to hide Tacit Knowledge for competitive advantage (Hernaus et al., 2019). Tacit Knowledge Sharing and learning require balancing personal competitiveness and relationships (Gubbins & Dooley, 2021; Hernaus et al., 2019).

Trust

Trust is generally understood as the willingness to rely on the intentions and actions of others (Kocak, 2023). Within Knowledge Sharing contexts, this concept manifests in several distinct forms, including Ability-Based Trust, Benevolence-Based Trust, Cognition-Based Trust, and Competence-Based Trust. Gubbins and Dooley (2021) found that pre-existing relationships prioritize Ability-Based Trust, while Benevolence-Based Trust is more relevant without prior connections; knowledge-seeking involves social identity, trust, and psychological safety. Gubbins and Dooley (2021) defined Ability-Based Trust as when knowledge holders identify experts by ability, and for Benevolence-Based Trust, they assess the seeker's need and goodwill in sharing. The authors stated that Competence-Based Trust, like Ability-Based Trust, works best in established relationships. Levin and Cross (2004) emphasized strong relational ties in knowledge transfer, using Competence-Based Trust as an example. Conversely, Chowdhury (2005) highlighted Cognition-Based Trust, which relies on evaluating credentials. Both Competence-Based Trust and Cognition-Based Trust ultimately build confidence and encourage Knowledge Sharing.

Methodology

Addressing gaps in understanding Knowledge Hoarding and Knowledge Hiding, as well as their relationship to Tacit Knowledge and trust, was central. An 11-stage survey design methodology (Rea & Parker, 2014) ensured unbiased data collection, guiding researchers from conceptualization to results.

Stage 1: Identifying the Focus of the Study and Method of Research

Rea and Parker (2014) outlined defining study goals and data collection methods as fundamental tasks. A quantitative survey design was used to gather participant views on Knowledge Hiding and

Knowledge Hoarding concerning Tacit Knowledge (Peng, 2013). The survey used standardized questions to reduce bias (Brace, 2013), aiming to uncover antecedents (e.g., mistreatment, trust) associated with Knowledge Hiding and Knowledge Hoarding constructs, which are not always directly observable (Connelly et al., 2012; Oliveira et al., 2021).

Stage 2: Determining the Research Schedule and Budget

Rea and Parker (2014) noted the need to determine a research schedule and budget. This quantitative survey used a cross-sectional study design over 42 days from November 12th through December 23rd, 2023. The budget was limited, but access to Qualtrics^{XM} and 285 completed responses minimized financial impact.

Stage 3: Establishing an Information Base

When creating a survey, gathering information from stakeholders is crucial (Rea & Parker, 2014). A literature review on Knowledge Hoarding and Knowledge Hiding influenced the survey questions (Oliveira et al., 2021). Guidance from Malik (2022) on Tacit Knowledge sharing and workplace innovation focused the survey on Knowledge Sharing best practices.

Stage 4: Determining the Sample Frame

The survey participants selected for the survey were determined by applying the sampling frame of the survey study (Rea & Parker, 2014). The participants for the study primarily worked as Information Technology professionals or had roles that are technology-based, adjacent.

Stage 5: Determining the Sample Size and Sample Selection

Approximately 400-500 participants with Information Technology and Knowledge Management skills were invited via social media. Recruits came from diverse departments, organizations, and countries, including Belgium, England, Germany, Italy, and the United States. Most participants were U.S. citizens, though German nationals also contributed, offering varied perspectives.

Stage 6: Designing the Survey Instrument

Following Brace (2013), pre-coded questions maximized response breadth and anonymity. The survey used a 7-point Likert scale for nuanced ordinal data, allowing scores (e.g., -3 to +3) for quantitative analysis (Brace, 2013). Questions were written to reduce common method biases for a high survey response rate (Podsakoff et al., 2003).

Stage 7: Pretesting the Survey Instrument

Pretesting surveys improves quality by identifying unclear items (Rea & Parker, 2014). Expert review enhances validity by assessing content before distribution (Brace, 2013). In this study, subject matter experts assessed the survey, and it was piloted with 14 Information Technology professionals to refine questions.

Stage 8: Selecting and Training Interviewers

Rea and Parker (2014) highlighted the need for interviewer training to ensure effective survey administration; however, this study used a self-administered survey due to the geographic diversity

of participants, making interviewer training unnecessary. Instead, Fowler's (2009) five guiding principles were followed to maintain best practices for self-administered surveys.

Stage 9: Implementing the Survey

Adhering to a random sampling procedure, maintaining the timeline, and ensuring privacy are imperative (Rea & Parker, 2014). The survey questions were grouped by RQ. Qualtrics^{XM} facilitated survey creation, data collection, and secure data storage (Qualtrics, 2023). The platform enables efficient survey management, direct distribution, anonymity, and completion on desktop and mobile devices.

Stage 10: Coding the Completed Questionnaires and Computerizing the Data

Rea and Parker (2014) recommended formatting the final survey for direct data entry into Qualtrics^{XM} to facilitate processing and analysis. Following Brace (2013), pre-coded closed questions were used to maximize response breadth and ensure anonymity, which is more challenging in interviews. Closed questions also simplify coding and quantification for analysis.

Stage 11: Analyzing the Data and Preparing the Final Report

Data analysis began once initial survey responses were collected in Qualtrics^{XM}. The first step was to assess survey completion rates, with a target minimum of 100 completed responses from the 400–500 invited participants. After analyzing the data and documenting findings related to the research questions, the next phase involves disseminating the completed research to relevant individuals, organizations, and publications for further review and post-analysis.

Results

This section presents the results, starting with an overview of the data analysis, followed by the Findings section, which discusses demographic data and the supporting survey questions for RQ4. The survey study's findings were analyzed to comprehend the participants' responses to questions about Knowledge Hiding, Knowledge Hoarding, Explicit Knowledge, Tacit Knowledge, Knowledge Sharing, and their trust.

Data Analysis

The data analysis section details the survey development, including subject matter experts' validation and pilot study methodology. The latter section provides an overview of the survey study and process of evaluating participant responses before discussing the findings. Two subject matter experts refined the survey for clarity and consistency. A pilot study with 14 experts revealed completion times from 6:21 to 37:47 and identified minor grammatical issues.

A Qualtrics^{XM} closed-ended survey examined characteristics and motivators influencing organizational trust and Tacit Knowledge sharing. After removing straightlining responses where some survey respondents answered the same response to a series of consecutive questions (Reuning & Plutzer, 2020), the sample was reduced from 338 to 285 responses.

Findings

The following sections elaborate on the seven demographic inquiries and the eight quantitative queries that bolster the research questions in the survey. Table 1 offers a summary of RQ4 supporting survey questions related to the participants.

Demographic data

Demographic analysis of 285 survey responses revealed a diverse respondent pool. Participants were nearly equally distributed between Europe (50.55%) and North America (49.45%), with a balanced gender (50.35% female, 49.65% male). Age distribution was fairly balanced across categories, with the 34-57 age range representing about 61.5% of participants. Participants represented 16 industry categories, with Information Technology (28.8%), Office & Administrative (10.5%), Healthcare (10.2%), and Education & Training (10.0%) being the most common. Educationally, most participants held at least a college degree, with 74.4% having a bachelor's or master's degree. The majority of participants (73.7%) had over 11 years of work experience. Ethnically, 59% of respondents identified as Caucasian, with the remaining 41% representing a diverse range of ethnicities. This combination of experience and diversity was beneficial in providing valuable feedback on the survey study.

Supporting survey questions

To capture the prevailing sentiment of the survey participants towards the supporting survey questions, a "Decision" column has been integrated into the subsequent tables to rank low and high perceptions. Ho (2017) concluded that using a linear Likert-type scale to measure participants' perceptions and attitudes is item-centered. This means that any differences in participant responses can be attributed to the specific questions asked in the survey. He also noted that each participant's response is considered independent of that of others. The psychological distances between different participant responses are assumed to be equal (Ho, 2017). Nonetheless, a weighted average was employed to gauge the prevailing perception among the 285 responses, offering a quick overview (i.e., perception) of the general sentiment towards the survey questions. The calculation of the weighted average is used to determine the relative significance of the values associated with the observations from the supporting research questions related to the four main research questions.

Each supporting survey question is classified as Low Perception or High Perception by comparing its mean score to the weighted average ($\bar{x}$). If the mean is below the weighted average, it is labeled Low Perception; if it equals or exceeds the weighted average, it is labeled High Perception. This method highlights prevailing trends among participants without diminishing the value of other responses. The supporting survey questions in Table 1 assessed factors influencing trust in Tacit Knowledge sharing for RQ4, showing an even distribution of Low Perception and High Perception responses. Table 1 presents each RQ4 supporting survey question, its mean, and its classification as high or low perception. The mean for each survey question is calculated by multiplying each Likert scale value by the number of responses it received, summing these products, and then dividing by the total number of responses. To determine the weighted average for RQ4, the means of all supporting survey questions are added together and then divided by the number of those questions. For RQ4, the weighted average for all supporting survey questions is 5.27.

Table 1. RQ4 Supporting Survey Questions

Question	STD	D	SD	N	S	A	SA	$\bar{X}$	σ	Decision
Q33) I share relevant Tacit Knowledge with coworkers based on their abilities in the workplace.	7	25	19	37	94	81	22	4.81	1.46	Low Perception
Q34) I share relevant Tacit Knowledge with coworkers who are perceived as being credible in the workplace.	4	7	11	43	87	107	26	5.20	1.21	Low Perception
Q35) I share relevant Tacit Knowledge with coworkers who have high standing in the workplace.	5	9	15	66	81	82	27	4.98	1.30	Low Perception
Q36) I share relevant Tacit Knowledge with coworkers who lack knowledge but are sincere in their request.	2	9	4	24	63	119	64	5.63	1.21	High Perception
Q37) I show goodwill in sharing relevant Tacit Knowledge with coworkers after evaluating their sincerity and potential skill set.	2	9	4	44	79	105	42	5.36	1.20	High Perception
Q38) I share relevant Tacit Knowledge with coworkers who possess subject matter expertise in the workplace.	3	4	8	34	72	109	55	5.51	1.19	High Perception
Q39) I share relevant Tacit Knowledge with coworkers who possess exceptional credentials in the workplace.	2	5	9	69	57	104	39	5.25	1.22	Low Perception
Q40) I share relevant Tacit Knowledge with coworkers who are perceived as subject matter experts qualified to share tacit knowledge.	2	3	16	39	60	114	51	5.45	1.22	High Perception

Note. N = 285, STD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, SD = Somewhat Disagree, N = Neither Agree or Disagree, S = Somewhat Agree, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree.

Discussion

This section discusses the supporting survey questions, implications, limitations, recommendations, and conclusions from a study of 285 participants. Participants used the QualtricsXM platform, contributing Knowledge Management and Knowledge Sharing expertise through writing, problem-solving, and reviewing. The findings, based on RQ4, will be further discussed. Participants showed a Low Perception to share Tacit Knowledge based solely on coworkers' abilities, indicating a tendency to assist regardless of skill level. Contrary to Gubbins and Dooley's (2021) findings, Tacit Knowledge holders were willing to share, regardless of

credibility or position, suggesting that connections influence Tacit Knowledge sharing over rank or perceived expertise. This study shows that individuals generally share Tacit Knowledge with sincere colleagues and subject matter experts, regardless of credentials, suggesting influences beyond abilities in Benevolence-Based Trust. This openness contrasts with typical Ability-Based Trust behavior. However, Knowledge Hoarding and Knowledge Hiding occurred within the organizations; respondents on the survey practiced Knowledge Hiding and Knowledge Hoarding, despite claiming no personal involvement. Time and trust influence Tacit Knowledge withholding, Knowledge Hoarding, and Knowledge Hiding. Low trust, power dynamics, and lack of benefits cause individuals to withhold Tacit Knowledge, aligning with Benevolence-Based Trust behavior. The supporting survey questions revealed that participants regulated Tacit Knowledge sharing based on reciprocation and potential benefits. **Trust is key**; some share only with subject matter experts (i.e., Cognition-Based Trust), while others share based on sincerity (i.e., Benevolence-Based Trust), regardless of ability. Mitigating Knowledge Hoarding and Knowledge Hiding requires trust, communication, and transparency. Despite Knowledge Sharing benefits, personal conflicts cause Knowledge Hoarding, so supportive policies are needed to reduce Knowledge Hiding and Knowledge Hoarding and enhance Tacit Knowledge collaboration. These dynamics are linked to association and sincerity in Tacit Knowledge sharing. **Trust is essential**; Cognition-Based Trust leads some to share only with subject matter experts, while Benevolence-Based Trust prompts others to share based on sincerity, regardless of ability. Trust and communication mitigate Knowledge Hoarding and Knowledge Hiding. Despite Knowledge Sharing benefits, personal conflicts cause Knowledge Hoarding, so supportive policies are needed to reduce Knowledge Hiding and Knowledge Hoarding and improve collaboration. This study showed that trust based on association is more significant than rank, fostering trust for Tacit Knowledge sharing. Participants valued sharing Tacit Knowledge with sincere coworkers (i.e., Benevolence-Based Trust). Sincerity outweighed expertise in building trust; however, some ambivalence existed regarding abilities, hinting at a trust barrier for less-skilled individuals. Competence-Based Trust influences Tacit Knowledge sharing, with participants trusting subject matter experts. Credentials alone don't establish trust, suggesting other factors are needed. Findings highlight trust factors in Tacit Knowledge sharing, balancing Benevolence-Based Trust with competence. Organizations should foster multiple dimensions of trust for effective Tacit Knowledge sharing.

Implications

Participants were aware of Knowledge Hiding, Knowledge Hoarding, Knowledge Sharing, Explicit Knowledge, and Tacit Knowledge behaviors. Although Knowledge Hoarding and Knowledge Hiding related to Tacit Knowledge withholding were rare, they occurred due to time and trust issues, showing context-dependent sharing. Generally, participants shared Explicit Knowledge and Tacit Knowledge when asked, motivated by status and credibility, and denied withholding knowledge for personal gain, instead sharing when their expertise was recognized and explicitly requested. Trust behaviors significantly influenced Tacit Knowledge sharing, with Ability-Based Trust encouraging sharing with skilled coworkers and Benevolence-Based Trust motivating sharing with sincere, even less knowledgeable, requesters. Participants typically shared Tacit Knowledge with recognized subject matter experts, though some were neutral. Consistent with Chowdhury (2005), strong personal connections (i.e., Ability-Based Trust) could override tendencies to withhold knowledge, highlighting trust as a key enabler. The final implication

emphasizes the importance of informing organizational leadership about the negative effects of Knowledge Hiding and Knowledge Hoarding, and how coworker interactions and trust levels influence Knowledge Sharing. This study revealed the presence of active knowledge withholding in workplaces. Building on this, Andreeva and Zappa (2023) suggested that collaboration enhances trust, improves communication for problem-solving, and expands opportunities for creativity and innovation.

Limitations

Although this cross-sectional study offered a diverse sample, it provided only a single data point and didn't account for supervisors' or leaders' influence on trust and knowledge sharing. A longitudinal approach could have provided broader insights into organizational knowledge dynamics, including leadership's impact on Knowledge Hoarding, Knowledge Hiding, Explicit Knowledge, and Tacit Knowledge sharing. Limited in-person interaction existed within the survey design; however, approximately 18% of participants contacted the principal investigator to discuss their insights. Using an open-ended survey could have yielded additional qualitative data on workplace knowledge dynamics.

Further Research

Future research should 1) consider using longitudinal studies and in-person surveys to data over time and offer deeper insights into Knowledge Management dynamics and leadership influence on Tacit Knowledge; 2) utilize one-on-one discussions to enrich the analysis of Knowledge Hoarding, Knowledge Hiding, and Tacit Knowledge sharing, despite the topic's sensitivity; and 3) concentrate on Tacit Knowledge sharing and the Knowledge Hoarding and Knowledge Hiding behaviors occurring among employees, supervisors, and organizational leadership.

References

- Aljawarneh, N. M., Alomari, K. A. K., Alomari, Z. S., & Taha, O. (2022). Cyber incivility and knowledge hoarding: Does interactional justice matter? *VINE Journal of Information and Knowledge Management Systems*, 52(1), 57-70. <https://doi.org/ghrsfw>
- Ali, S. H., & Sagsan, M. (2021). The moderating effect of ethical leadership between psychological ownership of knowledge and knowledge hiding: An empirical study on the public universities in Northern Iraq'. *Revista Argentina de Clínica Psicológica*, 30(2), 178–188.
- Andreeva, T., & Zappa, P. (2023). Whose lips are sealed? Gender differences in knowledge hiding at work. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 96(4), 828–855. <https://doi.org/mhn3>
- Arain, G. A., Bhatti, Z. A., Hameed, I., & Fang, Y.-F. (2020). Top-down knowledge hiding and innovative work behavior (IWB): A three-way moderated-mediation analysis of self-efficacy and local/foreign status. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 24(2), 127–149. <https://doi.org/gkc53x>

- Banagou, M., Batistič, S., Do, H., & Poell, R. F. (2021). Relational climates moderate the effect of openness to experience on knowledge hiding: A two-country multi-level study. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 25(11), 60–87. <https://doi.org/gr6j>
- Bari, M. W., Ghaffar, M., & Ahmad, B. (2020). Knowledge-hiding behaviors and employees' silence: Mediating role of psychological contract breach. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 24(9), 2171–2194. <https://doi.org/ghhxnt>
- Bilginoğlu, E. (2018). Knowledge hoarding: A literature review. *Management Science Letters*, 9(1), 61–72. <https://doi.org/gntgzh>
- Brace, I. (2013). *Questionnaire design: How to plan, structure and write survey material for effective market research* (Third edition). Kogan Page Limited.
- Chowdhury, S. (2005). The role of affect- and cognition-based trust in complex knowledge sharing. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 17(3), 310–326.
- Connelly, C. E., Zweig, D., Webster, J., & Trougakos, J. P. (2012). Knowledge hiding in organizations'. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33(1), 64–88. <https://doi.org/djd6w6>
- de Garcia, P. S., Oliveira, M., & Brohman, K. (2020). Knowledge sharing, hiding and hoarding: How are they related? *Knowledge Management Research & Practice*, 20(3), 339–351. <https://doi.org/ghf9w2>
- Feng, J., & Wang, C. (2019). Does abusive supervision always promote employees to hide knowledge? From both reactance and COR perspectives. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 23(7), 1455–1474. <https://doi.org/ghhxqs>
- Fowler, F. J. (2009). Survey research methods. [electronic resource] (4th ed.). SAGE. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452230184>
- Gamble, J. R. (2020). Tacit vs explicit knowledge as antecedents for organizational change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 33(6), 1123–1141. <https://doi.org/gkw2g6>
- Gubbins, C., & Dooley, L. (2021). Delineating the tacit knowledge-seeking phase of knowledge sharing: The influence of relational social capital components. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 32(3), 319–348. <https://doi.org/gjhxt5>
- Hernaus, T., Cerne, M., Connelly, C., Vokic, N. P., & Škerlavaj, M. (2019). Evasive knowledge hiding in academia: When competitive individuals are asked to collaborate. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 23(4), 597–618. <https://doi.org/gkc55h>
- Ho, G. W. K. (2017). Examining perceptions and attitudes: A review of Likert-type scales versus q-methodology. *Western Journal of Nursing Research*, 39(5), 674–689.
- Khalid, B., Iqbal, R., & Hashmi, S. D. (2020). Impact of workplace ostracism on knowledge hoarding: Mediating role of defensive silence and moderating role of experiential avoidance. *Future Business Journal*, 6(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/gng8mb>

- Koay, K. Y., & Lim, P. K. (2022). Ethical leadership and knowledge hiding: Testing the mediating and moderating mechanisms. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 26(3), 574–591. <https://doi.org/hv5q>
- Kocak, D. (2023). How interpersonal trust influences knowledge hiding: Examining a moderated mediation model. *Journal of Eastern European Management*, 28(4), 723–749. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.113515>
- Lanke, P. (2018). Knowledge hiding: Impact of interpersonal behavior and expertise. *Human Resource Management International Digest*, 26(2), 30–32. <https://doi.org/hrc3>
- Leonard, D., & Sensiper, S. (1998). The role of tacit knowledge in group innovation. *California Management Review*, 40(3), 112–132. <https://doi.org/b4n2>
- Levin, D. Z., & Cross, R. (2004). The strength of weak ties you can trust: The mediating role of trust in effective knowledge transfer. *Management Science*, 50(11), 1477–1490. <https://doi.org/bszbvk>
- Malik, S. (2022). Emotional intelligence and innovative work behaviour in knowledge-intensive organizations: How tacit knowledge sharing acts as a mediator? *VINE Journal of Information and Knowledge Management Systems*, 52(5), 650–669. <https://doi.org/jszp>
- Oliveira, M., Curado, C., & de Garcia, P. S. (2021). Knowledge hiding and knowledge hoarding: A systematic literature review. *Knowledge & Process Management*, 28(3), 277–294. <https://doi.org/g73d>
- Peng, H. (2013). Why and when do people hide knowledge? *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 17(3), 398–415. <https://doi.org/f43mvh>
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879–903. <https://doi.org/czw>
- Pradhan, S., Srivastava, A., & K. Mishra, D. K. (2019). Abusive supervision and knowledge hiding: the mediating role of psychological contract violation and supervisor directed aggression. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 24(2), 216–234. <https://doi.org/gj4szy>
- Qualtrics (2023). *Data Protection & Privacy*. <https://www.qualtrics.com/support/survey-platform/getting-started/data-protection-privacy>
- Rea, L. M., & Parker, R. A. (2014). *Designing and conducting survey research*. [electronic resource]: A comprehensive guide (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Rechberg, I. D. W. (2020). Emotional intelligence and knowledge management: A necessary link? *Knowledge and Process Management*, 27(1), 15–24. <https://doi.org/ggfz8m>
- Reuning, K., & Plutzer, E. (2020). Valid vs. invalid straightlining: The complex relationship between straightlining and data quality. *Survey Research Methods*, 14(5), 439–459. <https://doi.org/mbrd>

-
- Serenko, A. (2020). Knowledge sabotage as an extreme form of counterproductive knowledge behavior: The perspective of the target. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 24(4), 737–773. <https://doi.org/gr59>
- Singh, S. K. (2019). Territoriality, task performance, and workplace deviance: Empirical evidence on role of knowledge hiding. *Journal of Business Research*, 97, 10–19. <https://doi.org/gjg73x>
- Skerlavaj, M., Connelly, C. E., Cerne, M., & Dysvik, A. (2018). Tell me if you can: Time pressure, prosocial motivation, perspective taking, and knowledge hiding. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 22(7), 1489–1509. <https://doi.org/gd72gf>
- Tian, Y., Mao, L., Zhou, M., & Cao, O. (2021). Knowledge-based psychological ownership and knowledge hiding: The roles of loss of knowledge power and emotional intelligence. *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal*, 49(8), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.10530>
- Wang, X., & Dong, B. (2022). Emotional intelligence and knowledge hiding behaviors: The mediating role of job stress. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 1-11. <https://doi.org/hv5p>
- Wang, Y., Han, M. S., Xiang, D., & Hampson, D. P. (2018). The double-edged effects of perceived knowledge hiding: Empirical evidence from the sales context. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 23(2), 279–296. <https://doi.org/gj4szz>
- Wen, J., Zheng, J., & Ma, R. (2022). Impact of knowledge hiding behaviors on workplace invincibility: Mediating role of psychological contract breach. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 1-11. <https://doi.org/hv5n>