INFLUENCE OF CORE SELF-EVALUATIONS ON KNOWLEDGE SHARING
BEHAVIOUR WITH EVALUATION APPREHENSION AS A MEDIATOR

KHAIRULBAHIYAH BT YAAKUB

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the
requirements for the award of the degree of Master of Science
in Human Resource Development

Faculty of Management
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

SEPTEMBER 2014

Specially dedicated to *My Family*...

Faith...*makes all things possible*

Hope...*makes all things work*

Loves...*makes all things beautiful*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

In the name of Allah, the Most Gracious and the Most Merciful.

Alhamdulillah, all praises to Allah for the strengths and His blessing in completing this thesis. My sincere appreciation goes to Dr Roziana Bt Shaari, for her guidance dan supervision. Not forgotten, my appreciation to my co-supervisor, Dr Siti Aisyah Bt Abdul Rahman for her constant support and constructive comments.

Special thanks to the Dean, Faculty of Management, Professor Dr. Zainab Khalifah for her support towards my postgraduate affairs. My acknowledgement goes to all faculty staffs especially Puan Salida Bt Bahari for their help and co-operations.

This journey would not have been possible without the constant support of my husband, *Muhammad Hazril*, my lovely children, *Nurin, Nabil, Hasya* and *Hayyan*. Their support has been unconditional all these years; they have given up many things for me; they have cherished with me every great moment and supported me whenever I needed it. Also, thanks to *mak* and *ayah*, you made me into who I am. To all my friends, thank you for accompanying me on this adventure.

.

ABSTRACT

Knowledge sharing among individuals is a crucial aspect for the success of knowledge management. Behaviour of individuals in an organisation plays an important role in ensuring its success and their behaviour differences are assumed to be influenced by personality traits. Based on the literature reviewed, there are limited studies on the relationship between personality traits and knowledge sharing behaviour. Therefore, this study examined the effect of core self-evaluations comprising broad personality traits represented by two dimensions: self-conscientiousness (positive dimension) and self-negligence (negative dimension) on knowledge sharing behaviour. Prior literature argued that evaluation apprehension is anxiety based on fear of negative evaluation and feedback and one of the obstacles in knowledge sharing. Thus, the study has extended previous research by examining the effect of evaluation apprehension on knowledge sharing behaviour. Individuals with a positive personality are able to face criticism and accept feedback more effectively but there has yet to be an attempt to draw a distinction between the effect of core self-evaluations and evaluation apprehension. Furthermore, based on the literature reviewed, studies on the role of evaluation apprehension as a mediator between core self-evaluations and knowledge sharing behaviour are scarce. In this quantitative study, 128 academic librarians from five public research universities in Malaysia participated in the survey. Multiple regression was used to analyze the data. The results show that self-conscientiousness had a positive relationship on knowledge sharing behaviour. However and surprisingly, self-negligence influence on knowledge sharing behaviour was not supported. The results indicated that a librarian with self-conscientiousness would have the intensity to cope with evaluation apprehension and share knowledge as compared to those with self-negligence. As predicted, evaluation apprehension has been confirmed as the barrier in knowledge sharing behaviour. Finally, evaluation apprehension partially mediated the relationship between self-conscientiousness, self-negligence, and knowledge sharing behaviour. To sum up, findings of the study will add to the growing body of literature on knowledge sharing and librarianship research.

Keywords: *Knowledge Sharing Behaviour, Personality Traits, Core Self-Evaluations, Self-Conscientiousness, Self-Negligence, Evaluation Apprehension*

ABSTRAK

Perkongsian pengetahuan di kalangan individu adalah aspek penting dalam kejayaan pengurusan pengetahuan. Perlakuan individu dalam organisasi memainkan peranan penting di dalam memastikan kejayaannya dan perbezaan perlakuan mereka diandaikan dipengaruhi oleh tret personaliti. Berdasarkan kajian lepas, kajian terhadap hubungan di antara tret personaliti dan perlakuan perkongsian pengetahuan masih terhad. Oleh itu, kajian ini mengkaji kesan penilaian teras kendiri merangkumi tret personaliti umum yang diwakili oleh dua dimensi: *self-conscientiousness* (dimensi positif) dan *self-negligence* (dimensi negatif). Kajian sebelum ini mempersoalkan bahawa kebimbangan penilaian adalah kebimbangan yang berasaskan ketakutan terhadap penilaian dan maklum balas negatif dan merupakan salah satu daripada halangan dalam perkongsian pengetahuan. Oleh itu, kajian ini telah memperluaskan kajian terdahulu dengan mengkaji kesan kebimbangan penilaian terhadap perlakuan perkongsian pengetahuan. Individu yang mempunyai personaliti positif dikatakan mampu berhadapan dengan kritikan dan menerima maklum balas dengan lebih efektif tetapi masih belum ada percubaan untuk melihat perbezaan di antara kesan penilaian teras kendiri dan kebimbangan penilaian. Tambahan pula, berdasarkan kajian sebelumnya, kajian ke atas peranan kebimbangan penilaian sebagai perantara di antara penilaian teras kendiri dan perlakuan perkongsian pengetahuan masih terhad. Melalui kajian kuantitatif, seramai 128 pustakawan akademik dari lima buah universiti penyelidikan awam di Malaysia mengambil bahagian dalam kajian ini. Regresi berganda telah digunakan untuk menganalisa data. Hasil kajian menunjukkan bahawa *self-conscientiousness* mempunyai hubungan yang positif dengan perlakuan perkongsian pengetahuan.Walau bagaimanapun, adalah mengejutkan apabila pengaruh *self-negligence* terhadap perlakuan perkongsian pengetahuan tidak disokong. Hasil kajian menunjukkan bahawa pustakawan dengan *self-conscientiousness* akan mempunyai lebih kesungguhan untuk menghadapi kebimbangan penilaian dan berkongsi pengetahuan berbanding pustakawan dengan *self-negligence*. Seperti dijangka, kebimbangan penilaian telah disahkan sebagai halangan dalam perlakuan perkongisan pengetahuan. Akhirnya, kebimbangan penilaian mengantara sebahagian hubungan di antara *self-conscientiousness*, *self-negligence,* dan perlakuan perkongisan pengetahuan. Kesimpulannya, penemuan ini akan menyumbang kepada peningkatan ilmu dalam penulisan kajian perkongsian pengetahuan dan kepustakawanan.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	TITLE	PAGE

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF APPENDICES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1   Introduction

Knowledge has been used as a powerful tool in management, product design, development and innovation of the company. Therefore, many companies have been passionate in knowledge creation in order to stay competitive. However, knowledge as an infinite asset needs to be shared and used to increase its value (Fey and Furu, 2008; Groff and Jones, 2003; Tsai and Cheng, 2010). Knowledge sharing involves the process of combining and synthesising new knowledge with old knowledge to produce more knowledge in the future (Wang and Noe, 2010). Nonetheless, the readiness and willingness to share remains a major challenge since it involves human behaviour (Bordia *et al*., 2006; Jeon *et al*., 2011). Personality is one of the major psychological aspects which guides behaviour (Halder and Chakraborty, 2010). Prior studies examined the relationship of personality in the context of knowledge sharing behaviour such as Big Five Personality (Angle *et al*., 2006; Matzler *et al*., Teh *et al*., 2011) and self-esteem (Lee and Jang, 2010). Therefore, this study focuses on core self-evaluation, a broad personality concept and the relationship with knowledge sharing behaviour. Besides, this study examines the relationship between core self-evaluations and evaluation apprehension that may inhibit a person's intention to share.

This chapter covers the background of the research, problems that highlight the need for the research, research objectives, research questions, and research hypotheses. It also includes a review of the significance, scope, and limitations of the research.

1.2 Research Background

The journey to inculcate and establish knowledge sharing behaviour in the organisation remains unresolved due to the involvement of human as the key factor in knowledge sharing success (Yang and Wu, 2008). Individuals are known to have own uniqueness and speciality from one another. Since knowledge resides in the minds of individuals, the readiness and willingness to share with others are crucial (Bordia *et al.*, 2006; Jeon *et al.*, 2011). Personality is one of the major psychological aspects which guides behaviour (Halder and Chakraborty, 2010). Besides, it permits a prediction of what a person will do in a given situation (Cattell, 1950). Therefore, personality traits are possibly related to knowledge sharing behaviour. Yu *et al.* (2010) revealed that a single personality trait, openness, is one of the factors associated with facilitating the voluntary knowledge sharing in virtual communities. Meanwhile, a person with negative personality will remain insecure, doubtful, self-conscious, and anxious as he or she tends to withdraw from knowledge sharing activities (Halder, *et al.*, 2010). Few studies examined the relationship of personality in the context of knowledge sharing such as Big Five Personality (Angle *et al.*, 2006; Matzler *et al.*, 2008; Teh *et al.*, 2011) and self-esteem (Lee and Jang, 2010). Therefore, this study investigates the relationship of core self-evaluations and knowledge sharing behaviour among librarians in the academic libraries.

In addition, this study sought to identify evaluation apprehension (an anxiety based on fear of negative evaluation) as a mediator between core self-evaluations and knowledge sharing behaviour. As this study investigate the possible relationship between core self-evaluations and knowledge sharing behaviour, evaluation apprehension was predicted to be an obstacle. Mediation analysis is needed to determine whether or not mediatiors present when looking at the relationship

between two variables X and Y. Mediators are variables that act as an in-between step when looking at the effect of X on Y, where X causes a mediator M, and M is actually the cause of Y. MacKinnon *et al.* (2007) mentioned that it is not necessary to establish an overall effect to be mediated as long the predictor is related to the mediator and the mediator is related to the outcome. In this study, the motivation to share knowledge depends on the level of evaluation apprehension. Self-conscientiousness is expected to reduce the level of evaluation apprehension that would leads to the enhancement of knowledge sharing behaviour. Meanwhile, self-negligence is predicted to increase the level of evaluation apprehension and inhibit knowledge sharing behaviour.

The next sections will provide an overview of knowledge sharing behaviour from the academic librarians' perspectives in different contexts – academic libraries overseas and Malaysia.

1.2.1   Knowledge Sharing from the Academic Librarians' Perspectives: International Overview

Studies have revealed that the majority of libraries, especially in America, are determined towards knowledge sharing and the majority of their librarians value the importance of knowledge sharing (Parirokh *et al.*, 2008). Academic librarians are aware that it is imperative for the library to promote innovation activities through knowledge sharing environment (Shuhuai *et al.*, 2009). They are working on transformation of their relationship with faculty by collaborating and networking facilitated by integrating information technology (Mavodza, 2011). According to Branin (2003), in the era of 1950 to 1975, academic librarians are likely to be spending most of their time acquiring material to build tremendous collections. However, from 1975 to 2000, comes the revolution of information technology. The nature of collection development has changed to collection management. Apart from that, the beginning of the 21st century sees the emergence of the new term, knowledge management. Here starts the real challenge where the academic research librarians are expanding their expertise, willing to get outside their routines and the

walls of the traditional library. However, most academic libraries face innumerable challenges in nurturing and motivating librarians to share knowledge (Parirokh *et al*., 2008). Thus, it is crucial to examine factors that could influence knowledge sharing behaviour among the librarians.

1.2.2 Knowledge Sharing from the Academic Librarians' Perspectives: Malaysian Overview

The globalisation and the internationalisation of higher education have exerted different pressures and demands on Malaysia's higher education system. The National Higher Education Strategic Plan 2020 and the National Higher Education Action Plan 2007-2010 were launched in August 2007 to strengthen up the vision to face the global challenges in international higher education. The aim is to establish a world-class university system that allows Malaysia to become a regional education hub and transform it into a knowledge-based economy. As of 2012, there are 20 public universities in Malaysia whereby five of the universities have been designated as research universities, namely Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM), Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM), Universiti Pertanian Malaysia (UPM), Universiti Malaya (UM), and Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKM). As a result, these university libraries may have to espouse a more strategic direction to understand and satisfy the users' information and research needs in order to support the ongoing learning activities.

The libraries which still assume to be the conventional custodian of the records of knowledge may find themselves in direct and grave danger (Liu, 2008; Mavodza, 2011). These librarians are facing ruthless competition, which forced them to broaden and share their skills with others. Thus, knowledge sharing is predictably the most challenging task. A study by Sohail and Daud (2009) has found that working culture, staff attitude, motivation, and opportunities to share play an important role in enhancing knowledge sharing behaviour in the public universities. Therefore, efficient knowledge and experience sharing between the librarians are

critically important and have been particularly influential in contributing insights into the library institutions (Liu, 2010).

Academic libraries have been the heart of the universities by supporting the preservation and the development of knowledge (Liu, 2008). Academic librarian is known to possess the preeminent disciplines and skills in collecting, organising, and disseminating information. A new role of a modern academic librarian has evolved into performing information work in a different context and setting. As a result, academic librarians of the new era have to compete with the challenges and demands set by the management of the universities. It is good news for academic librarians that they need to play the central role in promoting their skills in knowledge sharing (Stoddart, 2001).

1.3   Problem Statement

Knowledge sharing remains the key challenge in the knowledge management (Davenport and Prusak, 1998; Kankanhalli, Tan, and Wei, 2005). Almost all research in knowledge sharing perspective has shown that behaviour remains as an important variable (Bordia, Irmer, and Abusah, 2006; Jeon, Kim, and Koh, 2011; Tsai and Cheng, 2010; Yu, Lu, and Liu, 2010). Tsai and Cheng (2010) emphasised knowledge sharing as a combination of an emotional expression and a behavioural reaction. Many studies investigate factors that could inculcate the behaviour to share such as rewards (Zhang *et al.*, 2010) and technology (Agnihotri and Troutt, 2009; Coakes, Amar, and Granados, 2010; Edwards, Shaw, and Collier, 2005; Mohamed, Stankosky, and Murray, 2006; Revilla, Rodriguez-Prado, and Prieto, 2009; Yu *et al.*, 2010). Technology can only facilitate knowledge processing and present it in flexible ways (Yu *et al.*, 2010). Meanwhile, the rewards are only to be seen partly as a function of sharing behaviour (Zhang *et al.*, 2010) which can only stimulate people's participation. However, the influence of rewards and technology remain unclear and complicated (Zhang *et al.*, 2010). Both will only assist (Yu *et al.*, 2010) and inspire people's involvement at the beginning stage (Hung *et al.*, 2011) but will not overcome knowledge hoarding (Coakes *et al.*, 2010). Obviously, it is the people

that need to change and be motivated to share (Stoddart, 2001) since they are the originators, transferors, and users of the knowledge (Tienne *et al*., 2004). The above issues are likely to support the crucial involvement of human and individual in cultivating the knowledge sharing behaviour (Bordia *et al*., 2006; Jeon *et al*., 2011; Swift, Balkin, and Matusik, 2010; Wang and Noe, 2010). Humans are not born to share knowledge and the behaviour needs to be nurtured (Yu *et al*., 2010). Moreover, human behaviours are based on self-interest and each person has different capabilities which make the knowledge sharing activities hard to analyse (Yang and Wu, 2008). Clearly, the behaviour still remains as an important variable in knowledge sharing (Bordia *et al*., 2006; Jeon *et al*., 2011; Tsai and Cheng, 2010; Yu *et al*., 2010) for future research.

Individuals are different from one another in terms of skills, abilities, personalities, perceptions, attitudes, emotions, and ethics (Quick and Nelson, 2009). Behavioural differences among individuals were said to be influenced by the personality traits and the situation (Chamorro-Premuzic and Furnham, 2010). Cattel (1950) mentioned that personality traits allow prediction of what a person will do when faced with a defined situation. Therefore, personality traits are expected to be useful for making predictions of behavioural outcomes in knowledge sharing. Previous research has proven positive personality traits may influence the intention to share (Lee and Jang, 2010; Tsai and Cheng, 2010). Big Five Personality Model has also been studied in relation to knowledge sharing behaviour (Angle, William, and Jesús, 2006; Matzler and Mueller, 2011; Matzler *et al*., 2008; Teh *et al*., 2011). Lee and Jang (2010) found that a person with higher self-esteem is more likely to contribute to the open information repository. Meanwhile, self-efficacy was found to have a positive effect on the intention to share knowledge (Tsai and Cheng, 2010). However, only a few studies have empirically examined the role of personality traits in knowledge sharing.

There is a research on a broad personality concept, core self-evaluation, that indicated a positive relationship with motivation, performance (Erez and Judge, 2001), job satisfaction (Judge and Bono, 2001; Srivastava *et al*., et al., 2010), work stress (Judge, Ilies, and Zhang, 2011), organisational change, and organizational behaviour (Judge and Mueller, 2011a). A person with positive core self-evaluations

tended to be better performers than those with negative core self-evaluations (Erez and Judge, 2001). However, core self-evaluations research thus far is only pertaining to be useful in organisational behaviour research. To our knowledge, there has not been an integrative effort to examine if core self-evaluations influence knowledge sharing behaviour. Therefore, the scenarios have provided the needs to investigate core self-evaluations in the context of knowledge sharing behaviour.

In a number of studies, Judge and colleagues have found that the core self-evaluations load on a single factor in Western cultures (Erez and Judge, 2001; Judge, Erez, and Bono, 1998; Judge, Bono, and Locke, 2000; Judge *et al.*, 1998). However, Guven (2007) and Sang and Chathoth (2013) revealed that the factor analysis for the eastern context did not show a single factor structure. Those differences revealed a distinct in the Eastern and Western contexts. Therefore, it is interesting to adopt core self-evaluation concept using two (2) dimensions: positive and negative. In earlier research, Judge *et al.* (1998) discussed the possibility that other traits might be considered as indicators of core self-evaluations. Judge, Van Vianen, and De Pater (2004) mentioned that there seems to be a connection between core self-evaluations and conscientiousness. Therefore, it is interesting to examine core self-evaluations via self-conscientiousness that represents positive dimension and self-negligence represents negative dimension.

Subsequently, personal competence and confidence are the major requirements for an individual to engage in the knowledge sharing (Angle *et al.*, 2006). However, evaluation apprehension, which is an anxiety based on fear of negative evaluation, may reduce the confidence level and restrain the intention of sharing (Bordia *et al.*, 2006). Evaluation apprehension has been revealed to negatively affect performance in several contexts, including task performance (Panayiotou and Vrana, 2004) and learning task (Geen, 1983). Numerous situations can evoke evaluation apprehension, including giving a speech, taking a test, or even competing in sports (Bordia *et al.*, 2006), whereas in knowledge sharing context, evaluation apprehension may result from the perception that knowledge shared is irrelevant and invaluable to others in terms of quality and usefulness which might be reviewed, assessed, and criticised by others (Bordia *et al.*, 2006; Wang and Noe, 2010). In Zhang *et al.* (2010), evaluation apprehension is mentioned indirectly when

they highlighted that "people will consider other people or users' behaviour – if employees download the ideas and give good feedback, he or she might contribute again – if others will not see the post, he or she may withhold knowledge". Consequently, evaluation apprehension is confirmed as a motivational barrier in the knowledge sharing (Bordia *et al*., 2006). However, the findings indicated that evaluation apprehension is only greatest when sharing through databases compared to interpersonal (Bordia *et al*., 2006). Thus, it would be interesting to replenish the gap to understand if evaluation apprehension inhibits knowledge sharing behaviour in general.

The questions remain on how evaluation apprehension can be reduced in order to establish a positive knowledge sharing behaviour (Wang and Noe, 2010). It has been claimed that trust (Argote, McEvily, and Reagans, 2003) and openness (Yu *et al*., 2010) are able to help in reducing apprehension. However, there is no further research that links personality with evaluation apprehension. Does core self-evaluation help in reducing the level of apprehension? Logically, individuals with a positive outlook will perform confidently, believe in their capabilities to face any obstacles, and eliminate defensive behaviours. Thus, it would be interesting to investigate if self-conscientiousness could overcome evaluation apprehension.

In other perspective, if self-conscientiousness managed to reduce the level of apprehension, would it help to boost up knowledge sharing behaviour? Hence, evaluation apprehension will act as the mediating variable in an effort to understand what leads to the enhancement of knowledge sharing behaviour.

1.4   Research Questions

1.   What is the relationship between core self-evaluations and knowledge sharing behaviour?

2.   What is the relationship between core self-evaluations and evaluation apprehension?

3.   What is the relationship between evaluation apprehension and knowledge sharing behaviour?

4.   Does evaluation apprehension mediate the relationship between core self-evaluations and knowledge sharing behaviour?

1.5   Research Objectives

1.   To examine the effect of core self-evaluations on knowledge sharing behaviour.

2.   To examine the effect of core self-evaluations on evaluation apprehension.

3.   To examine the effect of evaluation apprehension on knowledge sharing behaviour.

4.   To examine the mediation effect of evaluation apprehension in the relationship between core self-evaluations and knowledge sharing behaviour.

1.6   Research Hypotheses

The following hypotheses are formulated based on literature support and will be elaborated in Chapter 2.

H1a: Self-conscientiousness will be positively related to knowledge sharing behaviour.

H1b: Self-negligence will be negatively related to knowledge sharing behaviour.

H2a: Self-conscientiousness will be negatively related to evaluation apprehension as self-conscientiousness increases, apprehension decreases.

H2b: Self-negligence will be positively related to evaluation apprehension as self-negligence decreases, apprehension increases.

H3: Evaluation apprehension will be negatively related to knowledge sharing behaviour.

H4a: Evaluation apprehension will mediate the relationship between self-conscientiousness and knowledge sharing behaviour.

H4b: Evaluation apprehension will mediate the relationship between self-negligence and knowledge sharing behaviour.

1.7   Significance of the Study

Unlike most prior studies focusing on the external motivators such as technology, organisational culture, and rewards, this study seeks to contribute to an understanding of how personality influences knowledge sharing behaviour. The relationship between core self-evaluation and knowledge sharing behaviour is literally explored and has appended new knowledge of both fields. Furthermore, this research would disclose and understand the function of evaluation apprehension as a barrier that inhibits knowledge sharing behaviour.

From the perspective of the librarian, it would respond to the lack of study on knowledge sharing behaviour among academic librarians in Malaysia. The research would highlight new findings that would enhance knowledge sharing activities among academic librarians and strengthen their professionalism.

As for its contribution to the practice, this would serve as an input to the management that in order to create the awareness of sharing, managers should acknowledge individual personality and understand the uniqueness of each individual. The management should provide a continuous support to enhance

personal development in each of their employees by organising workshops or programmes oriented around positive personality traits. Besides, it may also change the perception of some knowledge-based organisations that value their investment in technology more than developing their own people.

1.8   Scope of the Study

The scope of this study is limited to the public research universities in Malaysia which encompasses five universities, namely Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM), Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM), Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKM), Universiti Malaya (UM), and Universiti Pertanian Malaysia (UPM). The respondents in this study were librarians from these libraries. Questionnaires were distributed to the professional academic librarians from grades S41 to JUSA. These librarians were chosen since they are the focal persons in preserving and developing knowledge in sustaining research activities for the university (Liu, 2008). A drastic change in their role required a strong connection and collaboration among team members directly or indirectly. In order to support each other in facing challenges, the sharing of both tacit and explicit knowledge of other librarians are essential.

The study focused on the integration of social cognitive model and cognitive dissonance model as a theoretical foundation to determine the relationship between core self-evaluations personality traits, evaluation apprehension, and knowledge sharing behaviour.

1.9   Definition of Terms

Table 1.1 summarises all the operational definitions and the referential sources of the research variables.

Table 1.1: Conceptual and Operational Definitions

Variables	Conceptual Definitions	References	Operational Definitions
Knowledge	Knowledge as a mixture of information, documentation, technical reports, professionalism, know-where, know-how, and distributed across the continuous spectrum from purely tacit to totally explicit.	Lin *et al*. (2012)	Knowledge in this study refers to tacit and explicit that is related to academic library setting. Tacit knowledge includes professionalism and experiences in handling the librarian's task, for example the tricks and techniques of databases searching, the ability to deal with difficult customers, skills in conducting training and classes, whereas the explicit knowledge might be in the form of printed procedures, manuals, reports, emails, and others.
	Knowledge as information processed and distributed across individual, including ideas, facts, expertise in the form of tacit and explicit that is	Wang and Noe (2010)	

	relevant for individual, teams, and organisational performance.		
Knowledge Sharing	The process of exchange, disseminating, donating and collecting knowledge, information and experiences which involve interpersonal relationships and social interactions aiming to help others, to solve problems, develop new ideas, expand the value of knowledge, and to create a synthesis.	Wang and Noe (2010)	The study examines the practice of exchange, disseminating, donating, and collecting knowledge among academic librarians within the organisation via all sorts of channels; face-to-face communication or written correspondence.
Knowledge Sharing Behaviour	The act of making knowledge available to others within the organisation.	Matzler and Mueller (2011)	The degree of commitment shown by academic librarians in sharing and contributing knowledge within an organisation.

	The degree to which the measure of intention and the behavioural criterion correspond with respect to their level of specificity	Madden *et al*. (1992),	
Core self-evaluations	A personality constructs which refer to fundamental, subconscious conclusions individuals reach about themselves, other people, and the world.	Judge *et al*. (1998)	Core self-evaluations in this study refer to two dimensions, namely self-conscientiousness (positive dimension) and self-negligence (negative dimension). Conscientious librarian is hardworking, responsible, organised, ambitious, competent, and reliable. Self-negligence is referred to as irresponsible, disorganized, lazy, and ignorant librarian. A librarian with self-conscientiousness is assumed to willingly share knowledge compared to those with self-negligence.
	The degree to which an individual believes him or herself to be capable, significant, and worthy as an organisational member.	Wang and Noe (2010)	

| Evaluation Apprehension | A state of fear or anxiety that one's knowledge or idea may be evaluated or critiqued by others. | Bordia *et al.* (2006) | Evaluation apprehension refers to a situation where academic librarians feel anxious or uncomfortable of their ideas being evaluated or judged by others either in written or oral communication. It will then inhibit the behaviour of sharing among librarians. |
| | A person's active anxiety-toned concern that he or she may be evaluated | Rosenberg (1969) | |

1.10 Chapter Summary

This chapter presents an overview of the study by giving an overture on the background of the problem which directs to the research questions, objectives, and hypotheses. The scope of the research is presented with brief discussions on the significance of the study.

1.11 Thesis Organisation

This research is organised into five chapters as shown in Table 1.2.

Table 1.2: Thesis Organisation

Chapter	*Description*
Chapter 1	Discusses on the overview of the whole research background. In addition, it looks into the background of problems, research questions, and objectives which lead to hypotheses.
Chapter 2	Discusses the literature related to this study.
Chapter 3	Describes the methodology used in the research.
Chapter 4	Discusses the analysis and the interpretation of the data collected where the relationship between the independent variables, mediating variable, and the dependent variable are tested.
Chapter 5	Gives a summary and the conclusion remarks of the entire study and then certain recommendation would be delineated for future research.

REFERENCES

Agnihotri, R., and Troutt, M. D. (2009). The Effective Use of Technology in Personal Knowledge Management : a Framework of Skills, Tools and User Context. *Online Information Review, 33*(2), 329-342.

Ahmed, Pervaiz K. (2002). Learning Through Knowledge Management Retrieved from Books 24 X 7 database Available from http://library.books24x7.com.ezproxy.psz.utm.my/toc.aspx?bookid=28118

Angle, C., William, C., and Jesús, F. S. (2006). Determinants of Individual Engagement in Knowledge Sharing. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 17*(2), 245-264.

Ardichvili, A., Page, V., and Wentling, T. (2003). Motivation and Barriers Participation in Virtual Knowledge-Sharing Communities of Practice. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 7*(1), 64 – 77.

Argote, L., McEvily, B., and Reagans, R. (2003). Managing Knowledge in Organizations: an Integrative Framework and Review of Emerging Themes. *Management Science, 49*(4), 571-582.

Baker, M. K., Kennedy, D. J., Bohle, P. L., Campbell, D., Wiltshired, J. H., and Fiatarone Singha, M. A. (2011). Core Self-Evaluation as a Predictor of Strength Training Adoption in Older Adults. *Maturitas 68*, 88-93.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-Efficacy : Toward a Unifying Theory of Behavioral Change. *Psychological Review, 84*(2), 1977.

Bandura, A. (1999). *A Social Cognitive Theory of Personality* (2nd ed. Ed.). New York: Guilford Publications.

Bandura, A., and Adams, N. E. (1977). Analysis of Self-Efficacy Theory of Behavioral Change. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 1*(4), 287-310.

Bandura, A., and Cervone, D. (1983). Self-Evaluative and Self-Efficacy Mechanisms Governing the Motivational Effects of Goals Systems. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45*, 1017-1028.

Baron, R. M., and Kenny, D. A. (1986). The Moderator-Mediator Variable Distinction in Social Psychological Research: Conceptual, Strategic, and

Statistical Considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 51*(6), 1173-1182.

Baruch, Y., and Holtom, B. C. (2008). Survey Response Rate Levels and Trends in Organizational Research. *Human Relations, 61*(8), 1139-1160.

Bawden, D., and Robinson, L. (2011). Individual Differences in Information-Related Behaviour: What Do We Know about Information Styles?. *New Directions in Information Behaviour : Library and Information Science* (pp. 127-158): Emerald Group Publishing.

Bellaver, R. F., and Lusa, J. M. (Eds.). (2002). *Knowledge Management Strategy and Ttechnology*. Boston: Artech House.

Bennett, E. E. (2009). Virtual HRD: The Intersection of Knowledge Management, Culture, and Intranets. *Advances in Developing Human Resources 11*(3), 362-374.

Bhatt, G. D. (2001). Knowledge Management in Organizations. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 5*(1), 68-75.

Bono, J. E., and Colbert, A. E. (2005). Understanding Responses to Multi-Source Feedback : the Role of Core Self-Evaluations. *Personnel Psychology, 58*, 171-203.

Bordia, P., Irmer, B. E., and Abusah, D. (2006). Differences in Sharing Knowledge Interpersonally and via Databases : the Role of Evaluation Apprehension and Perceived Benefits. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 15*(3), 262-280.

Branin, J. J. (2003). Knowledge Management in Academic Libraries: Building the Knowledge Bank at the Ohio State University. *Journal of Library Administration, 39*(4), 41-56.

Cabrera, E. F., and Cabrera, A. (2005). Fostering Knowledge Sharing through People Management Practices. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 16*(5), 720–735.

Cairncross, F. (2002). *The Company of the Future: How the Communications Revolution is Changing Management.* Boston, Mass: Harvard Business School Press.

Chamorro-Premuzic, T., & Furnham, A. (2010). *The Psychology Personnel Selection* Retrieved from Books 24x7 database

Conrad, L., and Darren L. R. (2003). *Individuals in Organizations: Personality, Perceptions and Learning*. In Organization Behaviour for Leisure Services. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Chen, I. Y. L., Chen, N. S., and Kinshuk. (2009). Examining the Factors Influencing Participants' Knowledge Sharing Behavior in Virtual Learning Communities. *Educational Technology & Society, 12*(1), 134-148.

Chiu, C. M., Hsu, M. H., and Wang, E. T. G. (2006). Understanding Knowledge Sharing in Virtual Communities: an Integration on Social Capital and Social Cognitive Theories. *Decision Support Systems, 42*(3), 1872-1888.

Coakes, E., Amar, A. D., and Granados, M. L. (2010). Knowledge Management, Strategy, and Technology : a Global Snapshot. *Journal of Enterprise Information Management, 23*(3), 282-304.

Costa F. T. Jr., McCrae R. R., and Dye D. A. (1991). Facet Scales for Agreeableness and Conscientiousness: a revision of the NEO Personality Inventory. *Personality and Individual Differences,* 12, 887-898.

Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research Design : Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. London: Sage Publications, Inc.

Dalkir, K. (2005). *Knowledge Management in Theory and Practice*. United States: Elsevier Inc.

Daly, J. A., and Miller, M. (1975). Further Studies in Writing Apprehension: SAT Scores, Success Expectations, Willingness to Take Advanced Courses, and Sex Differences. *Research in the Teaching of English, 9*, 255.

Dasgupta, M., and Gupta, R. K. (2009). Innovation in Organizations : a Review of the Role of Organizational Learning and Knowledge Management. *Global Business Review, 10*(2), 203-224.

Daud, S., and Yusuf, W. F. W. (2008). An Empirical Study of Knowledge on Management Processes in Small and Medium Enterprises. *Communications of the IBIMA, 4*, 169-177.

Davenport, T. H., and Prusak, L. (1998). *Working Knowledge : How Organizations Manage What They Know*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Dechawatanapaisal, D., and Siengthai, S. (2006). The Impact of Cognitive Dissonance on Learning Work Behavior. *Journal of Workplace Learning, 18*(1), 42-54.

Dodd, N., and Snelgar, R. (2011). *Core Self-Evaluations and Learning at the University of Zululand*. Paper presented at the 2nd International Conference on Humanities, Historical and Social Sciences

Edwards, J. S., Shaw, D., and Collier, P. M. (2005). Knowledge Management Systems : Finding Way with Technology. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 9*(1), 113-125.

Eftekharzade, S. F., and Mohammadi, B. (2011). The Presentation of a Suitable Model for Creating Knowledge Management in Educational Institutes (Higher Education). *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences, 29* (0), 1001-1011.

Endres, M. L., Endres, S. P., Chowdhury, S. K., and Alam, I. (2007). Tacit Knowledge Sharing, Self-Efficacy Theory and Application to the Open Source Community. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 11*(3), 92-103.

Erden, Z., Krogh, G. V., and Nonaka, I. (2008). The Quality of Group Tacit Knowledge. *Journal of Strategic Information Systems, 17*, 4-18.

Erez, A., and Judge, T. A. (2001). Relationship of Core Self-Evaluations to Goal Setting, Motivation and Performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(6), 10.

Fey, C. F., and Furu, P. (2008). Top Management Incentive Compensation and Knowledge Sharing in Multinational Corporations. *Strategic Management Journal, 29*, 1301-1323.

Fong, C.Y., Ooi, K. B., Tan, B. I., Lee, V. H., and Chong, A. Y. (2011). HRM Practices and Knowledge Sharing: an Empirical Study. *International Journal of Manpower, 32*(5/6), 704-723.

Geen, R. G. (1983). Evaluation Apprehension and the Social Facilitation/Inhibition of Learning. *Motivation and Emotion, 7*(2), 203-212.

Geisler, E., and Wickramasinghe, N. (2009). *Principles of Knowledge Management*. Retrieved from Books 24 X 7 database available from <http://common.books24x7.com.ezproxy.psz.utm.my /toc.aspx? bookid=34109

Goldberg, L. R. (1990). An Alternative "Description Of Personality": the Big Five Factor Structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 1216-1229.

Groff, T. R., and Jones, T. P. (2003). *Introduction to Knowledge Management: KM in Business*. Retrieved from Books 24 X 7 available from <http://common.books24x7.com.ezproxy.psz.utm.my/toc.aspx?bookid=8777>

Halder, S., Roy, A., and Chakraborty, P. K. (2010). The Influence of Personality Traits on Information Seeking Behaviour of Students. *Malaysian Journal of Library & Information Science, Vol.15, no.1, April 2010: 41-53, 15*(1), 41-53.

Hansen, M. T., Nohria, N., and Tierney, T. (1999). What's Your Strategy for Managing Knowledge. *Harvard Business Review, 77*(2), 106-116.

Harris, K., Harvey, P., and Kacmar, K. (2009). Do Social Stressors Impact Everyone Equally? An Examination of the Moderating Impact of Core Self-Evaluations. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 24*(2), 153-164.

Hough, L. M. and Schneider, R.J. (1996). *Personality Traits, Taxanomies and Applications in Organizations*. San Francisco : Jossey-Bass.

Hsiu-Fen, L. (2007). Knowledge Sharing and Firm Innovation Capability : an Empirical Study. *International Journal of Manpower, 28*(3/4), 315-332.

Hsu, M. H., Ju, T. L., Yen, C. H., and Chang, C. M. (2007). Knowledge Sharing Behavior in Virtual Communities: the Relationship between Trust, Self-Efficacy, and Outcome Expectations. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies, 65*(2), 153-169.

Hu, J., Wang, Z., Liden, R. C., and Sun, J. (2012). The Influence of Leader Core Self-Evaluation on Follower Reports of Transformational Leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*.

Hung, S. Y., Durcikova, A., Lai, H. M., and Lin, W. M. (2011). The Influence of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation in Individuals' Knowledge Sharing Behavior. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies, 69*, 415-427.

Hutchings, K., and Michailova, S. (2006). The Impact of Group Membership on Knowledge Sharing in Russia and China. *International Journal of Emerging Markets, 1*(1), 21-34.

I-Chieh, H. (2006). Enhancing Employee Tendencies to Share Knowledge – Case Studies of Nine Companies in Taiwan. *International Journal of Information Management, 26*(4), 326-338.

Issa, R. R. A., and Haddad, J. (2008). Perceptions of the Impacts of Organizational Culture and Information Technology on Knowledge Sharing in Construction. *Construction Innovation, 8*(3), 182-201.

Jen-te, Y. (2008). Individual Attitudes and Organisational Knowledge Sharing. *Tourism Management, 29*(2), 345-353.

Jeon, S. H., Kim, Y. G., and Koh, J. (2011). Individual, Social, and Organizational Contexts for Active Knowledge Sharing in Communities of Practice. *Expert Systems with Applications, 38*(10), 12423-12431.

Judd, C. M., and Kenny, D. A. (1981). *Estimating the Effects of Social Interventions*. London: Cambridge Univ Press.

Judge, T. A. (2009). Core Self-Evaluations and Work Success. *Curent Directions in Psychological Science, 18*(1), 58-62.

Judge, T. A., and Bono, J. E. (2001). Relationship of Core Self-Evaluations Traits – Self Esteem, Generalized Self-Efficacy, Locus Of Control and Emotional Stability – with Job Satisfaction and Job Performance : a Meta Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(1), 12.

Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Erez, A., and Locke, E. A. (2005). Core Self-Evaluations and Job and Life Satisfaction : The Role of Self-Concordance and Goal Attainment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(2), 257-268.

Judge, T. A., Erez, A., and Bono, J. E. (1998). The Power of Being Positive : The Relation between Positive Self-Concept and Job Performance. *Human Performance, 11*(2/3), 167-187.

Judge, T. A., Higgins, C. A., Thoresen, C. J., and Barrick, M. R. (1999). The Big Five Personality Traits, General Mental Ability, and Career Success Across the Life Span. *Personnel Psychology*, (52), 621-652.

Judge, T. A., Erez, A., Bono, J. E., and Thoresen, C. J. (2003). The Core Self-Evaluations Scale : Development of a Measure. *Personnel Psychology, 56*, 303-332.

Judge, T. A., and Hurst, C. (2007). Capitalizing on One's Advantages: Role of Core Self-Evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(5), 1212-1227.

Judge, T. A., Ilies, R., and Zhang, Z. (2011). Genetic Influences on Core Self-Evaluations, Job Satisfaction, and Work Stress: a Behavioral Genetics Mediated Model. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*.

Judge, T. A., and Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D. (2011a). Implications of Core Self-Evaluations for a Changing Organizational Context. *Human Resource Management Review, 21*(4), 331-341.

Judge, T. A., and Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D. (2011b). Implications of Core Self-Evaluations for a Changing Organizational Context. *Human Resource Management Review, 21*, 331-341.

Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A., Durham, C. C., and Kluger, A. N. (1998). Dispositional Effects on Job and Life Satisfaction : The Role of Core Evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*(1), 17-34.

Judge, T. A., Vianen, A. E. M. V., and Pater, I. E. D. (2004). Emotional Stability, Core Self-Evaluations, and Job Outcomes: A Review of the Evidence and an Agenda for Future Research. *Human Performance, 17*(3), 325-346.

Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D., Judge, T. A., and Scott, B. A. (2009). The Role of Core Self-Evaluations in the Coping Process. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(1), 177-195.

Kankanhalli, A., Tan, B. C. Y., and Wei, K. K. (2005). Contributing Knowledge to Electronic Knowledge Repositories: An Empirical Investigation. *MIS Quarterly, 29*(1), 113-143.

Kassim, N. A. (2009). Evaluating Users' Satisfaction on Academic Library Performance. *Malaysian Journal of Library & Information Science, 14*(2), 101-115.

Krejcie, R. V., and Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining Sample Size for Research Activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30,* 607-610.

Krogh, G. v., Ichijo, K., and Nonaka, I. (2000). *Enabling Knowledge Creation : How to Unlock the Mystery of Tacit Knowledge and Release the Power of Innovation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kuang-Liang Liu, C., and In-Lin Hu. (2010). Exploring the Effects of Task Characteristics on Knowledge Sharing in Libraries. *Library Review 59*(6), 14.

Kumar, J. A., and Ganesh, L. S. (2011). Balancing Knowledge Strategy: Codification and Personalization during Product Development. *Journal of Knowledge Management 15*(1), 18.

Kumar, R. (2005). *Research Methodology : a Step-by-Step Guide for Beginners* (2nd ed. Ed.). London: Sage Publications.

Lashley, C., and Lee-Ross, D. (2003). *Organization Behaviour for Leirsure Services.* United Kingdom: Routledge.

Lau, V. P., and Shaffer, M. A. (1999). Career Success : the Effects of Personality. *Career Development International, 4*(4), 225-230.

Leary, M. R., Barnes, B. D., Griebel, C., Mason, E., and McCormack, D., Jr. (1987). The Impact of Conjoint Threats to Social and Self Esteem on Evaluation Apprehension. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 50*(4), 304-311.

Lee, E. J., and Jang, J.W. (2010). Profiling Good Samaritans in Online Knowledge Forums: Effects of Affiliative Tendency, Self-Esteem, and Public Individuation on Knowledge Sharing. *Computers in Human Behavior, 26*(6), 1336-1344.

Leung, T. K. P., and Chan, R. Y.K. (2003). Face, Favour and Positioning –a Chinese Power Game. *European Journal of Marketing, 37*(11/12), 1575-1598.

Li, Y. H., Huang, J. W., & Tsai, M. T. (2009). Entrepreneurial Orientation and Firm Performance: the Role of Knowledge Creation Process. *Industrial Marketing Management 38*, 440-449.

Lin, H. F. (2007). A Stage Model of Knowledge Management: an Empirical Investigation of Process and Effectiveness. *Journal of Information Science, 33*(6), 643-659.

Liu, A. M. M. (2008). Wa! The Wu´ We´ i Academic Librarian. *Library Management, 29*(1/2), 104-115.

MacKinnon, D. P., Fairchild, A. J., and Fritz, M. S. (2007). Mediation Analysis. *Annual Review Psychology, 58*(593).

Matzler, K., and Mueller, J. (2011). Antecedents of Knowledge Sharing – Examining the Influence of Learning and Performance Orientation. *Journal of Economic Psychology, 32*(3), 317-329.

Matzler, K., Renzl, B., Müller, J., Herting, S., and Mooradian, T. A. (2008). Personality Traits and Knowledge Sharing. *Journal of Economic Psychology, 29*(3), 301-313.

Mavodza, J. (2011). The Academic Librarian and the Academe. *New Library World, 112*(9/10), 446-451.

McCroskey, J. C., Beatty, M. J., Kearney, P., and Plax, T. G. (1985). The Content Validity of the PRCA-24 as a Measure of Communication Apprehension across Communication Contexts. *Communication Quarterly, 33*(3), 165-173.

McCroskey, J. C., Richmond, V. P., John, A. D., and Falcione, R. L. (1977). Studies of the Relationship between Communication Aprehension and Self-esteem. *Human Communication Research, 3*(3), 269-277.

McKenzie, J., and Winkelen, C. V. (2004). *Understanding the Knowledgeable Organization : Nurturing Knowledge Competence*. London: Thomson.

Mohamed, M., Stankosky, M., and Murray, A. (2006). Knowledge Management and Information Technolgy : Can they Work in Perfect Harmony?. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 10*(3), 103-116.

Nonaka, I., and Konno, N. (1998). The Concept of Ba : Building a Foundation for Knowledge Creation. *California Management Review, 40*(3), 40-54.

Nonaka, I., and Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The Knowledge-Creating Company : How Japanese Creating Companies Create the Dynamics of Innovation.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Nonaka, I., and Takeuchi, H. (2004). *Hitotsubashi on Knowledge Management Singapore :* Singapore: John Wiley & Sons (Asia) Pte Ltd.

Nonaka, I., and Toyama, R. (2002). A Firm as a Dialectical Being : towards a Dynamic Theory of a Firm. *Industrial and Corporate Change, 11*(15), 995-1009.

Nonaka, I., Toyama, R., and Konno, N. (2000). SECI, Ba and Leadership: a Unified Model of Dynamic Knowledge Creation. *Long Range Planning, 33*(1), 5-34.

Nunnally, J. (1978). *Psychometric Theory.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

OECD. (2000). Knowledge Management in the Learning Society Retrieved from OECD Database

Oxoby, R. J. (2004). Cognitive Dissonance, Status and Growth of the Underclass. *The Economic Journal, 114*(7), 727-749.

Pallant, J. (2007). *SPSS : Survival Manual*. New York: Open University Press.

Panayiotou, G., and Vrana, S. R. (2004). The Role of Self-Focus, Task Difficulty, Task Self-Relevance, and Evaluation Anxiety in Reaction Time Performance. *Motivation and Emotion, 28*(2), 171-196.

Parirokh, M., Daneshgar, F., and Fattahi, R. (2008). Identifying Knowledge-Sharing Requirements in Academic Libraries. *Library Review, 57*(2), 107-122.

Pennington, D. C., Gillen, K., and Hill, P. (1999). *Social Psychology*. London: Arnold.

Porumbeanu, O.L. (2010). Implementing Knowledge Management in Romanian Academic Libraries : Identifying the Elements that Characterize their Organizational Culture. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship, 36*(6), 549-552.

Probst. (1998). Practical Knowledge Management :a Model that Works. *Prism, 2*, 17-29.

Probst, G., Raub, S., and Romhardt, K. (2001). *Managing Knowledge: Building Blocks for Success*. United Kingdom: John Wiley & Sons.

Quick, J. C., and Nelson, D. L. (2009). *Principles of Organizational Behavior : Realities and Challenges*. Australia: South-Western.

Reagans, R., and McEvily, B. (2003). Network Structure and Knowledge Transfer: the Effects of Cohesion and Range. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 48*(2), 240-267.

Reige, Andreas. (2005). Three-Dozen Knowledge –Sharing Barriers Managers Must Consider. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 9*(3), 18-35.

Revilla, E., and Prieto, B. R. (2009). Information Technology as Knowledge Management Enabler in Product Development : Empirical Evidence. *European Journal of Innovation Management, 12*(3), 346-363.

Revilla, E., Rodriguez-Prado, B., and Prieto, I. (2009). Information Technology as Knowledge Management Enabler in Product Development : Empirical Evidence. *European Journal of Innovation Management, 12*(3), 346-363.

Rey, L., Extremera, N., and Durán, M. A. (2012). Core Self-Evaluations, Meta-Mood Experience, and Happiness: Tests of Direct and Moderating Effects. *Personality and Individual Differences*(0).

Rosenberg, M. J. (1969). *The Conditions of Evaluation Apprehension*. New York: Academic Press.

Rosopa, P. J., and Schroeder, A. N. (2009). Core Self-Evaluations Interact with Cognitive Ability to Predict Academic Achievement. *Personality and Individual Differences, 47*(8), 1003-1006.

Shaari, R. (2009). *Human Resource Development and Knowledge Sharing Practices among Academicians in Malaysian Public Universities*. Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Malaysia.

Shuhuai, R., Xingjun, S., Haiqing, L., and Jialin, C. (2009). From Information Commons to Knowledge Commons: Building a Collaborative Knowledge Sharing Environment for Innovative Communities. *The Electronic Library, 27*(2), 247-257.

Sohail, M. S., and Daud, S. (2009). Knowledge Sharing in Higher Education Institutions: Perspectives from Malaysia. *The Journal Of Information And Knowledge Management Systems, 39*(2), 125-142.

Srivastava, A., Locke, E. A., Judge, T. A., and Adams, J. W. (2010). Core Self-Evaluations as Causes of Satisfaction: The Mediating Role of Seeking Task Complexity. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 77*(2), 255-265.

Stoddart, L. (2001). Managing Intranets to Encourage Knowledge Sharing: Opportunities and Constraints. *Online Information Review, 25*(1), 19-28.

Stone, R. C. (2010). Industry Culture Influences Pseudo-Knowledge Sharing: A Multiple Mediation Analysis. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 14*(6), 17.

Suppiah, Visvalingam (2011). Organisational Culture's Influence on Tacit Knowledge-Sharing Behaviour. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 15*(3), 462-477.

Swider, B. W., and Zimmerman, R. D. (2010). Born to Burnout: A Meta-Analytic Path Model of Personality, Job Burnout, and Work Outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 76*(3), 487-506.

Swift, M., Balkin, D. B., and Matusik, S. F. (2010). Goal Orientations and the Motivation to Share Knowledge. *Matusik, 14*(3), 16.

Tabachnick, B. G., and Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using Multivariate Statistics*. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.

Teh, P. L., Yong, C. C., Chong, C. W., and Yew, S. Y. (2011). Do the Big Five Personality Factors Affect Knowledge Sharing Behaviour? A Study of Malaysian Universities. *Malaysian Journal of Library & Information Science, 16*(1), 47-62.

Telci, E. E., Maden, C., and Kantur, D. (2011). The Theory of Cognitive Dissonance: a Marketing and Management Perspective. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences 24*, 378-386.

Tienne, K. B. D., Dyer, G., Hoopes, C. O., and Harris, S. (2004). Toward a Model of Effective Knowledge Management and Directions for Future Research : Culture, Leadership and CKOs. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 10*(4), 27-43.

Tohidinia, Z., and Mosakhani, M. (2009). Knowledge Sharing Behaviour and its Predictors. *Industrial Management & Data Systems 110*(4), 21.

Tsai, M. T., and Cheng, N. C. (2010). Programmer Perceptions of Knowledge-Sharing Behavior Under Social Cognitive Theory. *Expert Systems with Applications, 37*(12), 8479-8485.

Tsaousis, I., Nikolaou, I., Serdaris, N., and Judge, T. A. (2007). Do the Core Self-Evaluations Moderate the Relationship between Subjective Well-Being and Physical and Psychological Health? *Personality and Individual Differences, 42*(8), 1441-1452.

Tseng, W. S. (2001). *Personality and Depth*. In Psychology Handbook of Cultural Psychiatry (pp. 77-92). San Diego: Academic Press.

Vince, R. (2002). The Impact of Emotion on Organizational Learning. *Human Resource Development International, 5*(1), 73-85.

Walumbwa, F. O., Mayer, D. M., Wang, P., Wang, H., Workman, K., and Christensen, A. L. (2011). Linking Ethical Leadership to Employee Performance: the Roles of Leader–Member Exchange, Self-Efficacy, and Organizational Identification. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes 115*, 204-213.

Wang, S., and Noe, R. A. (2010). Knowledge Sharing: a Review and Directions for Future Research. *Human Resource Management Review, 20*(2), 115-131.

Wellington, J., and Szczerbinski, M. (2007). *Research Methods for the Social Sciences*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Wichardt, P. C. (2012). Norms, Cognitive Dissonance, and Cooperative Behaviour in Laboratory Experiments. *International Journal of Social Economics, 39*(5), 342-356.

Williamson, J. M., Pemberton, A. E., and Lounsbury, J. W. (2008). Personality Traits of Individuals in Different Specialties of Librarianship. *Journal of Documentation, 64*(2).

Withers, L. A., and Vernon, L. L. (2006). To Err is Human: Embarrassment, Attachment and Communication Apprehension. *Personality and Individual Differences, 40*, 99-110.

Yang, H. L., and Wu, T. C. T. (2008). Knowledge Sharing in an Organization. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 75*, 1128-1156.

Yao, L. J., Kam, T. H. Y., and Chan, S. H. (2007). Knowledge Sharing in Asian Public Administration Sector: The Case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Enterprise Information Management, 21*(1), 51-69.

Yavas, U., Karatepe, O. M., and Babakus, E. (2010). Relative Efficacy of Organizational Support and Personality Traits in Predicting Service Recovery and Job Performances: a Study of Frontline Employees in Turkey. *Tourism Review, 65*(3), 70-83.

Yu, T. K., Lu, L. C., and Liu, T. F. (2010). Exploring Factors that Influence Knowledge Sharing Behavior via Weblogs. *Computers in Human Behavior, 26*(1), 32-41.

Zhang, X., Chen, Z., Vogel, D., Yuan, M., and Guo, C. (2010). Knowledge-Sharing Reward Dynamics in Knowledge Management System : Game Theory-Based Empirical Validation. *Human Factors and Ergonomics in Manufacturing & Services Industries, 20*(2), 103-122.