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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

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAPTER</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ABSTRACT</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ABSTRAK</td>
<td>vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TABLE OF CONTENTS</td>
<td>vii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LIST OF TABLES</td>
<td>xi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LIST OF FIGURES</td>
<td>xiii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LIST OF APENDICES</td>
<td>xv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Research Background</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Problems Statement</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 Research Questions</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 Objectives</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.6 Research Hypotheses 9

1.7 Significance of the Study 10

1.8 Scope of the Study 11

1.9 Definition of Terms 11

1.10 Chapter Summary 16

1.11 Thesis Organisation 16

2 LITERATURE REVIEW 17

2.1 Introduction 17

2.2 Knowledge 18

2.3 Personality Traits 39

2.4 Evaluation Apprehension 47

2.5 Knowledge Sharing Behaviour among Academic Librarians 50

2.6 Previous Studies Related to this Research 53

2.7 Theoretical Background 58

2.8 The Development of Hypotheses 60

2.9 Conceptual Framework 64

2.10 Chapter Summary 68
3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY 69

3.1 Introduction 69
3.2 Operational Framework 70
3.3 Research Strategy 71
3.4 Sampling Frame 73
3.5 Data Collection 76
3.6 Research Instrument 77
3.7 Reliability and Validity Analysis 79
3.8 Data Analysis 80
3.9 Pilot Study 83
3.10 Chapter Summary 85

4 DATA ANALYSIS 86

4.1 Introduction 86
4.2 Demographic Background and the Level of Knowledge Sharing Behaviour 86
4.3 Normality Test 91
4.4 Construct Validity Analysis 92
4.5 Reliability Analysis 97
4.6 Descriptive Analysis 98
4.7 Correlations Analysis 105
4.8 Multiple Regressions Analysis 107
4.9 Mediation Analysis 108
4.10 Summary of Results 113

5 DISCUSSION 115

5.1 Introduction 115

5.2 Discussions of the Findings 116

5.3 Contributions 124

5.4 Limitations 127

5.5 Recommendations for Future Research 128

5.6 Conclusions 129

REFERENCES 130

APPENDICES 143 - 155
## LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE NO.</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Conceptual and Operational Definitions</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Thesis Organization</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Distinction between Data, Information and Knowledge</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Descriptors of what Constitutes Tacit Knowledge</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Literature on Individual Factors as Predictors to Knowledge Sharing</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Dimension of Personality</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Previous Studies Related to this Research Based on Previous Literature</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative based on methodological assumption</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Research Strategies and its Viable Situations</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Total Population of Academic Librarian in Public Research Universities in Malaysia 2011</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>The Categorization of Level Used in this Study</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Reliability Analysis</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Demographic of the Respondents</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Factor Loadings for the Rotated Factors of Knowledge Sharing Behaviour</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Factor Loadings for the Rotated Factors of Core Self-Evaluation</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Factor Loadings for the Unrotated Factors of Evaluation Apprehension</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Test</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>The Overall Level of Knowledge Sharing Behaviour among Academic Librarians</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Comparison of Knowledge Sharing Behaviour Between Gender</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>The Description on Core Self-evaluations Level</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>The Overall Level of Core Self-Evaluations Among Academic Librarians</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>The Description on Evaluation Apprehension Level</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>The Overall Level of Evaluation Apprehension Among Academic Librarians</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>Correlations Between Constructs</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>Multiple Regression Analysis</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>The Result For Mediation Analysis</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>Summary on Hypotheses Testing</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# LIST OF FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIGURE NO.</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Venn Diagram - Relationship Between Information and Knowledge</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Knowledge Conversion Process</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Building Blocks of Knowledge</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Individual Behaviour: Key Influential Factors</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Presence of others Causes Evaluation Apprehension and Distraction Conflict Resulting in Arousal</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Social Cognitive Theory : B Represents Behaviour, P Represents Personal Factors in the Form of Cognitive, Affective, and Biological Events, and E Represents the External Environment.</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Cognitive Dissonance Theory</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Conceptual Framework</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Operational Framework</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Methods of Data Collection</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Mediation Model</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Histogram and Normal Q-Q Plot of Knowledge Sharing Behaviour</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Histogram and Normal Q-Q Plot of Core Self-Evaluation</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Histogram and Normal Q-Q Plot of Evaluation Apprehension</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 Path Coefficients for the Self-Conscientiousness/Self-Negligence/Evaluation Apprehension/Knowledge Sharing Behaviour Mediation Analysis
## LIST OF APPENDICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPENDIX</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Survey Questionnaire</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Letter of Acceptance from Conference Organizer</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Article Journal Publication</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 mediators 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Conceptual Definitions</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Operational Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Lin et al. (2012)</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Knowledge as information processed and distributed across individual, including ideas, facts, expertise in the form of tacit and explicit that is</td>
<td>Wang and Noe (2010)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

Core self-evaluations
A personality constructs which refer to fundamental, subconscious conclusions individuals reach about themselves, other people, and the world.

The degree to which an individual believes him or herself to be capable, significant, and worthy as an organisational member.

Madden et al. (1992), Judge et al. (1998), Wang and Noe (2010)

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Apprehension</th>
<th>A state of fear or anxiety that one’s knowledge or idea may be evaluated or critiqued by others.</th>
<th>Bordia et al. (2006)</th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A person’s active anxiety-toned concern that he or she may be evaluated</td>
<td>Rosenberg (1969)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 1</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 2</td>
<td>Discusses the literature related to this study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 3</td>
<td>Describes the methodology used in the research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 4</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 5</td>
<td>Gives a summary and the conclusion remarks of the entire study and then certain recommendation would be delineated for future research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REFERENCES


