

HARNESSING KNOWLEDGE SHARING PRACTICE TO ENHANCE INNOVATIVE WORK BEHAVIOR: THE PARADOX OF SOCIAL EXCHANGE THEORY

Arsawan, I W. E., Rajiani, I., Wirga, I. W., Suryantini N.P.S. *

Abstract: Organizational behavior researchers have conducted lengthy debates about the role of knowledge in changing perspectives and behavior. However, some researchers assume that knowledge requires complex situations to work innovation, but other researchers consider that knowledge is the direct key to innovation. This study aims to explain the process of knowledge sharing from the perspective of a social exchange theory through direct and indirect relationships between research variables. This study uses a quantitative design to explain the relationship between variables in the framework of the structural equation model. The population in this study was the export-oriented creative industry in Indonesia, which numbered 69 enterprises, with 59 sample frames. The unit of analysis was 295 employees and managers and then analyzed using Smart PLS 3.0 software. Theoretical research findings are the existence of paradox in individual and organizational contexts about how this theory elaborates on the processes that occur, while the results of practical research show that knowledge sharing plays a vital role in workplace innovation and social exchange theory as a leading reference in developing employee personal interests. Limitations of the study are discussed in the paper.

Keywords: Knowledge Sharing, Innovative Work Behavior, Employee Commitment, Social Exchange Theory, Structural Equation Modelling

DOI: 10.17512/pjms.2020.21.2.05

Article history:

Received November 24, 2019; *Revised* January 15, 2020; *Accepted* January 20, 2020

Introduction

Knowledge, in the era of disruptive and industrial revolution 4.0, is believed to be an essential asset for organizations to gain sustainable competitive advantage. The phenomenon of industry 4.0 requires continuous innovation processes and technological development (Michalkova et al. 2019). In various empirical studies, knowledge has been tested as an important variable in organizational behavior because it plays a role in building innovation, increasing productivity, innovative work behavior and performance (Arsawan et al. 2018). The purpose of knowledge can have an impact on improving the quality of employees but can also be hidden

* **I Wayan Edi Arsawan** Dr., **I Wayan Wirga**, SE.,MBA, Department of Business Administration, Politeknik Negeri Bali, Indonesia; **Ismi Rajiani** Dr., Post Graduate Program Universitas Muhammadiyah Gresik; **Ni Putu Santi Suryantini**, SE, MM, Faculty of Economic and Business, Udayana University, Indonesia.

✉corresponding author: wayanediarsawan@pnb.ac.id

✉ismi.rajiani@umg.ac.id; wayanwirga@pnb.ac.id; santisuryantini@unud.ac.id

as part of efforts to restrain the competitive advantage of other employees. In the psychological aspect, employees will not want to add to the list of other employee advantages because they are considered competitors.

Knowledge sharing is essential for the individual level regarding innovative work behavior (Kim and Park, 2015) through providing opportunities for mutual learning and facilitating knowledge creation (Yu et al., 2013; Radaelli et al., 2014 Bernardi 2019; Jutidharabongse et al., 2020).

As a result, organizations that want to improve innovative work tend to motivate employees to increase their willingness to share knowledge (Carmeli et al., 2013).

This research was conducted to examine the inconsistency of empirical study results which is knowledge sharing enhance IWB (Asurakkody & Hee, 2020); (Hu & Zhao, 2016) and organizational success (Kim et al., 2016; Aninkan and Oyewole, 2014; Shahreki et al., 2019) but, Yeşil et al. (2013) found no significant relationship between knowledge sharing and innovation. This paper tries to close the research gap about the inconsistency of the results of research and sharpening the aspect of measuring knowledge sharing behavior by making theoretical compilations and elaborating on the role of social exchange theory concerning the motivation to share knowledge among employees.

Literature Review

Social Exchange Theory is used to explain the processes linking organizational treatment of employees to their job performance (Helfers et al., 2019), and employees expect to be treated in a particular way, tailor their actions and act in accordance to promote beneficial outcome (Colquitt et al., 2013; Laužikas and Miliūtė, 2020), thus involving trust and commitment is very important to exchange relationships in the implementation of the SET (Ferro et al., 2016) (Yang et al., 2019). Furthermore, Cropanzano et al., (2017) concluded SET is about individuals as part of a community, make rational decisions to maximize positive experiences through social interactions, pondering about the expected economic rewards, the costs, and self-efficacy (Zhang et al., 2017) by contributing their valuable knowledge to the team (Romani-Dias & Carneiro, 2019), and involved in an exchange relationship because the benefits expected (Wang et al., 2019). Knowledge sharing as an important tool of attitudes, behaviors and motivations is portrayed in the research of Kanovska (2018).

Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2011) define job satisfaction as attitudes and feelings that employees have because when expectations from work are in line with expectations about work components such as the work environment, working conditions, rewards, and communication. Other researchers measure job satisfaction in terms of meeting needs, differences, achievement values, equity, and genetic component models or dispositions (Yaseen, 2013). Stefanovska-Petkovska et al. (2019) define job satisfaction as pleasure, positive emotions that come from

the work experience that impact employee performance, productivity, and profitability.

Employee commitment is the ability to be loyal and identifies with duties, responsibilities, feel cohesive and get pleasure from being members of the organization and focused on relations involving individual mindsets (Meyer & Allen, 2018). Furthermore, employee commitment having a positive contribution to organization and employee outcomes (Meyer & Maltin 2010; Ranasinghe, 2019) and implicating relations involving the individual mindsets (Meyer et al., 2018) and retaining employess (Teo et al.,2019). Awais et al. (2015), have established three dimensions for employee commitment, which are as follows: affective, continuanceand normative commitment (Chung, 2013)

Knowledge sharing involves the exchange of knowledge between individuals to produce new knowledge (Obeidat et al., 2016) mapping knowledge assets (Singh, 2018), to increase creativity (Tassabehji et al., 2019) thereby accelerating innovation (Dahiyat, 2015) and facing challenges to gain competitive advantage (Masa'deh et al., 2016). So, this knowledge is created by employing organizational or network relations and kept on an individual as well as a collective level (Mikalauskiene & Atkociuniene, 2019; Vu & Ngo, 2019).

Innovative behavior refers to the initiation, development, and implementation of novel and useful ideas which eventually lead to the creation of better products, services, processes or methods (Xerri and Brunetto, 2013). It includes work methods, trends, innovation, work mechanisms, or developing new product development and innovation as intellectual infrastructure and valuable source of competitive advantage (Davids & Frenken, 2018; Gorzelany et al. 2019).

H1: Job satisfaction has a significant positive effect on employee commitment

H2: Job satisfaction has a significant positive effect on knowledge sharing

H3: Job satisfaction has a significant positive effect on IWB

H4: Employee commitment has a significant positive effect on knowledge sharing

H5: Employee commitment has a significant positive effect on IWB

H6: Knowledge sharing has a significant positive effect on IWB

Methodology

Population research is 69 enterprises, and sample frames are 59 SMEs in Bali Indonesia. Respondents in this study were export-oriented creative business employees. Sampling methods using simple random sampling that each member of the population has the same opportunity to be sampled just once. So from 59 SMEs, each was searched for 5 respondents to be asked to fill out the questionnaire. The total number of respondents is 295 employees as the unit of analysis in this study. Questionnaires are arranged in simple and easy to understand and before spreading the questionnaire, first, be explained the purpose of the study and using semantic differential scale 7. Questionnaires distributed offline totaled 192 by visiting SMEs directly, while online distributed through google forms

totaling 119. The questionnaires that were returned in full for analysis were 311 or 94.85% which indicated that the return rate of the questionnaire was very high. Research data collection was carried out for seven months, namely March-September 2019.

Result and Discussion

Outer model measurement

This study uses three methods of measurement, namely convergent and discriminant validity and composite reliability. The first step is using convergent validity to measure the validity of an indicator that can be shown by the value of the outer loading factor. This study employs the value of outer loading above 0.60. The second step is to use discriminant validity by comparing the root average of variance square coefficient extracted (\sqrt{AVE}) for each latent variable. The recommended AVE value is greater than 0.50. AVE root value of job satisfaction is 0.885 greater than the correlation coefficient between job satisfaction with other variables, namely 0.857; 0.705 and 0.644. AVE root value employee commitment is 0.945 greater than the correlation coefficient between employee commitment with other variables, namely 0.738 and 0.644. In contrast, the AVE root value knowledge sharing is 0.944 greater than the correlation coefficient between knowledge sharing with other variables which are 0.844. This indicates that the indicators that reflect the dimensions of the variables in this study have good discriminant validity.

Composite reliability is a measurement of reliability values between indicators of the variables that make it up. The results of indicator testing are said to be reliable if the composite reliability and Cronbach's alpha have a value of > 0.70 . The results of the calculation of composite reliability values range from 0.864 - 0.985 (> 0.70), which reflects the variable dimensions are reliable. Similarly, the Cronbach's value shows values ranging from 0.710 - 0.978 (> 0.70), so indicators are reliable so that they can be declared free from the problem of random errors (MacKenzie et al., 2011).

After completing the outer model measurement, the next stage is inner model measurement was carried out by evaluating the feasibility of the model through the results of R^2 analysis using the predictive relevance method of Stone Geiser and Goodness of Fit (GoF). Calculations of Q^2 and GoF use the R-square coefficient (R^2). R^2 shows the strength of the relationship generated by exogenous variables on endogenous variables so R^2 can show the strength of a research model. According to Chin (2010), the value of R^2 is 0.67 classified as strong, 0.33 classified as a moderate model and 0.19 classified as a weak model. Based on the analysis, the R^2 value of job satisfaction is 0.712, employee commitment is 0.776, knowledge sharing is 0.751, and employee performance is 0.824. The R^2 value is classified as a strong model because it is above 0.67. The average value of 0.766 means that the model of the inter-construct relationship is explained 76.6 percent, while other

variations outside the model explain the remaining 23.4 percent. The distribution of Adjusted R^2 values is smaller than the distribution of R^2 values, meaning changes or expansion of research models by including other latent variables are still possible.

The next inner model measurement is Q Square Predictive Relevance (Q^2), which measures how well observations produced by the model. Q^2 has a range of values ranging from 0 to 1, where the value closer to 1 means that the model has better predictability. The value of Q^2 is calculated by the formula:

$$Q^2 = 1 - [(1-R^2y_1) (1-R^2y_2) (1-R^2y_3)]$$

$$Q^2 = 1 - [(1-0,776) (1-0,751) (1-0,824)]$$

$$Q^2 = 1 - [(0,244) (0,249) (0,176)]$$

$$Q^2 = 1 - 0,0107$$

$$Q^2 = 0,9893$$

The results of Q^2 calculations show a value of 0.9893 which means that the model shows very good observations, namely 98.93% of the relationship between variables can be explained by the model. In comparison, the remaining 0.107% is a factor of error or other factors not included in the research model. The next stage is to validate the overall model because it is the single measure of the measurement model and the structural model.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{GoF} &= \sqrt{\text{com} \times R^2} \\ &= \sqrt{0.683 \times 0.766^2} \\ &= \sqrt{0.683 \times 0.586756} \\ &= 0.6330 \end{aligned}$$

The results of the GoF show a value of 0.633 which is close to 1 (one) which means that the model is fit and indicates that the measurement accuracy of the model as a whole means good. The last stage is using effect size (Chin, 2010) to provide detailed information about the variation of values. The effect size criteria (f^2) are 0.02-0.15 (weak impact), 0.15 - 0.35 (moderate impact) and > 0.35 (strong impact).

Table 1: Cohen's Size Effect Analysis

| Table 1. Cohen's Size Effect Analysis | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|----------|
| Construct | Original Sample (O) | Sample Mean (M) | Standard Deviation (STDEV) | T Statistics ((O/STDEV)) | P Values |
| JS -> KS | 0.188 | 0.208 | 0.105 | 1.810 | 0.071 |
| JS -> IWB | 0.104 | 0.133 | 0.088 | 1.181 | 0.238 |
| Average | 0.146 | | | | |

The results of the analysis, as shown in Table 1, displaying a mean of 0.145, indicated a weak mediation relationship.

Hypotheses testing

Testing the hypothesis in this study was carried out through two stages, namely testing the direct effect and testing the indirect effects of exogenous variables on endogenous variables.

Table 2: Direct Relationship between variables

| Construct | Original Sample | Sample Mean | Standard Deviation (STDEV) | T Statistics (O/STDEV) | P Values | Remarks |
|-----------|-----------------|-------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|----------|---------------|
| JS -> EC | 0.535 | 0.521 | 0.084 | 6.384 | 0.000 | Supported |
| JS -> KS | 0.153 | 0.158 | 0.082 | 1.863 | 0.063 | Not Supported |
| JS -> IWB | 0.474 | 0.467 | 0.081 | 5.836 | 0.000 | Supported |
| EC -> KS | 0.139 | 0.116 | 0.079 | 1.759 | 0.079 | Not Supported |
| EC -> IWB | 0.459 | 0.455 | 0.090 | 5.104 | 0.000 | Supported |
| KS -> IWB | 0.536 | 0.511 | 0.092 | 5.817 | 0.000 | Supported |

Job satisfaction has a significant positive effect on employee commitment indicated by a coefficient of 0.535 with a t-statistic of $6.384 > 1.96$ which means hypothesis 1 is accepted. The results are supported by Moneke and Umeh (2014); Aydogyu and Asikgil (2011). Relationship between job satisfaction on knowledge sharing as indicated by a coefficient of 0.153 with a t-statistic of $1.863 > 1.96$ which means insignificant, so hypothesis 2 is rejected and identical findings with the study by Bektas et al. (2008). The relationship of job satisfaction to innovative work behavior is indicated by a coefficient of 0.474 with a t-statistic of $5.836 > 1.96$ which means significant so that hypothesis 3 is accepted. The results are inline with Niu (2014).

Meanwhile, the relationship between commitment and knowledge sharing is 0.139 with t-statistics $1.759 < 1.96$, which means insignificant and hypothesis 4 is rejected. The results of this study are supported by Teh & Sun (2012). Employee commitment has a significant positive effect on innovative work behavior, where the path coefficient value showed is equal to 0.459 with t-statistics $5.104 > 1.96$, which means significant and hypothesis 5 is accepted. The results are supported by research conducted by Hakimian et al. (2016). Knowledge sharing has a significant positive effect on innovative work behavior as indicated by the coefficient of 0.536 with t-statistics $5.817 > 1.96$, for which hypothesis 6 is accepted. The results of this study confirm the results of a study conducted by Nguyen et al. (2019), Akram et al. (2018), Jaber (2016), Akhavan et al. (2015). The next step in the structural

equation modeling approach is to test indirect relationships through mediating roles.

In the table 3 there are four patterns of mediation relationships that are tested statistically, and none of them meets the mediation pattern. This means that there is no role for mediator variables that play a strategic function in strengthening the dependent variable. The absence of mediation patterns proves that direct relations between variables do not require an intermediary relationship.

Table 3: Relations of Indirect Variables

| No | Model * | Path Coefficient | t-statistics | t-Table | Remarks |
|----|----------|------------------|--------------|---------|----------------------|
| a | JS → EC | 0.535 | 6.384 | > 1,96 | No mediation pattern |
| b | EC → KS | 0.139 | 1.759 | > 1,96 | |
| c | JS → KS | 0.153 | 1.863 | > 1,96 | |
| a | EC → KS | 0.139 | 1.759 | > 1,96 | No mediation pattern |
| b | KS → IWB | 0.536 | 5.817 | > 1,96 | |
| c | EC → IWB | 0.459 | 5.104 | > 1,96 | |
| a | JS → EC | 0.535 | 6.384 | > 1,96 | No mediation pattern |
| b | EC → IWB | 0.459 | 2.763 | > 1,96 | |
| c | JS → IWB | 0.474 | 5.836 | > 1,96 | |
| a | JS → KS | 0.153 | 1.863 | > 1,96 | No mediation pattern |
| b | KS → IWB | 0.536 | 5.817 | > 1,96 | |
| c | JS → IWB | 0.474 | 5.836 | > 1,96 | |

Discussion

Innovation is a necessity in the context of hyper-competition and industrial revolution 4.0 (Rajiani & Norain, 2019; Janoskova & Kral, 2019). Companies especially the SME sector, can utilize the creativity of their workforce to turn ideas into new products and services that excel in competition and put more attention to intellectual capital (Aymen et al., 2019).

The implementation of social exchange theory has two opposite sides in both individual and organizational levels. Knowledge sharing will enhance the capabilities of other employees as competitors while reducing employee competitive advantage. So as much as possible not to do or delay sharing knowledge. Here, the role of SET is crucial, because employees will want to share knowledge if they get something from what has been shared. This means that the role of intrinsic motivation plays an important role to be willing to share knowledge because they feel they have responsibility and commitment, self-development and at the same time enjoy work. Contraindications that occur will be vulnerable to misinterpretation because it has implications for the quality of knowledge shared more absurd because employees feel they do not have to share their knowledge, do not believe (Arsawan et al. 2018), do not have an interest, even

counterproductive work behavior (CWB). Most importantly, employees do not necessarily want to share knowledge because they consider it a short-term advantage that must be maintained in achieving productivity.

This study offers more comprehensive knowledge and conceptualization of new research models, provides a clear and systematic understanding of the interrelationships between variables, the second implication is that this study succeeded combine and examine the SECI model by Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995). IOT model by Lin (2007) become a systematic and comprehensive measurement. Third, it provides an explanation and understanding that the SMEs sector has the potential to build an atmosphere of knowledge sharing and respect intellectual assets (O'Dell and Hubert, 2011).

On individual levels, employees clearly understand about willingness to share because they feel part of their commitments and responsibilities, share ideas, absorb the knowledge that plays an important role in improving performance (Michailova and Minbaeva, 2012). At the organizational level, managers must prepare a mechanism, structure, patterns, build an organizational culture that promotes teamwork, and organizational justice to increase performance and competitive advantage also as reference material for managers in understanding employee behavior.

Conclusions

Small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) play a crucial role in societies, being a source of employment, responsible for economic development and innovation, family income, and well-being, social change, and greater empowerment (Castela, F. Ferreira, J. Ferreira, & Marques, 2018; Grillo, F. Ferreira, Marques, & J. Ferreira, 2018; Ključnikov, Belás, & Smrčka, 2016). However, this type of firm has significant resource limitations (Belas, Smrcka, Gavurova, & Dvorsky, 2018). that restrain SMEs from successfully competing in a global market .Thus, SMEs must adopt the knowledge and create innovation culture (Bilan et al., 2020) such as material construction facilitators, institutional, and intellectual infrastructure (Gorzelay-Dziadkowiec et al.,2019). Also enhancing innovative work behavior at individual and organizational level by using website and digital platform, operational management, marketing and promotions (Barroso et al.,2019), and finlly created knowledge through internal R&D and human capital (Doloreux et al.,2018).

Recent research has provided substantial empirical evidence about the important role of knowledge sharing as a success determinant of creativity, performance, and innovation. Based on empirical evidence collected to date, the organization that embraces these recommendations will succeed in promoting the sharing of knowledge to develop and win the tough business competition. This research provides two important findings on the relationship between job satisfaction and

employee commitment that has insignificant effect on knowledge sharing behavior.

This study also has limitations, the first, this research is a behavioral study with one period that conducted on only export-oriented SMEs. The second, this study used self-report instruments in providing an overview of how respondents feel. Self-reports are appropriate for measuring psychological ownership. In terms of sharing knowledge, self-report may be the best method of evaluation, because usually only informants who know the sharing of knowledge that cannot be separated from the effects of bias.

In the future, behavioral research can be continued to investigate the relationship of knowledge sharing and innovative work behavior to performance both at the individual and organizational level, involving more variables and adopting the longitudinal design. Therefore, it is necessary to conduct comparative research comparing SMEs and other sectors, such as education, banking and IT to enlarge the generalization.

References

- Akhavan, P., Hosseini, S. M., Abbasi, M., & Manteghi, M. (2015). Knowledge-sharing determinants, behaviors, and innovative work behaviors: an integrated theoretical view and empirical examination. *Aslib Journal of Information Management*, 67(5), 562-591.
- Akram, T., Lei, S., Haider, M. J., & Hussain, S. T. (2018). Exploring the impact of knowledge sharing on the innovative work behavior of employees: A study in China. *International Business Research*, 11(3), 186-194.
- Aninkan, DO and AA Oyewole. (2014). The influence of individual and organizational factors on employee engagement. *International Journal Development Sustainable*, 3, 1381-1392.
- Arsawan, I. W. E., Rajjani, I., & Suryantini, S. P. (2018). Investigating knowledge transfer mechanism in five star hotels. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 18.
- Asurakkody, T. A., & Hee, S. (2020). Effects of Knowledge Sharing Behavior on Innovative work Behavior among Nursing Students: Mediating role of Self-Leadership. *International Journal of Africa Nursing Sciences*, 100190.
- Awais, M., Malik, M.S. and Qaisar, A. (2015). A review: the job satisfaction act as mediator between spiritual intelligence and organizational commitment. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, Vol. 5 No. 4, 203-210.
- Aymen, R. A., Alhamzah, A., & Bilal, E. (2019). A multi-level study of influence financial knowledge management small and medium enterprises. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 19.
- Barroso, R. M., Ferreira, F. A., Meidutė-Kavaliauskienė, I., Banaitienė, N., Falcão, P. F., & Rosa, Á. A. (2019). Analyzing the determinants of e-commerce in small and medium-sized enterprises: a cognition-driven framework. *Technological and Economic Development of Economy*, 25(3), 496-518.
- Bektas C, Koseoglu MA, and Soylyu, A (2008). What is Level of Relationship between Knowledge Management and Job Satisfaction? Evidence from a Five- Star Hotel from Antalya Region in Turkey. *First International Conference on Proceedings Book Volume-I/Ii/Iii, Turkey*.

- Belas, J., Smrcka, L., Gavurova, B., & Dvorsky, J. (2018). The Impact of Social and Economic Factors in the Credit Risk Management of SME. *Technological and Economic Development of Economy*, Volume 24, Issue 3: 1215-1230.
- Bernardi, A. 2019. The capability approach and organizational climate as tools to study occupational health and safety, *Insights into Regional Development* 1(2): 155-169.
- Bilan, Y., Hussain, H. I., Haseeb, M., & Kot, S. (2020). Sustainability and Economic Performance: Role of Organizational Learning and Innovation. *Engineering Economics*, 31(1), 93-103.
- Carmeli, A., Gelbard, R. and Reiter-Palmon, R. (2013). Leadership, creative problem-solving capacity, and creative performance: the importance of knowledge sharing. *Human Resource Management*. Vol. 52 No. 1, 95-122
- Castela, B., Ferreira, F., Ferreira, J., & Marques, C. (2018). Assessing the innovation capability of small- and medium-sized enterprises using a non-parametric and integrative approach. *Management Decision*, 56(6), 1365-1383.
- Chin W.W. (2010). How to Write Up and Report PLS Analyses, In: Esposito Vinzi V., Chin W., Henseler J., Wang H. (eds). *Handbook of Partial Least Squares. Springer Handbooks of Computational Statistics*, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 655-690.
- Chung, E. (2013). The relationship of training and organizational commitment in one Korean organization", *Published Dissertation*, The University of Minnesota
- Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., Rodell, J. B., Long, D. M., Zapata, C. P., Conlon, D. E., & Wesson, M. J. (2013). Justice at the millennium, a decade later: A meta-analytic test of social exchange and affect-based perspectives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98, 199.
- Cropanzano, R., Anthony, E., Daniels, S. and Hall, A. (2017), "Social exchange theory: a critical review with theoretical remedies", *Academy of Management Annals*, Vol. 11 No. 1, 1-38
- Dauids, M., & Frenken, K. (2018). Proximity, knowledge base and the innovation process: towards an integrated framework. *Regional Studies*, 52(1), 23-34.
- Doloreux, D., Shearmur, R., & Rodriguez, M. (2018). Internal R&D and external information in knowledge-intensive business service innovation: complements, substitutes or independent?. *Technological and Economic Development of Economy*, 24(6), 2255-2276.
- Ferro, C.; Padin, C.; Svensson, G.; Payan, J. (2016). Trust and commitment as mediators between economic and non-economic satisfaction in manufacturer-supplier relationships. *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, 31, 13–23.
- Gorzalany-Dziadkowiec, M., Gorzalany, J., Stauskis, G., Hernik, J., Van Assche, K., & Noszczyk, T. (2019). The innovation process in local development—the material, institutional, and intellectual infrastructure shaping and shaped by innovation. *Technological and Economic Development of Economy*, 25(6), 1232-1258.
- Grillo, C., Ferreira, F., Marques, C., & Ferreira, J. (2018). A knowledge-based innovation assessment system for small- and medium-sized enterprises: adding value with cognitive mapping and MCDA. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 22(3), 696-718.
- Hakimian, F., Farid, H., Ismail, M. N. & Nair, P.K. (2016). Importance of commitment in encouraging employees' innovative behavior. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Business Administration*. Vol. 8, 1, 70-83

- Helfers, R. C., Reynolds, P. D., & Maskály, J. (2019). Applying social exchange theory to police deviance: Exploring self-protective behaviors among police officers. *Criminal justice review*, 44(2), 183-203.
- Hu, B., & Zhao, Y. (2016). Creative self- efficacy mediated the relationship between knowledge sharing and employee innovation. *Social behavior and personality*. 44(5), 815-826
- Jaberi, E. (2016). The effect of knowledge sharing on innovative behavior among employee of Besat hospital in city of Hamedan. *International Academic Journal of Accounting and Financial Management*, 3(4), 41-47
- Janoskova, K., & Kral, P. (2019). An In-Depth Analysis of the Summary Innovation Index in the V4 Countries. *Journal of Competitiveness*, 11(2), 68-83.
- Jutidharabongse, J., Aujirapongpan, S., Ritkaew, S. 2020. Dynamic knowledge management capability and strategic intuition of Thai entrepreneurs. *Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Issues*, 7(4), 2955-2966.
- Kanovska, L. (2018). Smart services and their benefits for manufacturers from a global perspective. *Ekonomicko-manazerske spektrum*, 12(2), 46-56.
- Kim, S.-J.; Park, M. (2015). Leadership, Knowledge Sharing, and Creativity: The Key Factors in Nurses' Innovative Behaviors. *Journal Nursing Administration*, 45, 615–621.
- Kim, W, GF Khan, J Wood and MT Mahmood. (2016). Employee engagement for sustainable organizations: Keyword analysis using social network analysis and burst detection approach. *Sustainability*, 8(7), 631.
- Ključnikov, A., Belás, J., & Smrčka, L. (2016). Risk-taking and Aggressiveness as the Significant Part of the Entrepreneurial Orientation of SMEs: Case of the Czech Republic. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, Volume 14, No 1, 129-139.
- Laužikas, M., Miliūtė, A. 2020. Liaisons between culture and innovation: comparative analysis of South Korean and Lithuanian IT companies. *Insights into Regional Development*, 2(2), 523-537.
- Lin, H.F. (2007). Knowledge sharing and firm innovation capability: an empirical study. *International Journal of Manpower*, 28 (3/4), 315-332.
- MacKenzie, S.B., Podsakof, P.M., & Podsakof, N.P. (2011). Construct Measurement and Validation Procedures in MIS and Behavioral Research: Integrating New Existing techniques. *MIS Quarterly*, Vol.35. No. 2, 293-334
- Masa'deh, R., Obeidat, B.Y., and Tarhini, A. (2016). A Jordanian Empirical Study of The Associations Among Transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership, Knowledge Sharing, Job Performance, and Firm Performance. *Journal of Management Development*. Vol. 35 Iss 5. 681 705.
- Meyer, J.P., & Maltin, E.R. (2010). Employee commitment and well-being: A critical review, theoretical framework, and research agenda. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 77, 323-337.
- Meyer, J.P., Morin, A.J.S., & Wasti, A. (2018). Employee commitment before and after an economic crisis: A stringent test of profilesimilarity. *Human Relations*, 71(9), 1204-1233.
- Michailova, S., and Minbaeva, D. (2012). Organizational Values and Knowledge Sharing In Multinational Corporations: The Danisco Case. *International Business Review*, Vol. 21 No. 1 59–70

- Michalkova, L., Frajtova Michalikova, K., & Tanase, A. (2019). Factor analysis and its application in innovation management within manufacturing enterprises in Romania. *Ekonomicko-manazerske spektrum*, 13(2), 37-45.
- Mikalauskiene, A., & Atkociuniene, Z. (2019). Knowledge Management Impact on Sustainable Development. *Montenegrin Journal of Economics*, 15(4), 149-160.
- Moneke, N. I., & Umeh, O. J. (2014). How organizational commitment of critical care nurses influence their overall job satisfaction. *Journal of Nursing Education and Practice*, 4(1), 148.
- Nguyen, T., Nguyen, K., & Do, T (2019). Knowledge sharing and innovative work behavior: The case of Vietnam. *Uncertain Supply Chain Management*.7(4), 619-634.
- Niu, H. J. (2014). Is innovation behavior congenital? Enhancing job satisfaction as a moderator. *Personnel Review*,43(2), 288-302.
- Nonaka, I., and Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The Knowledge Creating Company: How Japanese Companies Create the Dynamic of Innovation*, New York: Oxford University Press
- O'Dell, C. and Hubert, C. (2011). *The New Edge in Knowledge: How Knowledge Management is changing the way we do business*. (1st ed.), Wiley
- Obeidat, B.Y., Al-Suradi, M.M., Masa'deh, R. and Tarhini, A. (2016). The impact of knowledge management on innovation: an empirical study on Jordanian consultancy firms. *Management Research Review*. Vol. 39 No. 10, 1214-1238.
- Radaelli, G., Lettieri, E., Mura, M. and Spiller, N. (2014). Knowledge sharing and innovative workbehaviour in healthcare: a micro-level investigation of direct and indirect effects. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, Vol. 23 No. 4, 400-414.
- Rajiani, I., & Ismail, N. (2019). Management innovation in balancing technology innovation to harness universities performance in the era of community 4.0. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 19.
- Ranasinghe, R. (2019). Antecedents of Job Performance of Tourism Graduates: Evidence from State University-Graduated Employees in Sri Lanka. *Journal of Tourism and Services*, Vol. 10 No. 18, 16-34.
- Romani-Dias, M., & Carneiro, J. (2019). Internationalization in higher education: faculty tradeoffs under the social exchange theory. *International Journal of Educational Management*.
- Shahreki, J., Ganesan, J., Raman, K., Chin, A.L.L., Chin, T.S. 2019. The effect of human resource information system application on employee satisfaction and turnover intention, *Entrepreneurship and Sustainability issues*, 7(3), 1462-1479.
- Singh, P.K. (2018). Knowledge strategy, sharing behavior and performance: reviewing a knowledge oriented approach. *Management Research Review*. Vol. 41 No. 3, 395-411
- Skaalvik, E.M. and Skaalvik, S. (2011). Teacher job satisfaction and motivation to leave the teachingprofession: relations with school context, feeling of belonging, and emotional exhaustion. *Teaching and Teacher Education*. Vol. 27 No. 6, 1029-1038.
- Stefanovska-Petkovska, M., Petrovska, I., Bojadziev, M., Schaeffer, I., & Tomovska-Misoska, A. (2019). The Effects of Organizational Culture and Dimensions on Job Satisfaction and Work-Life Balance. *Montenegrin Journal of Economics*, 15(1), 99-112.
- Tassabehji, R., Mishra, J.L. and Dominguez-Péry, C. (2019). Knowledge sharing for innovation performance improvement in micro/SMEs: an insight from the creative sector. *Production Planning and Control*, Vol. 30 Nos 10/12, 935-950.

- Teh, P. L., & Sun, H. (2012). Knowledge sharing, job attitudes and organisational citizenship behaviour. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*. Vol. 112 No. 1, 2012 64-82
- Teo, S. T., Bentley, T., & Nguyen, D. (2019). Psychosocial work environment, work engagement, and employee commitment: A moderated, mediation model. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 102415.
- Vu, H.M, Ngo, V.M. (2019). Strategy Development from Triangulated Viewpoints for a Fast Growing Destination Toward Sustainable Tourism Development – A Case Of Phu Quoc Islands in Vietnam. *Journal of Tourism and Services*, Vol. 10 No. 18, 117-140.
- Wang, Y., Xiang, D., Yang, Z., & Ma, S. S. (2019). Unraveling customer sustainable consumption behaviors in sharing economy: A socio-economic approach based on social exchange theory. *Journal of cleaner production*, 208, 869-879.
- Xerri, MJ and Y Brunetto. (2013). Fostering innovative behaviour: The importance of employee commitment and organisational citizenship behavior. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(16), 3163–3177.
- Yang, X., Zhao, K., Tao, X., & Shiu, E. (2019). Developing and validating a theory-based model of crowd funding investment intention—Perspectives from social exchange theory and customer value perspective. *Sustainability*, 11(9), 2525.
- Yaseen, A. (2013). Effect of compensation factors on employee satisfaction-a study of Doctor's Dissatisfaction in Punjab. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, Vol. 3 No. 1, 142-157.
- Yeşil, S, A Koska and T Büyükbeşe. (2013). Knowledge sharing process, innovation capability and innovation performance: An empirical study. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 75, 217–225.
- Yu, C., Yu, T.F. and Yu, C.C. (2013). Knowledge sharing, organizational climate, and innovative behavior: a cross-level analysis of effects. *Social Behavior and Personality*, Vol. 41 No. 1, 143-156.
- Zhang, X., Zhang, Y., Sun, Y., Lytras, M., Ordonez de Pablos, P. and He, W. (2017), "Exploring the effect of transformational leadership on individual creativity in e-learning: a perspective of social exchange theory", *Studies in Higher Education*, Vol. 43 No. 11, 1964-1978

WYKORZYSTYWANIE WIEDZY PRAKTYCZNEJ W CELU ZWIĘKSZENIA INNOWACYJNEGO ZACHOWANIA W PRACY: PARADOX TEORII WYMIANY SPOŁECZNEJ

Streszczenie: Badacze zachowań organizacyjnych przeprowadzili długie debaty na temat roli wiedzy w zmienianiu perspektyw i zachowań. Jednak niektórzy badacze zakładają, że wiedza wymaga złożonych sytuacji do pracy nad innowacjami, ale inni badacze uważają, że wiedza jest bezpośrednim kluczem do innowacji. Niniejsze badanie ma na celu wyjaśnienie procesu dzielenia się wiedzą z perspektywy teorii wymiany społecznej poprzez bezpośrednie i pośrednie związki między zmiennymi badawczymi. W tym badaniu zastosowano projekt ilościowy w celu wyjaśnienia związku między zmiennymi w ramach modelu równań strukturalnych. Populacją w tym badaniu był przemysł kreatywny zorientowany na eksport w Indonezji, który liczył 69 przedsiębiorstw, z 59 przykładowymi ramkami. Jednostką analizy było 295 pracowników i menedżerów, a następnie dokonano

jej analizy za pomocą oprogramowania SmartPLS 3.0. Teoretyczne wyniki badań wskazują na istnienie paradoksu w kontekście indywidualnym i organizacyjnym dotyczącym sposobu, w jaki teoria rozwija się w zachodzących procesach, podczas gdy wyniki badań praktycznych pokazują, że dzielenie się wiedzą odgrywa istotną rolę w innowacji w miejscu pracy i teorii wymiany społecznej jako wiodącemu odniesieniu rozwijania osobistych zainteresowań pracowników. Ograniczenia badania omówiono w artykule.

Słowa kluczowe: dzielenie się wiedzą, innowacyjne zachowanie w pracy, zaangażowanie pracowników, teoria wymiany społecznej, modelowanie równań strukturalnych

利用知识共享实践来增强创新工作行为: 社会交换理论的悖论

摘要: 组织行为研究人员就知识在改变观点和行为中的作用进行了长时间的辩论。但是, 一些研究人员认为知识需要复杂的情境才能进行创新, 而其他研究人员则认为知识是创新的直接关键。本研究旨在通过研究变量之间的直接和间接关系, 从社会交换理论的角度解释知识共享的过程。本研究使用定量设计来解释结构方程模型框架内变量之间的关系。本研究的人口为印度尼西亚的出口导向型创意产业, 该产业有69家企业, 有59个样本框架。分析单位为295名员工和经理, 然后使用SmartPLS 3.0软件进行分析。理论研究的发现是在个人和组织环境中存在着关于该理论如何详细阐述所发生的过程的悖论, 而实践研究的结果表明, 知识共享在工作场所创新和社会交流理论中起着至关重要的作用。发展员工的个人利益。本文讨论了这项研究的局限性。

关键词: 知识共享创新工作行为员工投入社会交往理论结构方程模型