E-ISSN: 2963-3699
P-ISSN: 2964-0121
https://return.publikasikupublisher.com/index.php/return/index

The Influence of Knowledge Attributes on Interpersonal Distrust in Knowledge Hiding

Ivan, Elsye Tandelilin
Universitas Surabaya, Indonesia
Email : elliin@staff.ubaya.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This study aims to test and analyze the influence of the theory of knowledge management, which includes psychological danger, interpersonal distrust, knowledge hiding, knowledge attribute, and compassion training on employees in paper mills. The type of research used is basic research, utilizing four variables and one moderation variable, namely psychological danger, interpersonal distrust, knowledge hiding, knowledge attribute, and compassion training as the moderation variable. This study used primary data by distributing an online questionnaire involving 123 respondents as a sample and was analyzed using the SEM (Structural Equation Modeling) method with SPSS 25 and AMOS Graphics 22.0 software. The results of the study showed that all hypotheses were supported: psychological danger had a significant positive effect on interpersonal distrust; psychological danger had a significant positive effect on knowledge hiding; interpersonal distrust had a significant positive effect on knowledge hiding; compassion training had a significant positive effect on the influence of psychological danger on interpersonal distrust; and knowledge attribute had a significant positive effect on interpersonal distrust.

Keywords: Knowledge Management, Psychological Danger, Interpersonal Distrust, Knowledge Hiding, Compassion Training

INTRODUCTION

In competitive global economy, the success of a company is attributed to effective knowledge management (Cheng et al., 2008). Knowledge hiding and knowledge sharing are two fields of study in the knowledge management section. Based on knowledge management, knowledge assets can be created by stopping individuals from hiding knowledge and allowing others to share knowledge within the organization. Organizations can be more effective when knowledge sharing is done at a collective level. Therefore, knowledge creation and sharing is essential to maintain a competitive advantage, especially in knowledge-intensive industries (Kumar Jha and Varkkey, 2018).

The research conducted by Lanke (2023) aims to propose a new introduction to knowledge hiding and interventions to overcome it. This study has several variables that are tested, namely psychological danger, interpersonal distrust, compassion training, and knowledge hiding. Compasion training as a moderation to find out the impact on the psychological hazard variable. Based on research that has been carried out, psychological danger can create a circle of distrust that leads to knowledge hiding between employees, and compassion training has a significant positive effect on these variables. Compassion training can help employees to develop empathy for others, so it can help improve interpersonal interaction. This research shows that employees who have compassion will trust other employees and do not do knowledge hiding when asked. Employees will also learn to process individual perceptions of danger and risk in interpersonal transactions with compassion. Previous research has shown that psychological danger acts as a precursor and distrust as a consequence of knowledge hiding behavior. Previous research

promotes compasion training as a routine practice in resource development and enhances innovation and learning in organizations.

The same research was also conducted by Yuan et al. (2020) aimed to test the relationship between several knowledge attributes (complexity, implicitness), interpersonal distrust, knowledge hiding (KH), and team efficacy, to explore a new dimension to knowledge hiding. Another objective of this study was to investigate the relationship between knowledge attributes by focusing on the mediating effects of interpersonal distrust and the moderation effects of team efficacy. This study has several variables that are tested, namely knowledge implicitness, knowledge complexity, interpersonal distrust, team efficacy, evasive hiding, playing dumb, rationalized hiding, bullying hiding. Based on the results of the research, knowledge hiding can be divided into four dimensions, namely evasive hiding, playing dumb, rationalized hiding, and bullying. The researcher revealed that knowledge attribute is an important predictor in knowledge hiding behavior in organizations, this attribute has a significant positive effect on interpersonal distrust mediation of knowledge hiding. Knowledge has a unique value that can give rise to an individual's tendency to do knowledge hiding. This triggers employees to share knowledge in a complex and difficult to understand way because employees do not want to lose the advantages of their knowledge. The impact of this causes the emergence of interpersonal distrust between individuals and causes knowledge hiding. Previous research revealed that team efficacy negatively moderated the relationship between interpersonal distrust and evasive hiding and playing dumb, while team efficacy positively moderated the relationship between interpersonal distrust and rationalize hiding and bullying hiding, the researcher stated that team efficacy inhibited the mechanism of knowledge attributes that affect knowledge hiding through interpersonal distrust. Team efficacy provides psychological guidance in "knowledge security" for employees so as to inhibit knowledge hiding behavior between colleagues. Organizations that have high efficacy, when faced with knowledge requests by others, team members will reduce evasive hiding and playing dumb behaviors and will increase the behavior of rationalize hiding and bullying hiding. Yuan et al. (2020) said that there are similarities and repetitions in academic research on the definition of knowledge attribute. Uncertainty can be replaced with complexity, while ambiguity can be replaced by implicitness.

This study was replicated in the journal Lanke (2023) by adding independent variables from the research of Yuan et al. (2020) The independent variables added were knowledge attributes (knowledge complexity, knowledge implicitness). Previous research has shown that there are factors such as interpersonal distrust, psychological danger that have been shown to affect knowledge hiding behavior, and compassion training as moderation variables (Lanke, 2023). One aspect that is often overlooked is the role of the attributes of knowledge itself. This study was carried out by adding knowledge attribute variables which include knowledge complexity, knowledge implicitness. Knowledge complexity refers to how complex a knowledge is to be understood or applied, while knowledge implicitness describes how difficult it is to explain or express explicitly. These attributes are believed to have an important role in increasing the level of interpersonal distrust. Knowledge attribute is not directly related to knowledge hiding because Yuan et al. (2020) use social exchange theory (SET) as the basis for thinking. According to SET, when someone receives a request to share knowledge, colleagues will consider the level of trust and expectation of reciprocity before deciding to share or hide knowledge. SET states that a person who has knowledge complexity and knowledge

implicitness, does not necessarily immediately hide knowledge, there is suspicion of others and then fear of being used, fear of knowledge being taken without reply, and interpersonal distrust arises. Thus, knowledge attributes can strengthen the tendency for knowledge hiding.

The interpersonal distrust variable in Lanke's (2023) research shows an influence on knowledge hiding. The same results were also found in the research of Connelly et al. (2012) and Yuan et al. (2020), where interpersonal distrust also showed a positive significance for knowledge hiding. In general, the existence of interpersonal distrust in individuals and groups can encourage individuals and groups to hide knowledge (knowledge hiding). This shows that interpersonal distrust has a positive significance for knowledge hiding.

The psychological danger variable in Lanke's (2023) research showed an effect on interpersonal distrust. Another study conducted by Edmondson (2011) showed a significant positive influence with the interpersonal distrust variable. This states that when employees feel psychological danger in dealing with other employees, the employee is less likely to trust other employees, which creates a circle of distrust among employees (Lanke, 2023). In general, employees who feel pressured by danger are less likely to be able to trust others. This can create an unsafe environment and cause knowledge hiding between employees due to a sense of distrust of each other. So that the psychological danger variable has a positive significance for interpersonal distrust.

The psychological danger variable in Lanke's (2023) study showed a significant positive influence on knowledge hiding. Another study conducted by Men et al. (2020) states that psychological safety has a negative significance on knowledge hiding, so employees who have low psychological security may lack confidence in colleagues and hide knowledge. Generally, employees who feel threatened will cause a sense of unwillingness to interact with the employee and cause knowledge concealment. So that the psychological danger variable has a positive significance for knowledge hiding.

The variable of knowledge attribute in the study of Yuan et al. (2020) states that knowledge attribute has a positive influence on interpersonal distrust. The results of a study by Kankanhalli et al. (2005) stated that knowledge attribute is significantly positive for interpersonal danger. Interpersonal distrust reinforces the effects of knowledge complexity and implicit on knowledge concealment behaviors (Kankanhalli et al., 2005). Generally, increasingly complex knowledge can increase distrust between employees because the knowledge provided is considered complex, difficult to understand and incomplete so that it can increase distrust. The knowledge attribute variable has a positive significance on interpersonal distrust.

The compassion training variable in Lanke's (2023) study states that compassion training is significantly positive as a moderation between psychological danger and interpersonal distrust. Another study conducted by Jazaieri et al. (2013) stated that compassion training can help improve interaction between employees, this training is a predictor of psychological health and well-being and is useful in fostering a positive emotional state. Compassion training can trigger employees to empathize with others thereby reducing psychological danger and mistrust between employees. The compassion training variable has positive significance in moderating psychological danger to interpersonal distrust.

This study was conducted to see the influence of knowledge attribute as a mediation on interpersonal distrust that occurs due to psychological danger and its consequences to knowledge hiding. This research uses the object of one of the departments in a company

from the paper industry sector in Surabaya. The company PT. Suparma Tbk. has many mutated employees and new employees who are prepared to replace the seniors who will be retired, but the juniors who will replace feel that the knowledge they have is immature or not fully taught by the seniors. This affects the performance of the juniors and feels doubted by their superiors in decision-making. The learning provided by senior employees is only a small fraction of the work done by those senior employees. This is because senior employees feel threatened by the presence of younger employees and are afraid of being replaced. Senior employees also keep their distance from the junior employee because they feel that the employee is untrustworthy.

The distrust that occurs is carried out by more senior employees because they feel that the junior employee is still not trustworthy. Senior employees feel that mutated employees are spies from other parts so they keep their distance from the individual. The existence of new employees triggers senior employees to verbally and non-verbally bully. Non-verbal bullying is carried out by hitting, pushing, pinching, and restricting movement. Verbal bullying is done by changing names with disrespect, speaking rudely, and teasing. This makes junior employees feel isolated and not confident in the work they do. New employees and mutated employees do not have enough knowledge to do a good job, to increase their knowledge, they should be able to read manuals or work instructions. Document storage and work instructions are in the office and are not available in the paper machine area, which makes new and mutated employees unable to access the documents and confusion about what to do. The retirement age limit for private employees based on the 2024 Job Creation Law is 58 years. Based on this rule, employees who are 58 years old can be retired (Ervira Octaviola Kurniawan, 2024). HRD will regenerate and prepare candidates who will replace the employee. HRD prepares candidates who will be entrusted to employees who will be retired in the hope that their knowledge can be channeled. Employees who will be retired feel that this is unfair and that the achievements that have been made are not looked at. This encourages employees who will be retired to do knowledge hiding in the hope that employees who will be retired are still needed by the company and reemployed. The junior who will replace feels that the knowledge they have is insufficient and confused in doing the job, so that the employee's decision-making and performance decreases. Not only retirement, employees can also be transferred to other parts when the boss asks HRD because they feel that the employees they have do not have adequate potential, so that when there are employees who are mutated, the employees feel that they will be replaced.

Based on data from HRD, the number of retirees at PT. Suparma Tbk. in 2023 will number 55 people, while in 2024 until October there will be 41 people. In 2022 there were 82 mutations, while in 2023 there were 73 people who were mutated from other parts and in 2024 until October it reached 54 people. As for new employees from 2023 to 2024, there are 55 people. (Internal data of PT. Suparma Tbk., 2024).

The purpose of this study is to find out how much influence independent variables (knowledge attribute, interpersonal distrust, and psychological danger) have on dependent variables (knowledge hiding) and moderation variables (compassion training). The benefits of this research are: (1) This research contributes to enriching the knowledge management literature by examining the influence of knowledge attribute on interpersonal distrust and knowledge hiding; (2) Managers and HRD can use these findings to create a more psychologically safe work environment and encourage knowledge sharing; (3) This research can help companies in developing policies that reduce knowledge hiding such as by increasing openness and building a culture of

knowledge sharing; (4) This research can be used as a reference for further research on strategies to increase trust between employees in the company

RESEARCH METHOD

This research is classified as basic research because the research carried out is causal to understand the variables in the research and the influence between variables. Independent variables are knowledge attribute (knowledge complexity and knowledge implicitness), psychological danger, interpersonal distrust. The dependent variables are knowledge hiding, and compassion training as the moderation variable. This research is classified as quantitative research because it can be measured. According to Sugiono (2019), quantitative research is a research method based on the philosophy of positivism, used to research certain populations/samples, and data collection techniques using statistical research instruments with the aim of testing the established hypotheses.

This study examined *knowledge hiding* as the dependent variable, which was influenced by three independent variables: *knowledge attributes* (complexity and implicitness), *psychological danger*, and *interpersonal distrust*, with *compassion training* as the moderation variable. *Knowledge hiding* (X1) at PT. Suparma Tbk. was measured through behaviors such as pretending ignorance (X1.1), giving irrelevant answers (X1.2), refusing to share (X1.3), and avoiding questions (X1.4). The independent variables included *knowledge complexity* (Y1), measured by technical difficulty (Y1.1) and special experience requirements (Y1.3); *knowledge implicitness* (Y2), assessed through difficulty in verbal explanation (Y2.1) and need for demonstration (Y2.2); *psychological danger* (Y3), evaluated via fear of criticism (Y3.1) and anxiety about competence (Y3.3); and *interpersonal distrust* (Y4), measured by suspicion of coworkers' intentions (Y4.2) and discomfort in trusting colleagues (Y4.4). The moderation variable, *compassion training* (Z5), was assessed through improved emotional understanding (Z5.1), better emotion management (Z5.2), openness to others' perspectives (Z5.3), and increased care for colleagues (Z5.4).

The data used in this study were quantitative and could be measured and expressed numerically for statistical analysis. The data source was primary data, obtained directly by distributing online questionnaires. The questionnaires were distributed to employees of PT. Suparma Tbk. who had worked for more than one year, had participated in *compassion training*, or had been transferred from other departments. The research used an interval scale, allowing for the use of numerical scales in response options. The target population consisted of employees of PT. Suparma Tbk. who met the specified criteria. The sampling method applied was probability sampling, specifically simple random sampling, to ensure each individual in the population had an equal chance of selection. The sampling process involved translating question indicators from referenced journals, developing a questionnaire based on relevant indicators, defining respondent criteria, distributing the questionnaire online, and providing instructions on how to complete it. According to Hair et al. (2014), the minimum sample size should be five to ten times the number of indicators; with 24 question indicators in this study, a minimum of 120 respondents was required from a population of 209 eligible employees.

To process the data and test the hypotheses, a validity test was conducted to determine whether each variable's indicators accurately measured the intended constructs. SPSS software was used to test the validity level of each item. The first step involved a pilot test with 30 respondents to assess the clarity, validity, and reliability of the questionnaire items. A Pearson correlation value of 0.5 or higher indicated valid data.

Reliability testing was also conducted to measure the consistency and stability of the research instruments.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Analysis Measurement Model

In the Structural Equation Model (SEM), a measurement model is a model that describes the relationship between variables and their indicators. The measurement model stage is carried out to test whether the measuring instruments used in the study are valid and reliable. The measurement model analysis was carried out using the Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) method on all variable indicators in the study. The measurement model must meet the criteria of the Goodness of Fit Index for the model to be said to be suitable for further analysis. The results of the Goodness of Fit Index test are as follows:

Tabel 1. *Goodness of Fit Measurement Model* Penelitian

No	Compatibility Test	Compatibility Criteria	Compatibility Result	Information
1	CMIN/DF	CMIN/DF ≤ 2	1,569	Good fit
2	RMSEA	RMSEA ≤ 0,08	0,069	Good fit
3	GFI	GFI ≥ 0,9	0,804	Marginal fit
4	CFI	CFI ≥ 0,90	0,921	Good fit
5	TLI	TLI ≥ 0,9	0,908	Good fit

(Sumber: Lampiran 6)

In Table 1, it can be seen that there are several goodness of fit indices that must be met in the measurement model. According to Hair et al. (2014), this research model shows good results based on various goodness-of-fit indices: CMIN/DF value of 1.569 (good fit ≤2), RMSEA 0.069 (good fit ≤0.08), GFI 0.804 (marginal fit 0.80-0.89), CFI of 0.921 (good fit ≥0.90), and TLI of 0.908 (good fit ≥0.90), which collectively indicate that this research model has a good level of fit with the data.

After conducting the measurement model, then validity and reliability measurements were carried out using standardized loading. The indicator can be said to be valid and reliable if it meets the standardized loading value ≥ 0.5. If the indicator has a standardized load lower than 0.5, then it cannot be used and must be removed from the measurement model.

Tabel 2. Nilai *Standarized Loading dalam Measurement Model*

Variabel	Indikator	Std. Loading	Kriteria
Knowledge Hiding	X1. 1	0,842	≥ 0,5
	X1. 2	0,851	≥ 0,5
	X1. 3	0,834	≥ 0,5
	X1. 4	0,809	≥ 0,5
Knowledge Complexity	Y1. 1	0,615	≥ 0,5
	Y1. 2	0,792	≥ 0,5
	Y1. 3	0,807	≥ 0,5
	Y1. 4	0,793	≥ 0,5
Knowledge Implicitness	Y2. 1	0,727	≥ 0,5

Variabel	Indikator	Std. Loading	Kriteria
	Y2. 2	0,587	≥ 0,5
	Y2. 3	0,708	≥ 0,5
	Y2. 4	0,718	≥ 0,5
Psychological Danger	Y3. 1	0,723	≥ 0,5
	Y3. 2	0,845	≥ 0,5
	Y3. 3	0,791	≥ 0,5
	Y3. 4	0,840	≥ 0,5
Interpersonal Distrust	Y4. 1	0,736	≥ 0,5
	Y4. 2	0,775	≥ 0,5
	Y4. 3	0,779	≥ 0,5
	Y4. 4	0,703	≥ 0,5
Compassion Training	Z5. 1	0,735	≥ 0,5
	Z5. 2	0,763	≥ 0,5
	Z5. 3	0,812	≥ 0,5
	Z5. 4	0,717	≥ 0,5

(Sumber: Lampiran 6)

In Table 2 it can be seen that all indicators qualify for standardized loading of more than 0.5. Thus, it can be concluded that all indicators used in the study can be used and do not need to be eliminated from the measurement model. The next process is to measure validity and reliability using average variance extracted (AVE) and Construct Reliability (CR) values. The indicator is said to be good and can be used if it meets the requirements of the average variance extracted (AVE) value ≥ 0.5 and the Construct Reliability (CR) value ≥ 0.7.

Tabel 3. Nilai *Average Variance Extracted* (AVE) dalam *Measurement Model*

Variabel	Std. Loading	Σ Std. Loading	AVE	Kriteria
Knowledge Hiding	0,842	3,336	0,696	≥ 0,5
	0,851			
	0,834			
	0,809			
Knowledge Complexity	0,615	3,007	0,571	≥ 0,5
	0,792			
	0,807			
	0,793			
Knowledge Implicitness	0,727	2,740	0,472	≥ 0,5
	0,587			
	0,708			

Variabel	Std. Loading	Σ Std. Loading	AVE	Kriteria
	0,718			
Psychological Danger	0,723	3,199	0,642	≥ 0,5
	0,845			
	0,791			
	0,840			
Interpersonal Distrust	0,736	2,993	0,561	≥ 0,5
	0,775			
	0,779			
	0,703			
Compassion Training	0,735	3,027	0,574	≥ 0,5
	0,763			
	0,812			
	0,717			

(Sumber: Lampiran 7)

In Table 3, it can be seen that the knowledge implicitness indicator has an average variance extracted (AVE) value of less than 0.5. In the knowledge implicitness variable, the data can be declared valid because it meets the criteria for a standardized loading value ≥ 0.5 (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). Meanwhile, indicators of knowledge hiding, knowledge complexity, psychological danger, interpersonal distrust, and compassion training have an average variance extracted (AVE) value of more than 0.5 so that they are declared valid.

Tabel 4. Nilai *Construct Reliability* (CR) dalam *Measurement Model*

Variabel	Σ Std. Loading	(Σ Std. Loading)^2	Error	Σ Error	CR	Kriteria
Knowledge Hiding	3,336	2,783	0,291	1,217	0,901	≥ 0,7
			0,275			
			0,304			
			0,345			
Knowledge Complexity	**3,007**	2,286	0,621	1,714	0,841	≥ 0,7
			0,372			
			0,348			
			0,371			
Knowledge Implicitness	**2,740**	1,889	0,471	2,110	0,781	≥ 0,7
			0,655			
			0,498			
			0,484			
	3,199	2,568	0,477	1,432	0,877	

Psychological Danger			0,285			≥ 0,7
			0,374			
			0,294			
Interpersonal Distrust	**2,993**	2,243	0,458	1,757	0,836	≥ 0,7
			0,399			
			0,393			
			0,505			
Compassion Training	**3,027**	2,296	0,459	1,704	0,843	≥ 0,7
			0,417			
			0,340			
			0,485			

(Sumber: Lampiran 7)

In Table 4, it can be seen that all indicators meet the Construct Reliability (CR) requirements of more than 0.7 so that they can be said to be reliable. Based on the standardized loading, AVE, and CR values that meet the criteria, the research can be continued with structural testing and hypothesis testing.

Structural Model Analysis

The next test is to test the structural model which aims to test the hypothesis. The fit of the structural model can be measured through the goodness of fit.

Table 5. Goodness of fit Structural Research Model

No	Compatibility Test	Compatibility Criteria	Compatibility Result	Information
1	CMIN/DF	CMIN/DF ≤ 2	1,560	Good fit
2	RMSEA	RMSEA ≤ 0,08	0,068	Good fit
3	GFI	GFI ≥ 0,9	0,802	Marginal fit
4	CFI	CFI ≥ 0,90	0,921	Good fit
5	TLI	TLI ≥ 0,9	0,909	Good fit

Table 5 shows several goodness-of-fit indices that must be satisfied in the structural model. According to Hair et al. (2014), the required indices include:

- The CMIN/DF value is considered to indicate a normal fit if ≤ 3 and a good fit if ≤ 2. In this study's model, the CMIN/DF value obtained is 1.560, which indicates a good fit.
- The recommended RMSEA value, according to Hair et al. (2014), should be ≤ 0.08 to be categorized as a good fit. In this study, the RMSEA value is 0.068, indicating a good fit.
- The Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) is considered marginal fit if the value ranges from 0.80 to 0.89, and good fit if it is ≥ 0.90. In this model, the GFI value is 0.802, which indicates a marginal fit.
- The Comparative Fit Index (CFI) is deemed a good fit if the value is ≥ 0.90. The CFI value obtained in this model is 0.921, indicating a good fit.
- The Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) is considered a good fit if the value is ≥ 0.90. The TLI value in this model is 0.909, indicating a good fit.

Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis testing can be conducted once the structural model meets the required fit criteria. The purpose of this testing is to examine and evaluate the effect between one variable and another. These effects can be either significant or insignificant within the structural model. A hypothesis is accepted if the critical ratio (CR) value for each variable is greater than 1.96 and the p-value is ≤ 0.05 (α = 5%).

As shown in Table 6 below, all five hypotheses are statistically significant and supported, with each variable having a CR value > 1.96 and a p-value ≤ 0.05.

Table 6. Hypothesis Test Results

Hypothesis	Impact	Std. Estimate	CR	P-Value	Information
H1	Psychological Danger → Interpersonal Distrust	0,412	3.287	0,001	Significant Hypothesis supported
H2	Psychological Danger → Knowledge Hiding	0,769	4,218	***	Significant Hypothesis supported
H3	Interpersonal Distrust → Knowledge Hiding	0,471	2,913	0,004	Significant Hypothesis supported
H4	Compassion Training → Interpersonal Distrust	0,217	2,076	0,038	Significant Hypothesis supported
H5	Knowledge Complexity → Interpersonal Distrust	0.336	1,971	0,049	Significant Hypothesis supported
	Knowledge Implicitness → Interpersonal Distrust	0,256	2,120	0,034	Significant Hypothesis supported

(Sumber: Lampiran 8)

Discussion of Hypothesis Testing Results

Table 6 concludes that Hypothesis 1 is supported, as the direction of the influence of the psychological danger variable on interpersonal distrust aligns with the proposed hypothesis. This is evidenced by the standardized estimate value of 0.412 (positive), a critical ratio greater than 1.96 at 3.287, and a p-value less than 0.05, which is 0.001.

Table 6 also indicates that Hypothesis 2 is supported, as the influence of psychological danger on knowledge hiding is consistent with the proposed hypothesis. This is shown by a positive standardized estimate value of 0.769, a critical ratio of 4.218 (greater than 1.96), and a p-value less than 0.05, denoted as ***.

Hypothesis 3 is also supported, as the influence of interpersonal distrust on knowledge hiding follows the proposed hypothesis. The standardized estimate is 0.471 (positive), with a critical ratio of 2.913 and a p-value of 0.004, which is below the 0.05 threshold.

Furthermore, Table 6 confirms that Hypothesis 4 is supported, as compassion training moderates the effect of psychological danger on interpersonal distrust in accordance with the hypothesis. This is shown by a positive standardized estimate of 0.217, a critical ratio of 2.076, and a p-value of 0.038, all meeting the required criteria.

Finally, Hypothesis 5 is supported, which examines the effect of knowledge attributes on interpersonal distrust. Knowledge attributes were measured using two variables: knowledge complexity and knowledge implicitness. First, the effect of knowledge complexity on interpersonal distrust aligns with the proposed hypothesis, supported by a standardized estimate of 0.336 (positive), a critical ratio of 1.971, and a p-value of 0.049. Second, the effect of knowledge implicitness on interpersonal distrust is also supported, with a standardized estimate of 0.256 (positive), a critical ratio of 2.120, and a p-value of 0.034.

Effect of psychological danger on interpersonal distrust (H1)

The results of the study show that psychological danger to interpersonal distrust has a significant relationship. This is evidenced by the value of standardized estimates of 0.412 which has a positive value; and has a critical ratio value greater than 1.96, which is 3.287; and has a p-value of less than 0.05, which is 0.001. These results have proven that H1 is supported. The results of this study are in accordance with the research that has been conducted by Lanke (2023) and Edmondson (2011) which states that hypothesis 1 is supported. However, the results of this study are not in line with the research of Gilligan et al. (2013) which states that violence can increase trust through community solidarity (collective coping) and social selection (purging).

The results of this study are in line with research conducted by Lanke (2023) and Edmondson (2011) which stated that employees who feel psychological danger are less likely to trust other employees, thus creating a circle of distrust among employees. The results of this study prove that when respondents experience psychological danger at work, they can foster distrust towards colleagues who commit violence. Verbal and non-verbal violence received by the employee fosters a sense of distrust towards co-workers. This encourages mutual suspicion, fear, and other unpleasant experiences between colleagues, so it is important for companies to create a psychologically safe work environment so that it can reduce distrust between employees. The higher the level of psychological danger, the higher the interpersonal distrust between employees.

The effect of psychological danger on knowledge hiding (H2)

The results of the study show that psychological danger to knowledge hiding has a significant relationship. This is evidenced by a standardized estimate value of 0.769 which has a positive value, has a critical ratio value greater than 1.96 which is 4.218, and has a p-value of less than 0.05, namely ***. The results of this study are in accordance with previous research conducted by Lanke (2023) and Men et al. (2020) which stated that hypothesis 2 is supported.

The results of this study are in line with research conducted by Lanke (2023) and Men et al. (2020) which stated that employees who have low psychological security may lack trust in colleagues and engage in knowledge hiding. The results of this study prove that respondents who experience psychological danger at work often do knowledge hiding. This can happen because there is a fear of criticism, being considered incompetent, or afraid of being humiliated if the knowledge shared turns out not to be in accordance with expectations. Employees who feel threatened both verbally and non-verbally prefer to withhold knowledge as a form of self-protection. The higher the psychological danger possessed by employees, the higher the knowledge hiding carried out by employees.

The effect of interpersonal distrust on knowledge hiding (H3)

The results of the study show that interpersonal distrust of knowledge hiding has a significant relationship. This is evidenced by a standardized estimate value of 0.471 which has a positive value, has a critical ratio value greater than 1.96 which is 2.913, and has a p-value of less than 0.05 which is 0.004. The results of this study are in accordance with previous research conducted by Lanke (2023), Connelly et al. (2012) and Yuan et al. (2020) which stated that hypothesis 3 is supported.

The results of this study are in line with research conducted by Lanke (2023), Connelly et al. (2012) and Yuan et al. (2020) which stated that the existence of interpersonal distrust in individuals and groups encourages individuals and groups to do knowledge hiding. This proves that respondents with interpersonal distrust tend to engage in knowledge hiding. Distrust that arises due to past conflicts, prejudices between employees, and unpleasant experiences, makes employees feel doubtful that the knowledge shared will be used properly or appreciated. The higher the level of distrust between employees, the higher the knowledge hiding that can occur when other employees ask for knowledge.

The effect of compassion training on moderating psychological danger on interpersonal distrust (H4)

The results of the study showed that compassion training moderated the psychological danger to interpersonal distrust. This is evidenced by a standardized estimate value of 0.217 which has a positive value, has a critical ratio value greater than 1.96 which is 2.076, and has a p-value of less than 0.05 which is 0.038. The results of this study are in accordance with previous research conducted by Lanke (2023) and Jazaieri et al. (2013) which stated that hypothesis 4 is supported. The results of this study are not in line with the research of Lupoli et al. (2020) which states that compassion can reduce the trust given by others.

The results of this study are in line with research conducted by Lanke (2023) and Jazaieri et al. (2013) which stated that compassion training can help improve interaction between employees, this training is a predictor of psychological health and well-being and is useful in fostering a positive emotional state. The results of this study prove that compassion training can help reduce distrust that arises as a result of psychological danger. Compassion training encourages employees to foster a sense of empathy, social awareness, and employees' ability to manage negative emotions, so that employees who feel threatened are still able to build social relationships with colleagues. The higher the compassion, the lower the psychological danger and lower the distrust between employees.

Effect of knowledge attribute on interpersonal distrust (H5)

The results of the study show that knowledge attribute to interpersonal distrust has a significant relationship. Knowledge attribute is proven by testing the variables of knowledge complexity and knowledge implicitness. The test of the knowledge complexity variable for interpersonal distrust is in accordance with the hypothesis that has been formulated by looking at a standardized estimate value of 0.336 which has a positive value, has a critical ratio value greater than 1.96 which is 1.971, and has a p-value of less than 0.05 which is 0.049. The test of the variable knowledge implicitness on interpersonal distrust is in accordance with the hypothesis that has been formulated by looking at the standardized estimate value of 0.256 which has a positive value, has a

critical ratio value greater than 1.96 which is 2.120, and has a p-value of less than 0.05 which is 0.034. The results of this study are in accordance with previous research conducted by Kankanhalli et al. (2005) and Yuan et al. (2020) which stated that hypothesis 5 is supported.

The tests carried out on these two variables prove that the higher the level of complexity and implicitness of the knowledge that employees have, the greater the distrust between colleagues. This happens because knowledge that is difficult to understand or not well documented can cause suspicion towards the owner of the knowledge.

CONCLUSION

The study's findings supported five hypotheses: (1) psychological danger positively influenced interpersonal distrust as employees developed mistrust toward colleagues; (2) psychological danger led to knowledge hiding as a self-protection mechanism; (3) interpersonal distrust, often rooted in past conflicts, increased knowledge hiding due to doubts about how shared knowledge would be used; (4) compassion training effectively moderated psychological danger's impact on distrust by fostering empathy and emotional regulation; and (5) knowledge attributes (complexity and implicitness) contributed to interpersonal distrust. Expanding Lanke's (2023) model by incorporating knowledge attributes, this study confirmed prior relationships while uniquely highlighting their role in distrust dynamics. Practical recommendations include fostering psychological safety through open idea-sharing environments, conflict resolution to rebuild trust, integrating compassion training into employee development, and improving knowledge documentation. Future research could explore longitudinal effects of compassion training on distrust reduction or cross-cultural comparisons of knowledge hiding drivers, particularly in industries with high turnover or intergenerational knowledge transfer challenges.

REFERENCES

Alavi, M., & Leidner, D. E. (2001). Knowledge management and knowledge management systems: Conceptual foundations and research issues. MIS Quarterly, 107–136. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2307/3250961

Anand, P., & Hassan, Y. (2019). Knowledge hiding in organizations: everything that managers need to know. Development and Learning in Organizations: An International Journal, 33(6), 12–15. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1108/DLO-12-2018-0158

Bai, Y., Han, G. H., & Harms, P. D. (2016). Team conflict mediates the effects of organizational politics on employee performance: A cross-level analysis in China. Journal of Business Ethics, 139, 95–109. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2604-6

Bogilović, S., Černe, M., & Škerlavaj, M. (2017). Hiding behind a mask? Cultural intelligence, knowledge hiding, and individual and team creativity. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 26(5), 710–723. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2017.1337747

Černe, M., Hernaus, T., Dysvik, A., & Škerlavaj, M. (2017). The role of multilevel synergistic interplay among team mastery climate, knowledge hiding, and job

characteristics in stimulating innovative work behavior. Human Resource Management Journal, 27(2), 281–299. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12132

Edmond, J., & Lehmann, J. (2021). Digital humanities, knowledge complexity, and the five 'aporias' of digital research. Digital Scholarship in the Humanities, 36(Supplement_2), ii95–ii108. https://doi.org/10.1093/llc/fqab031

Edmondson, A. C., & Lei, Z. (2014). Psychological Safety: The History, Renaissance, and Future of an Interpersonal Construct. In Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior (Vol. 1, pp. 23–43). Annual Reviews Inc. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091305

Ervira Octaviola Kurniawan. (2024, December 7). Inilah Batas Umur Pensiun Karyawan Swasta Tahun 2024 Berdasarkan UU Cipta Kerja yang Telah Ditetapkan Pemerintah. AYOBANDUNG.COM. https://www.ayobandung.com/umum/7914100813/inilah-batas-umur-pensiun-karyawan-swasta-tahun-2024-berdasarkan-uu-cipta-kerja-yang-telah-ditetapkan-pemerintah?page=2

Gilligan, M. J., Pasquale, B. J., & Samii, C. (2013). Civil War and Social Cohesion: Lab-in-the-Field Evidence from Nepal. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12067

Hair, J. F., Sarstedt, M., Hopkins, L., & G. Kuppelwieser, V. (2014). Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) An emerging tool in business research. European Business Review, 26(2), 106–121. https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-10-2013-0128

Jazaieri, H., Jinpa, G. T., McGonigal, K., Rosenberg, E. L., Finkelstein, J., Simon-Thomas, E., Cullen, M., Doty, J. R., Gross, J. J., & Goldin, P. R. (2013). Enhancing Compassion: A Randomized Controlled Trial of a Compassion Cultivation Training Program. Journal of Happiness Studies, 14(4), 1113–1126. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-012-9373-z

Kumar Jha, J., & Varkkey, B. (2018). Are you a cistern or a channel? Exploring factors triggering knowledge-hiding behavior at the workplace: evidence from the Indian R&D professionals. Journal of Knowledge Management, 22(4), 824–849. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-02-2017-0048

Lanke, P. (2023). "Is compassion an answer to the hiding problem?" Role of psychological danger and compassion training in knowledge hiding behavior. Development and Learning in Organizations, 37(1), 18–22. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1108/DLO-12-2021-0229

Liu, W., Zhang, P., Liao, J., Hao, P., & Mao, J. (2016). Abusive supervision and employee creativity: The mediating role of psychological safety and organizational identification. Management Decision, 54(1), 130–147. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-09-2013-0443

Lupoli, M. J., Zhang, M., Yin, Y., & Oveis, C. (2020). A Conflict of Values: When Perceived Compassion Decreases Trust. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2020.104049

Malik, O. F., Shahzad, A., Raziq, M. M., Khan, M. M., Yusaf, S., & Khan, A. (2019). Perceptions of organizational politics, knowledge hiding, and employee creativity: The moderating role of professional commitment. Personality and Individual Differences, 142, 232–237. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2018.05.005

Men, C., Fong, P. S. W., Huo, W., Zhong, J., Jia, R., & Luo, J. (2020). Ethical Leadership and Knowledge Hiding: A Moderated Mediation Model of Psychological Safety and Mastery Climate. Journal of Business Ethics, 166(3), 461–472. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-018-4027-7

Rajan, T. N. (2017). Unit-4 Knowledge: Definition, Types, Nature, Properties and Scope. http://hdl.handle.net/123456789/10933

Rhee, Y. W., & Choi, J. N. (2017). Knowledge Management Behavior and Individual Creativity: Goal Orientations as Antecedents and In-group Social Status as Moderating Contingency. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 38(6), 813–832. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2168

Scott, K. L., Restubog, S. L. D., & Zagenczyk, T. J. (2013). A social exchange-based model of the antecedents of workplace exclusion. Journal of Applied Psychology, 98(1), 37. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030135

Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2016). Research methods for business: A skill building approach. john wiley & sons.

Sugiono. (2019). METODE-PENELITIAN-KUANTITATIF-KUALITATIF-DAN-R-D-Sugiono.

Swift, P. E., & Hwang, A. (2013). The impact of affective and cognitive trust on knowledge sharing and organizational learning. The Learning Organization, 20(1), 20–37. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1108/09696471311288500

Waluyo, M. W. (2016). CORE View metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk provided by UPN Jatim Repository.

Wang, Y., Han, M. S., Xiang, D., & Hampson, D. P. (2018). The double-edged effects of perceived knowledge hiding: empirical evidence from the sales context. Journal of Knowledge Management, 23(2), 279–296. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-04-2018-0245

Yuan, Y., Yang, L., Cheng, X., & Wei, J. (2020). What is bullying hiding? Exploring antecedents and potential dimension of knowledge hiding. Journal of Knowledge Management, 25(5), 1146–1169. https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-04-2020-0256

Zhao, H., Xia, Q., He, P., Sheard, G., & Wan, P. (2016). Workplace ostracism and knowledge hiding in service organizations. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 59, 84–94. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2016.09.009