Ranah Research
Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development
E-ISSN: 2655-0865
082170743613 ranahresearch@gmail.com https://jurnal.ranahresearch.com
DINASTI RESEARCH

DOI: https://doi.org/10.38035/rrj.v8i4

Analysis of Factors Influencing Knowledge Sharing with the Moderating Effect of Perceived Organizational Support Among Civil Servants in Indonesia: Case Study of BPS-Statistics Indonesia

Muhammad Rizki[1], Dana Indra Sensuse[2], Sofian Lusa[3], Nadya Safitri[4], Damayanti Elisabeth[5]
[1]Faculty of Computer Science, Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia, muhammad.rizki411@ui.ac.id
[2]Faculty of Computer Science, Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia, dana@cs.ui.ac.id
[3]Faculty of Computer Science, Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia, sofian.lusa12@ui.ac.id
[4]Faculty of Computer Science, Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia, nadya.safitri@ui.ac.id
[5]Faculty of Computer Science, Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia, damayanti.elisabeth@ui.ac.id

Corresponding Author: muhammad.rizki411@ui.ac.id

Abstract: As an essential component of knowledge management within organizations, knowledge sharing helps to improve teamwork, especially in government institutions that involve civil servants. This research aims to determine the factors that influence Knowledge Sharing Behavior (KSB), performing consideration of Knowledge Sharing Intention (KSI) as an endogenous driver, Perceived Organizational Support (POS) as a moderating variable, and self-efficacy, subjective norm, horizontal trust, vertical trust, IT adoption, and public service motivation as exogenous variables. Based on a survey of 327 respondents at the BPS-Statistics of Indonesia, the results reveal that Self-efficacy, Subjective Norms, and IT Adoption concurrently have a positive direct impact on both Knowledge Sharing Intention and Knowledge Sharing Behavior. Furthermore, Public Service Motivation and Knowledge Sharing Intention also exhibit a positive direct effect on the target variable. Nevertheless, neither horizontal nor vertical trust has an impact on the way people share knowledge. Meanwhile, regarding the moderating effects, perceived organizational support possesses the power to specifically strengthen the relationship between Self-efficacy and Knowledge Sharing Intention, whereas its interaction effects on other behavioral pathways are found to be non-significant.

Keywords: Knowledge sharing, government, civil servants, perceived organizational support

INTRODUCTION

Technological developments currently serve as the primary catalyst for massive digital transformation across various sectors, including the public sector (Aghimien et al., 2022; Brunetti et al., 2020). Digital transformation involves more than just technological change; it

encompasses fundamental shifts in work processes, organizational structures, and organizational governance (Aghimien et al., 2022). As providers of public services, governments are expected to adapt dynamically in response to digital challenges and opportunities in order to enhance efficiency, accountability, and better public service delivery (Brunetti et al., 2020; Sumara et al., 2025).

In Indonesia, the transformation of the public sector is being carried out through Sistem Pemerintah Berbasis Elektronik (SPBE) policy, which represents a cohesive structure for applying technology in order to support governance and public services (Indonesia, 2018). One of the indicators used in evaluating the SPBE is the implementation of knowledge management (Indonesia, 2018).

Knowledge management involves the coordinated handling of organizational knowledge through its development, preservation, distribution, and practical use (Shateri & Hayat, 2020). Knowledge sharing is a key dimension within the broader field of knowledge management, which is the behavior of individuals to share information, experiences, and expertise with colleagues (Iswahyudi et al., 2023; Kmieciak, 2020; Santos et al., 2023). Knowledge sharing has been shown to enhance organizational learning, promote collaboration, and foster innovation in a dynamic government environment (Zan et al., 2024; Ansong et al., 2023; Salehi & Alanbari, 2023).

Earlier research has identified a number of challenges in implementing knowledge sharing in the government sector, including hierarchical bureaucratic structures, a weak culture of sharing, and limited supporting infrastructure (Brunetti et al., 2020; Mohd Rasdi & Tangaraja, 2022; Tseng, 2017). However, various studies have also confirmed that effective knowledge sharing process has beneficial effects on the performance of public sector organizations (Mohd Rasdi & Tangaraja, 2022; Castaneda et al., 2016).

BPS-Statistics of Indonesia as a government agency with a hierarchical organizational structure from the central to regional levels has dynamics and issues regarding knowledge sharing. In practice, BPS regularly encourages their employees to participate in training, workshops, and competency development to improve human resource capacity (BPS, 2025). However, the knowledge gained from these trainings is often only stored by certain individuals, without any system or organizational encouragement to ensure that this knowledge is spread evenly to other employees. As a result, there is an information and competency gap between employees and between departments.

Based on previous research, several factors have been recognized as significant predictors of knowledge sharing. These factors include individual aspects such as self-efficacy and subjective norm, which are related to self-confidence and social pressure to share knowledge (Castaneda et al., 2016; Devi et al., 2024; Haron et al., 2023). On the other hand, organizational factors such as horizontal trust, vertical trust, IT adoption, and public service motivation also contribute to creating a work environment that supports knowledge sharing (Kmieciak, 2020; Devi et al., 2024; Kipkosgei et al., 2020; Mohd Rasdi & Tangaraja, 2022; Tseng, 2017). Perceived organizational support is also an important element reflecting the degree to which employees feel cared for and appreciated by the organization, which can encourage knowledge sharing (Shateri & Hayat, 2020; Castaneda et al., 2016).

However, there is an ongoing deficiency in the literature about how various individual and organizational factors simultaneously influence knowledge sharing, particularly in complex government organizations such as the BPS (Devi et al., 2024). The number of studies that integrate these factors into a comprehensive model and explore the moderating roles of perceived organizational support remains relatively limited. Understanding the moderating effect is crucial for explaining the dynamics of interactions among variables that contribute to a more thorough understanding of knowledge sharing behavior. In response, this research endeavors to close the gap by analyzing the effects of factors at both individual and

organizational levels affecting knowledge sharing and testing how perceived organizational support moderates these relationships.

Literature Review

The problem formulation contains article questions that must be explained in the discussion and answered in the conclusion.
Literature Review

Self Efficacy (SE)

SE represents the degree to which an individual feels confident in accomplishing tasks or fulfilling goals (Haron et al., 2023). In terms of knowledge sharing, self-efficacy can influence how competent individuals feel to contribute and share the information or expertise they have (Devi et al., 2024). Prior studies have demonstrated that self-efficacy impacts both the willingness behind sharing knowledge and the concrete acts of sharing (Devi et al., 2024).

H1: *Self-efficacy has a positive effect on Knowledge Sharing Intention*.
H2: *Self-efficacy has a positive effect on Knowledge Sharing Behavior*

Subjective Norm (SN)

Subjective norm describes the extent to which individuals feel that those around them, especially those they consider to be important, expect them to participate in a particular activity (Haron et al., 2023). In this context, social support or pressure from supervisors, colleagues, and the work environment are factors that shape the desire to share knowledge (Liang et al., 2016). Subjective norm has been proven to be one of the main predictors in previous studies to examine an individual's intentions and behavior (Castaneda et al., 2016; Tseng, 2017).

H3: *Subjective norms have a positive effect on Knowledge Sharing Intention*.
H4: *Subjective norms have a positive effect on Knowledge Sharing Behavior*

IT Adoption

IT adoption involves the process of accepting and using information technology by individuals or organizations to perform specific activities using technology (Tseng, 2017). In knowledge sharing, the adoption of digital technology has become crucial because digital platforms are often used as the primary channel for knowledge exchange (Tseng, 2017). The level of adoption is shaped by multiple factors, including perceptions of how beneficial technology is, and the technology, perceptions of ease of use, and organizational readiness (Tseng, 2017).

H5: *IT Adoption has a positive effect on Knowledge Sharing Intention*.
H6: *IT Adoption has a positive effect on Knowledge Sharing Behavior*

Horizontal trust (HT)

Horizontal trust reflects the trustworthiness perceived among individuals holding equivalent positions in an organization, such as between coworkers (Kmieciak, 2020). This trust is an important foundation for creating an open and collaborative work environment (Santos et al., 2023). An environment based on mutual trust allows individuals to share knowledge without worries about being judged negatively by their colleagues (Santos et al., 2023). The strong connection between horizontal trust and behavior exhibited in knowledge sharing is well-established in existing research, both in the context of tacit and explicit knowledge (Kmieciak, 2020).

H7: *Horizontal Trust has a positive effect on Knowledge Sharing Behavior*

Vertical Trust (VT)

Vertical trust describes the confidence employees have in those at higher or lower positions within the organization, such as supervisors or subordinates (Kmieciak, 2020). This trust has become a key element in bridging cross-level communication, while encouraging openness in conveying ideas, information, and sensitive knowledge (Shateri & Hayat, 2020). Previous research has stated that vertical trust correlates with knowledge sharing behavior, both in the form of active contributions and information gathering and can increase innovative behavior in the work environment (Kmieciak, 2020).

H8: *Vertical Trust has a positive effect on Knowledge Sharing Behavior*

Public Service Motivation (PSM)

PSM is commonly seen as the willingness of individuals to dedicate effort toward public and community interest (Mohd Rasdi & Tangaraja, 2022). In public sector organizations, this motivation acts as a driving factor in encouraging individuals to actively share knowledge, especially when these actions are believed to improve the effectiveness of the services provided (Mohd Rasdi & Tangaraja, 2022; Hwang, 2012).

H9: *Public Service Motivation has a positive effect on Knowledge Sharing Behavior*

Knowledge Sharing Intention (KSI)

The intention to share knowledge represents a person's motivation or commitment to perform knowledge sharing behaviors later on (Castaneda et al., 2016). This intention is often used as an early indicator that can predict future behavior (Castaneda et al., 2016). Factors such as perceived behavioral control, attitude, and subjective norms often serve as the primary determinants in forming this intention or desire (Castaneda et al., 2016).

H10: *Knowledge Sharing Intention has a positive effect on Knowledge Sharing Behavior*

Knowledge Sharing Behavior (KSB)

The behavior of knowledge sharing consists of actual activities performed by someone to openly share what they have learned and experienced with fellow members of an organization (Shateri & Hayat, 2020). This activity is a strategic and key element in managing organizational knowledge efficiently and effectively (Santos et al., 2023). KSB plays an important role for organizations in supporting employee competency development, increasing organizational value, and maintaining the organization's competitive advantage (Santos et al., 2023). Previous studies have identified various determining factors, including trust, motivation, and perceived organizational support (Mohd Rasdi & Tangaraja, 2022). This activity can be carried out to share tacit or explicit knowledge through direct interaction or digital platforms (Kim, 2009).

Perceived organizational support (POS)

OS refers to how employees perceive the organization’s recognition of their contributions and its care for their overall well-being (Shateri & Hayat, 2020). The level of this perception is closely related to employees' involvement and commitment to knowledge sharing (Shateri & Hayat, 2020).

H11: *Perceived organizational support positively moderates the relationship between Self-efficacy and Knowledge Sharing Intention*.

H12: *Perceived organizational support positively moderates the relationship between Self-efficacy and Knowledge Sharing Behavior*.
H13: *Perceived organizational support positively moderates the relationship between Subjective norms and Knowledge Sharing Intention*.
H14: *Perceived organizational support positively moderates the relationship between Subjective norms and Knowledge Sharing Behavior*.

Related Studies

Based on the literature, it is known that several studies have examined the various factors that drive knowledge sharing among individuals. Previous research indicates that knowledge sharing is influenced by individual factors, organizational factors, and the social environment within organizations.

Research undertaken by Devi et al. (2024), which examined KSB in government institutions, especially at the Ministry of Law and Human Rights in Indonesia, found that KSB is shaped by a range of influencing factors. In this study, factors such as IT adoption, self-efficacy, recognition and reward, organizational commitment, and horizontal trust were utilized to explore their association with KSB. In addition, leadership style was examined as a moderating variable. The results showed that all variables except recognition and reward had a significant positive effect on KSB. Furthermore, leadership style was found to moderate the relationships involving IT adoption and recognition and reward.

Another study conducted by Kmieciak (2020) in Poland investigated the relationship between horizontal trust, vertical trust, and innovative work behavior, with knowledge sharing serving as a mediating variable. The findings revealed that both horizontal trust and vertical trust significantly influenced knowledge sharing.

Research conducted in a public organization in Colombia by Castaneda et al. (2016) also analyzed factors influencing KSI and KSB. The study found that self-efficacy significantly affected KSI, whereas subjective norm significantly affected KSB

METHOD

Research Instruments

A structured questionnaire with several statements representing the research variables serves as the instrument for this study. A five-point Likert scale, which goes from 1 (strongly in opposition) to five (strongly agree), is used to measure each characteristic through a series of questions.

The variables measured in this study include: KSB, KSI, self-efficacy, subjective norm, horizontal trust, vertical trust, IT adoption, public service motivation, and perceived organizational support.

Data Collection

A quantitative approach was employed in this study, with data primarily gathered through surveys. BPS staff from both headquarters and regional participated in the survey through questionnaire distribution, with a total of 17,969 employees. This method is considered appropriate for collecting data on individuals' perceptions, attitudes, and intentions toward organizational behaviors such as knowledge sharing.

Data Processing

The PLS-SEM approach, supported by SmartPLS software, was used to process the data in this study. This method was chosen because of its ability to handle complex research models consisting of many latent constructs and indicators, and it doesn't require normal distribution of data (Hair et al., 2017).

The analysis was conducted through two main phases: measurement model evaluation and structural model evaluation (Hair et al., 2017). During the measurement model evaluation, tests were conducted on convergent validity, discriminant validity, and construct reliability. The purpose of this phase was to ensure that each construct was accurately measured by its indicators. Once the measurement model meets the required criteria, the next stage is structural model evaluation. This stage involves testing the relationships between constructs through path coefficient analysis and R-square (Hair et al., 2019). The significance test is performed using the bootstrapping technique.

Additionally, analysis is conducted on moderator variables to test POS in strengthening the interconnections between determinant constructs and KSB and KSI.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Demographics Distribution

Based on the results obtained from data collection using an online questionnaire, a total of 327 respondents were obtained, consisting of 171 males and 156 females. According to age, the largest number of respondents were in the 25-26 years, while the smallest number was in the >55 years. Regarding educational background, the predominant number of participants were DIV/S1 graduates, while the smallest number were DI/DII/DIII graduates. Table 1 illustrates the characteristics of the respondent distribution.

Table 1. Demographic Distribution

Demographic	Category	Total	percentage
Gender	Male	171	52,29%
	Female	156	47,71%
Age	18 – 25	30	9,17%
	26 – 35	159	48,62%
	36 – 45	77	23,55%
	46 – 55	51	15,60%
	> 55	10	3,06%
Education	Senior High School	13	3,98%
	DI/DII/DIII	7	2,14%
	DIV/bachelor	244	74,62%
	Master/Doctoral	63	19,27%

Measurement Models

In this study, measurements are performed on the model in several stages, including internal validity using loading factors, followed by assessment of discriminant validity that was subsequently carried out through two separate analyses, First, the Fornell-Larcker Criterion and then a cross-loading analysis was performed, and finally a reliability test through construct reliability and validity (Hair et al., 2011).

Table 2. Outer Loadings

Indicators	LF	Indicators	LF	Indicators	LF
HT_1	0.826	KSI_3	0.929	SE_4	0.808
HT_2	0.825	POS_1	0.895	SN_1	0.635
HT_3	0.854	POS_2	0.633	SN_2	0.804
IT_1	0.958	POS_3	0.857	SN_3	0.784
IT_2	0.961	PSM_1	0.778	SN_4	0.841
KSB_1	0.944	PSM_2	0.861	VT_1	0.855
KSB_2	0.957	PSM_3	0.738	VT_2	0.891

Indicators	LF	Indicators	LF	Indicators	LF
KSB_3	0.943	SE_1	0.786	VT_3	0.855
KSI_1	0.940	SE_2	0.862		
KSI_2	0.932	SE_3	0.874		
Values less than 0.70					

KSB = knowledge sharing behavior, KSI = knowledge sharing intention, SE = self-efficacy, SN = subjective norm, HT = horizontal trust, VT = vertical trust, POS = perceived organizational support, PSM = public service motivation, IT = IT adoption,

In the internal validity analysis using loading factors, the standard for valid indicators is having a loading factor greater than 0.70. Based on the data in Table 2, there are two indicators with loading factors below the standard, namely POS2 in the Perceived Organizational Support construct with a value of 0.633 and SN1 in the Subjective Norm construct with a value of 0.635. Therefore, these two indicators were excluded from the measurement to uphold the integrity and credibility of the measurement.

To guarantee that every construct differs from the others both philosophically and empirically, discriminate validity testing is conducted. To verify that the AVE for a particular construct is higher than the correlations it has with other constructs, the first analysis used the Fornell-Larcker criterion to see if each construct square root of the AVE was higher than its correlations with every other construct. It can be inferred from table 3's data that the AVE value of each construct is higher than the others. Furthermore, in the Cross loadings test, the value of each indicator demonstrates has a higher value on the construct that is measured. So based on those things, it can be said that the model satisfies the criterion for discriminant validity.

Table 3. Fornell-Larcker Criterion

Variable	HT	IT	KSB	KSI	POS	PSM	SE	SN	VT
HT	0.835								
IT	0.211	0.960							
KSB	0.374	0.266	0.948						
KSI	0.370	0.319	0.628	0.934					
POS	0.503	0.125	0.475	0.362	0.934				
PSM	0.552	0.308	0.518	0.523	0.460	0.794			
SE	0.375	0.093	0.514	0.452	0.504	0.457	0.833		
SN	0.524	0.104	0.545	0.517	0.560	0.484	0.608	0.823	
VT	0.614	0.178	0.366	0.341	0.546	0.524	0.392	0.467	0.867

The cross-loadings test showed that each indicator loaded most strongly on its respective construct, confirming that the model satisfies discriminant validity criteria. To assess construct validity further, composite reliability was computed, with a required threshold above 0.70. Separately, Cronbach's alpha was also evaluated using the same cutoff. Table 4 displays the composite reliability values, alongside Cronbach's alpha results, all of which exceed the minimum acceptable level, demonstrating that the measurement model is reliable.

Table 4. Validity and Reliability Analysis

	rho_a	rho_c	Cronbach's alpha	AVE
HT	0.793	0.874	0.785	0.698
IT Adoption	0.916	0.959	0.914	0.921
KSB	0.945	0.964	0.944	0.899
KSI	0.927	0.953	0.927	0.872
LS	0.865	0.931	0.853	0.871
POS	0.717	0.836	0.705	0.630
PSM	0.855	0.901	0.852	0.694

	rho_a	rho_c	Cronbach's alpha	AVE
SE	0.779	0.863	0.764	0.677
SN	0.854	0.901	0.838	0.752
VT	0.793	0.874	0.785	0.698

Structural Model

In order to assess the structural model, R-square or the coefficient of determination, is examined (Hair et al., 2011). This value indicates how well exogenous factors contribute to the variation in the endogenous variables. According to the findings in Table 5, it can be seen that the KSB variable has an R-square value of 0.524. This implies that 52.4% of the variance in Knowledge Sharing Behavior (KSB) can be explained by the exogenous variables in this study, and this value can be categorized as moderate. Meanwhile, for Knowledge Sharing Intention (KSI), it is known to have an R-square value of 0.375. This value implies that 37.5% of the variance in KSI is explained by its predictor variables, which can also be categorized at a moderate level.

Table 5. R-Square Analysis

	Value	Adjusted Value
KSB	0.524	0.509
KSI	0.375	0.364

To conduct hypothesis testing, an analysis was made based on the path coefficient value which was derived from the measurement of the path coefficient and the specific indirect effect on measurements using PLS-SEM. The direction of the path is established by evaluating the original sample value. If the original sample value is positive, it indicates that there is a direct relationship, this means that if there is an increase in one of the constructs, there will be an increase in the related construct. Meanwhile, if the value is negative, then an increase in one of the constructs will cause a decrease in other constructs.

Table 6. Path Coefficients

	Hypothesis	Original sample	P values	Result
H01	SE -> KSI	0,222	0	S
H02	SE ->KSB	0,114	0,047	S
H03	SN ->KSI	0,323	0	S
H04	SN ->KSB	0,162	0,006	S
H05	IT Adoption ->KSI	0,257	0	S
H06	IT Adoption ->KSB	0,064	0,048	S
H07	HT ->KSB	-0,057	0,165	NS
H08	VT ->KSB	-0,011	0,424	NS
H09	PSM ->KSB	0,143	0,011	S
H10	KSI ->KSB	0,37	0	S
H11	POS x SE ->KSI	0,097	0,029	S
H12	POS x SE ->KSB	-0,071	0,126	NS
H13	POS x SN ->KSI	-0,038	0,297	NS
H14	POS x SN ->KSB	0,082	0,082	NS

* S = Supported, Ns = Not Supported.

To assess the path's importance, an analysis is also conducted using the p-value at a 5% significance level. Therefore, there are 13 hypotheses tested in this study that are accepted.

Hypothesis Test

In the variable self-efficacy, it is known in H1 that self-efficacy has a noteworthy beneficial impact on Knowledge Sharing Intention (KSI). Furthermore, H2 reveals that self-efficacy also has a significant direct effect on Knowledge Sharing Behavior (KSB), though statistically much weaker (O=0.114, P=0.047) compared to its impact on intention (O=0.222, P=0.000). This indicates an essential dynamic within the organization: while employees'

confidence in their competencies heavily drives their intention to share, high self-efficacy alone does not automatically translate into robust, proactive behavior without a strong psychological transition from intention to action.

In terms of subjective norms, this variable was found to have a powerful and highly significant direct impact on both KSI (H3) and KSB (H4). This is clearly reflected in the organizational pattern where explicit or implicit expectations, alongside active support from supervisors and coworkers, create a compelling social environment. This social encouragement concurrently drives both the employees' internal desire (intention) and their immediate daily actions to engage in knowledge sharing behavior.

Regarding IT adoption, hypotheses H5 and H6 reveal that IT adoption has a highly significant impact on KSI, while its direct effect on KSB is statistically significant but quite marginal (O=0.064, P=0.048). This indicates that even though the organization has implemented appropriate IT infrastructures such as corporate email, digital collaboration/repository platforms, or instant messaging like WhatsApp to facilitate data exchange, the availability of technology primarily shapes the readiness and intention to share. To fully transform this technological adoption into active, consistent knowledge sharing behavior, employees must still possess a strong personal willingness to utilize these digital tools.

In the other two trust-related variables tested in this study, which were horizontal trust (H7) and vertical trust (H8), it was found that the influence of both variables on KSB was not significant, leading to the rejection of both hypotheses. This can be attributed to specific organizational conditions where a rigid or bureaucratic structure might inadvertently overshadow interpersonal trust. Additionally, if an individualistic or competitive work climate exists, it acts as a barrier from the horizontal trust perspective, while bureaucratic boundaries stifle vertical trust, preventing these factors from successfully driving knowledge sharing behavior.

Furthermore, public service motivation (PSM) under H9 was determined to have a direct, positive, and significant impact on KSB. This demonstrates that the organization's inherent goal to serve the public interest naturally encourages employees to exhibit knowledge sharing behavior. Their intrinsic drive to improve public service quality, operational efficiency, and administrative decision-making manifests directly in their daily collaborative activities.

Before the moderation analysis is discussed further, H10 analysis was used to examine the relationship between Knowledge Sharing Intention (KSI) and Knowledge Sharing Behavior (KSB). The results indicate that there is a highly meaningful and positive impact between employee intentions and their actual behavior. This strongly supports the notion that an employee's internal intention to share knowledge tends to directly realize actual knowledge sharing activities within the organization.

In the moderation variable testing, out of the four interaction hypotheses proposed, only H11 was accepted. In H11, it is proven that Perceived Organizational Support (POS) significantly and positively moderates the relationship between self-efficacy and KSI. This demonstrates that when employees feel highly valued and supported by the organization, their confidence in their own capabilities is heavily amplified, drastically increasing their intention to share knowledge.

Conversely, the other three moderation hypotheses, which are H12 (POS moderating self-efficacy → KSB), H13 (POS moderating subjective norms → KSI), and H14 (POS moderating subjective norms → KSB), were all rejected. This indicates that POS does not directly interact with subjective norms or the direct link between self-efficacy and behavior. In these pathways, the existing social norms and individual capabilities operate independently of how employees perceive overarching organizational support.

Implications

This research provides implications both theoretically and practically for government organizations, especially the case study organization, BPS-Statistics of Indonesia in improving knowledge sharing behavior whithin the organization.

Theoritical Implications

This study contributes to a better understanding of the factors shaping KSB, especially in government agencies. For the first variable, self-efficacy, this study supports and expands previous empirical findings (Castaneda et al., 2016; Devi et al., 2024). The statistical results confirm that self-efficacy acts as a critical antecedent that simultaneously drives both the internal desire to share knowledge (Knowledge Sharing Intention / KSI) and the actual execution of the behavior (Knowledge Sharing Behavior / KSB).

In addition, this study confirms that subjective norms play play an indispensable role in encouraging individuals to engage in knowledge sharing (Castaneda et al., 2016). The empirical evidence here demonstrates that social expectations from peers and supervisors heavily and directly determine both an employee's intention (KSI) and actual sharing actions (KSB) concurrently.

The inclusion of Public Service Motivation (PSM) also emerges as a vital theoretical contribution, proving to have a direct, positive, and significant impact on KSB. This aligns with prior literature emphasizing that a strong public-service orientation drives collaborative behaviors (Mohd Rasdi & Tangaraja, 2022).

Perceived Organizational Support (POS) as a moderator reveals nuanced theoretical insights. While traditional literature assumes organizational support universally accelerates all sharing pathways, this study shows that POS specifically interacts with individual capabilities. Conversely, the rejection of H12, H13, and H14 indicates that POS does not alter direct behavioral executions or social pressure patterns, proving that subjective norms and direct behavioral pathways operate independently of overarching organizational support.

The application of technology adoption described in the IT adoption variable also supports the findings of previous research where IT adoption can increase knowledge sharing behavior (Devi et al., 2024; Tseng, 2017). However, while IT adoption strongly drives intention, its direct path to behavior is remarkably marginal. This shifts the theoretical focus from merely providing IT infrastructure to cultivating user willingness and mental readiness to utilize those tools.

In general, it was discovered that the knowledge sharing intention variable expanded previous research so that future research is expected to consider this variable as a basis for knowledge sharing behavior where previous research only include self-efficacy and subjective norm as their variables (Castaneda et al., 2016).

However, the study presents an intriguing contradiction to established trust literature (Kmieciak, 2020; Santos et al., 2023; Devi et al., 2024; Kipkosgei et al., 2020; Mohd Rasdi & Tangaraja, 2022; Jiarui et al., 2022). Regarding Horizontal Trust (H7) and Vertical Trust (H8), both of which were found to be non-significant. This divergence theoretically signals that in highly structured, formal, or bureaucratic settings, systemic structural frameworks and social compliance mechanisms can heavily overshadow personal interpersonal trust. Meanwhile, Public Service Motivation (H9) and Knowledge Sharing Intention (H10) prove to have a direct, positive, and significant impact on KSB, confirming that public-service orientation (Mohd Rasdi & Tangaraja, 2022) and internal intention are the most vital proximal drivers of actual collaborative action.

Practical Implications

This research is expected to be a guideline for government agencies, especially BPS-Statistics of Indonesia, in order to formulate effective strategies to increase KSB among

employees. To promote knowledge sharing, organizations must ensure an environment where employees feel comfortable, confident in their own expertise (self-efficacy), and unafraid of being criticized. The organization must encourage open communication, collaboration across positions, and mutual respect so that they can build a conducive work environment. Organizational or department leaders need to show their support consistently (perceived organizational support)—such as providing appreciation and dedicated resources—because this institutional backing is proven to heavily amplify employees' confidence into a strong intention to share.

In addition, organizations need to cultivate the value of social care, public service motivation (PSM), and commitment to common interests so it will naturally encourage increased KSB driven by their intrinsic goal to serve the public. A healthy work culture must also be established by strengthening positive subjective norms, where leaders clearly communicate and model expectations regarding knowledge exchange so that social encouragement from coworkers becomes a standard workflow. Lastly, a positive perception of technology adoption must be built through continuous digital literacy support, ensuring that information technology is viewed as an intuitive asset that simplifies tasks, which in the future will strengthen the creation of a sustainable learning ecosystem in the workplace.

CONCLUSION

Based on the empirical findings gathered from 327 respondents at BPS-Statistics Indonesia, this study concludes that Knowledge Sharing Behavior (KSB) is directly driven by Knowledge Sharing Intention (KSI), Self-efficacy, Subjective Norms, Public Service Motivation (PSM), and IT Adoption. Among these direct pathways, Self-efficacy, Subjective Norms, and IT Adoption concurrently drive the formation of employees' internal intentions (KSI), which ultimately stands as the strongest direct predictor of actual sharing actions (KSB). Conversely, Horizontal Trust and Vertical Trust have no significant impact on driving knowledge sharing within this bureaucratic framework, indicating that rigid structures or competitive work climates might overshadow personal interpersonal trust. In terms of moderation, Perceived Organizational Support (POS) is proven to play a selective yet vital role by significantly strengthening the positive relationship between Self-efficacy and Knowledge Sharing Intention (KSI). However, POS does not successfully moderate the direct paths toward behavior or pathways stemming from subjective norms, confirming that social expectations and direct behavioral execution operate independently of overarching organizational support.

To strengthen knowledge sharing within the organization, several actionable strategies should be implemented. BPS should focus heavily on fostering the initial intention to share by designing structured collaborative environments that lower psychological barriers, allowing employees to feel comfortable exchanging experiences, methods, and data. Furthermore, management must implement persuasive programs that encourage cross-hierarchical knowledge exchange across all organizational levels, effectively eliminating bureaucratic hesitation. A healthy corporate culture should also be institutionalized by aligning social expectations with daily workflows, where leaders explicitly communicate expectations, set concrete models, and formally appreciate active knowledge contributors. Additionally, it is critical to align knowledge sharing with the agency's core public service mission, as employees who perceive their contributions as beneficial to national statistics and society will be more intrinsically motivated to collaborate. Lastly, BPS must support its IT adoption with active organizational backing by providing intuitive, seamless digital systems alongside continuous training, ensuring that information technology is viewed as a valuable asset that effectively facilitates sustainable knowledge sharing.

REFERENCE

Aghimien, D., Aigbavboa, C., Oke, A. E., & Aliu, J. (2022). Delineating the people-related features required for construction digitalisation. *Construction Innovation, 24*(7), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1108/CI-01-2022-0012

Ansong, A., Ennin, E. E., & Yeboah, M. A. (2023). Relational leadership and employee creativity: The role of knowledge-sharing behaviour and leader–follower dyadic tenure. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Insights, 6*(5), 1890–1908. https://doi.org/10.1108/JHTI-06-2022-0218

Badan Pusat Statistik. (2025). *Laporan kinerja BPS*.

Brunetti, F., Matt, D. T., Bonfanti, A., De Longhi, A., Pedrini, G., & Orzes, G. (2020). Digital transformation challenges: Strategies emerging from a multi-stakeholder approach. *The TQM Journal, 32*(4), 697–724. https://doi.org/10.1108/TQM-12-2019-0309

Castaneda, D. I., Fernández Ríos, M., & Durán, W. F. (2016). Determinants of knowledge-sharing intention and knowledge-sharing behavior in a public organization. *Knowledge Management & E-Learning, 8*(2), 372–386.

Devi, R. K., Yulfitri, A., Hidayat, D. S., & Sensuse, D. I. (2024). Determinants of knowledge sharing among civil servants and the moderating effects of leadership styles. *Business Information Review, 41*(1), 20–33. https://doi.org/10.1177/02663821231216687

Hair, J. F., Hollingsworth, C. L., Randolph, A. B., & Chong, A. Y. L. (2017). An updated and expanded assessment of PLS-SEM in information systems research. *Industrial Management & Data Systems, 117*(3), 442–458. https://doi.org/10.1108/IMDS-04-2016-0130

Hair, J. F., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2011). PLS-SEM: Indeed a silver bullet. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice, 19*(2), 139–152. https://doi.org/10.2753/MTP1069-6679190202

Hair, J. F., Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. *European Business Review, 31*(1), 2–24. https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-11-2018-0203

Haron, H., Mat Nor, F., Johari, F., Misbah, H., & Shafii, Z. (2023). Factors influencing the behavioural intention to accept benefidonor concept among stakeholders of waqf. *Journal of Islamic Accounting and Business Research, 14*(8), 1344–1360. https://doi.org/10.1108/JIABR-06-2022-0146

Hwang, Y. (2012). Understanding moderating effects of collectivist cultural orientation on the knowledge sharing attitude by email. *Computers in Human Behavior, 28*(6), 2169–2174. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2012.06.023

Indonesia. (2018). *Peraturan Presiden Republik Indonesia Nomor 95 Tahun 2018 tentang Sistem Pemerintahan Berbasis Elektronik*.

Iswahyudi, P., Dwiyanto, Kosasih, A., & Putra, I. (2023). The relationship between individual competencies and creativity of cadet with knowledge sharing: A case study at the Indonesian Pilot Academy. *International Journal of Professional Business Review, 8*(7), e02485. https://doi.org/10.26668/businessreview/2023.v8i7.2485

Jiarui, W., Xiaoli, Z., & Jiafu, S. (2022). Interpersonal relationship, knowledge characteristic, and knowledge sharing behavior of online community members: A TAM perspective. *Computational Intelligence and Neuroscience, 2022*, Article 4188480. https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/4188480

Kim, S. (2009). Revising Perry's measurement scale of public service motivation. *The American Review of Public Administration, 39*(2), 149–163. https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074008317681

Kipkosgei, F., Son, S. Y., & Kang, S. W. (2020). Coworker trust and knowledge sharing among public sector employees in Kenya. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 17*(6), Article 2009. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17062009

Kmieciak, R. (2020). Trust, knowledge sharing, and innovative work behavior: Empirical evidence from Poland. *European Journal of Innovation Management*. https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-04-2020-0134

Liang, C., Chang, C. C., Rothwell, W., & Shu, K. M. (2016). Influences of organizational culture on knowledge sharing in an online virtual community: Interactive effects of trust, communication and leadership. *Journal of Organizational and End User Computing, 28*(4), 15–32. https://doi.org/10.4018/JOEUC.2016100102

Mohd Rasdi, R., & Tangaraja, G. (2022). Knowledge-sharing behaviour in public service organisations: Determinants and the roles of affective commitment and normative commitment. *European Journal of Training and Development, 46*(3–4), 337–355. https://doi.org/10.1108/EJTD-02-2020-0028

Salehi, M., & Sadeq Alanbari, S. A. (2023). Knowledge sharing barriers and knowledge sharing facilitators in innovation. *European Journal of Innovation Management*. https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-12-2022-0702

Santos, R. F., Oliveira, M., & Curado, C. (2023). The effects of the relational dimension of social capital on tacit and explicit knowledge sharing: A mixed-methods approach. *VINE Journal of Information and Knowledge Management Systems, 53*(1), 43–63. https://doi.org/10.1108/VJIKMS-05-2020-0094

Shateri, K., & Hayat, A. A. (2020). Investigating the mediating role of organizational trust in the relationship between perceived organizational support and knowledge sharing. *Knowledge Management & E-Learning, 12*(3), 298–314. https://doi.org/10.34105/j.kmel.2020.12.016

Sumara, A. R., Sobandi, A., & Sojanah, J. (2025). The role of digital culture in mediating transformational leadership on employee performance. *Dinasti International Journal of Economics, Finance & Accounting (DIJEFA)*. https://doi.org/10.38035/dijefa.v5i6

Tseng, S. M. (2017). Investigating the moderating effects of organizational culture and leadership style on IT-adoption and knowledge-sharing intention. *Journal of Enterprise Information Management, 30*(4), 583–604. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEIM-04-2016-0081

Zan, F., Leong, Y. C., Ismail, N. A., Chu, M., Saif, A. N. M., & Islam, K. M. A. (2024). Knowledge sharing and innovation performance: The mediating role of open innovation. *Global Business and Organizational Excellence, 43*(3), 32–45. https://doi.org/10.1002/joe.22235