Unveiling HR Management Issues in Higher Education Institutions: How Does Ethical Leadership Prevent Knowledge Hiding?

Miftachul Mujib[1], Adilla Kustya Ulfa[2]

[1]Department of Management, Faculty of Economics, Universitas Tidar, Indonesia
[2]Department of Management, Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Dian Nuswantoro, Indonesia

Abstract	This study was undertaken due to the limited research on how a knowledge-sharing climate can reduce knowledge-hiding behaviors. Additionally, the moderating effect of ethical leadership in preventing knowledge-hiding intentions has yet to be examined. The purpose of this study is to explore the impact of a knowledge-sharing environment within organizations on knowledge-hiding behaviors in the higher education sector and to assess the role of ethical leadership in enhancing the influence of this culture on such behaviors. Data were gathered from 156 lecturers from various public and private universities in Indonesia using a survey method, and analysis was performed with the SEM-PLS technique. Findings indicate that a knowledge-sharing climate negatively impacts knowledge hiding, and ethical leadership moderates this relationship for certain sample groups, excluding the generational sample group. This study contributes to the theoretical understanding of how a knowledge-sharing environment can help deter knowledge-hiding behavior, and practically, it underscores the importance of fostering ethical leadership to reduce knowledge hiding among lecturers in higher education.
Keywords	knowledge sharing climate; knowledge hiding; ethical leadership; higher education

INTRODUCTION

Society Era 5.0. requires individuals to have the ability to collaborate to support success in work and career, one of which is collaboration in sharing knowledge. Knowledge sharing is beneficial for individual employees and organizational continuity because it can increase the effectiveness and efficiency of organizational operations and encourage the creation of updated knowledge, innovation, and organizational growth (Anand et al., 2022). However, not all individuals have the desire to share the knowledge they have. Instead, they carry out what is known as hiding knowledge. Knowledge hiding is the deliberate act of withholding information or knowledge from others (Xia et al., 2022). Although it is a relatively mild form of deviant behavior in the workplace, this unethical action should be avoided, as it poses risks to both colleagues and overall organizational performance (Ghani et al., 2020; Koay & Lim, 2022).

Research by Peng (2013) states that around 50% of employees intend to withhold, mislead, or hide knowledge from others. They mainly do this to protect their knowledge, maintain expertise dominance, and defensive awareness (Huo et al., 2016). It becomes ironic when it occurs in academic circles, which should act as the leading agents in transferring knowledge to students and society in general. The function of universities as institutions that accommodate scholars in collecting and disseminating knowledge will not run optimally if many academicians practice knowledge hiding. Knowledge hiding in higher education warrants investigation because it is not a trivial problem that will disappear simply by promoting knowledge sharingHowever, knowledge-hiding intention is driven by complex psychological motives and varies across different organizational contexts (Ghani et al., 2020).

Investigation of knowledge-hiding behavior among higher education academics needs to be carried out to plan anticipatory steps to prevent it from hampering knowledge development. However, studies that focus on knowledge-hiding issues in the higher education sector are still limited, not as many as in other sectors such as knowledge

management, the private sector, information technologies companies, and high technology and R&D firms (Anand et al., 2022; Ghani et al., 2020). Several studies in the higher education sector have been carried out, but there is still very little exploration of factors that have the potential to prevent the emergence of knowledge-hidden behavior, especially among lecturers. Demirkasimoglu's (2016) study only explored the relationship between personality traits among academics. Ghani et al. (2020) investigated how interactional justice influences the educational interactions between supervisors and students, as well as the moderating effect of professional commitment on knowledge-hiding behaviors. Research by Xu and Jiesen (2022) took students as objects in testing knowledge hiding in dual method learning on their performance. This study focuses on investigating knowledge hiding in the higher education sector, specifically using lecturers at universities in Indonesia as objects.

In academia, knowledge hiding can be driven by motivational factors across three levels: individual, personal, and organizational (Zutshi et al., 2021). A knowledge-sharing climate can be an organizational condition that can prevent the emergence of knowledge-hiding intentions and behavior among organizational members. A culture of knowledge sharing is a prerequisite for successfully initiating knowledge management in organizations (Jasimuddin & Saci, 2022). A knowledge-sharing climate within an organization naturally encourages individuals to be more open and to share knowledge with one another, reducing the likelihood of engaging in knowledge-hiding behaviors (Ulfa et al., 2023). To date, there appear to be no studies that have specifically investigated how a knowledge-sharing climate might counteract knowledge hiding. In this research, we propose a knowledge-sharing climate as a factor that is thought to prevent knowledge hiding from being tested empirically, according to the suggestions of Xiao and Cooke (2019).

Another condition that has the potential to minimize knowledge-hiding behavior is leadership practices. Leaders can lead their members to share knowledge to support innovation and organizational development, collaborating to exchange ideas, concepts, and knowledge, indirectly reducing the potential for knowledge-hiding intentions. Ethical leadership is seen as effective in reducing intentions to hide knowledge by encouraging actions aligned with norms through both individual behavior and interpersonal relationships. It promotes this conduct among followers via open communication, positive reinforcement, and ethical decision-making (Yadi et al., 2022). While numerous studies position ethical leadership as a factor leading to reduced knowledge hiding (Abdullah et al., 2019; Anser et al., 2021; Koay & Lim, 2022; Yadi et al., 2022), none have examined it as a strengthening variable to help prevent the onset of knowledge hiding. This study posits that ethical leadership acts as a moderating variable, enhancing the effect of a knowledge-sharing climate on reducing knowledge hiding.

This study draws on Hobfoll's (1989) Conservation of Resources (COR) Theory to gain a deeper understanding of why individuals choose to hide their knowledge. According to COR Theory, people strive to acquire, retain, safeguard, and defend resources they consider valuable (Hobfoll, 2001). When individuals perceive threats from others, they may conceal or protect these valuable resources (Hobfoll, 1989). These resources encompass objects, personal traits, conditions, or energy that are either inherently valuable or valuable because they help in acquiring or safeguarding other important resources (Hobfoll, 2001). Since knowledge is viewed as a resource that belongs to others once it is shared, individuals may engage in knowledge hiding as a strategy to protect their resources (Feng & Wang, 2019).

This research has two primary objectives. Firstly, it investigates how the knowledge-sharing climate within an organization affects knowledge-hiding behavior in the higher education sector. Secondly, it explores the moderating role of ethical leadership in enhancing the impact of the knowledge-sharing climate on knowledge-hiding behavior within this sector. The study also includes tests across multiple groups to identify variations in moderation effects between sample groups from two distinct types of institutions: state and private universities in Indonesia. Overall, this research highlights the importance of organizational factors, particularly a knowledge-sharing climate, in mitigating knowledge-hiding behavior. Furthermore, the

research results will support the need to implement ethical leadership to minimize the knowledge-hiding behavior of lecturers in higher education.

Knowledge Hiding

Knowledge hiding is defined as an individual's attempt to withhold or conceal knowledge from others (Connelly et al., 2012; Demirkasimoglu, 2016). This differs from the related concept of knowledge hoarding, where individuals intentionally keep knowledge from others due to a lack of requests for that knowledge (Evans et al., 2015). While knowledge hiding is often seen as the antithesis of knowledge sharing, it is a deliberate act motivated by specific purposes and various factors (Xia et al., 2022). Behaviors associated with knowledge hiding include evasive hiding, playing dumb, and rationalized hiding (Connelly et al., 2012). Evasive hiding involves providing misleading information or promising a complete response later, despite having no real intention to follow through or aiming to delay the response (Anand et al., 2022). Playing dumb refers to a lack of willingness to assist and pretending not to comprehend what someone else is saying (Connelly et al., 2012; Xia et al., 2022). Rationalized hiding occurs when an individual justifies their failure to provide requested knowledge (Anand et al., 2022; Zutshi et al., 2021). Oliveira et al. (2021) highlighted various organizational factors (such as organizational justice, abusive supervision, ethical leadership, and organizational culture), job-related factors (like task autonomy), and personal factors (including psychological ownership, personality traits, and work involvement) that can contribute to knowledge hiding.

Knowledge-sharing Climnate

A knowledge-sharing climate encompasses the organizational values, core beliefs, norms, and social rules that provide a framework for the creation, sharing, and application of knowledge (Ferreira et al. in Lei et al., 2019). Fostering an environment that promotes and supports knowledge sharing increases the likelihood that members will share their expertise and learn from one another (Song et al., 2015). To cultivate a positive knowledge-sharing climate, organizations should concentrate on three key aspects: fairness, innovation, and affiliation (Bock et al., 2014). Implementing fair and equitable organizational policies helps build trust among employees, which can motivate them to share their knowledge (Al-Kurdi et al., 2020; Bock et al., 2014). Trust between members to share knowledge will be built if the organization values their creativity and innovation (Al-Kurdi et al., 2020). In addition, providing organizational resources as tools and instruments for the creation and exchange of knowledge is a form of support for creating an organizational knowledge-sharing climate (Radaelli et al., 2011).

Ethical leadership

Ethical leadership is a leadership style grounded in established norms, characterized by personal conduct and interpersonal relationships. It encourages this behavior among members through effective two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision-making (Ko et al., 2018). According to Gea (2014), ethical leadership refers to the practice of incorporating ethical considerations as the foundation for making decisions or taking actions. It can be concluded that ethical leadership considers ethical values as the basis for decision-making, which is related to the primary responsibilities of a leader facing conflict between employees and can show how the exemplary leadership is to be carried out. Ethical leadership manifests in personality and moral behavior in personal life, which influences its members to uphold ethics and behave morally (Ko et al., 2018). An individual is deemed an ethical leader when they prioritize two key aspects: being a moral person and being a moral manager. The term "moral person" pertains to the personal traits and qualities that the leader possesses, whereas "moral manager" refers to the ethical conduct exhibited by the leader in their professional environment (Koay & Lim, 2022). The focus on moral principles and ethical management sets ethical leadership apart from other leadership styles, including transformational, spiritual, and authentic leadership (Ko et al., 2018). Ethical leaders exhibit qualities such as honesty, fairness, responsibility, and a genuine concern for the personal and professional needs of their team members (Brown et al., 2005). Research has shown that ethical leadership is positively related to employee attitudes and behaviors, such as ethical conduct among subordinates, performance beyond job expectations, and knowledge sharing, while

also helping to mitigate negative outcomes like knowledge hiding, unethical actions, and moral disengagement (Abdullah et al., 2019; Anser et al., 2021; Koay & Lim, 2022; Rahaman et al., 2020).

Hypothesis Development

Knowledge-hiding behavior among academics will slow down knowledge development in higher education institutions. The primary role of lecturers in teaching, research, and community service involves the dissemination and acceptance of high-level knowledge by various parties (e.g., colleagues, students, and the community) so that knowledge-hiding behavior will hinder the implementation of these roles (Zutshi et al., 2021). According to Conservation of Resources (COR) Theory, individuals strive to acquire and preserve resources while safeguarding them against potential loss in the workplace (Hobfoll, 2001). Moreover, if they face continuous competition and comparison with their colleagues, it will lead them to a lack of resources (Li & Chen, 2018). In the higher education workplace, each individual competes with each other to increase their knowledge resources. When faced with limited knowledge resources in a competitive environment, organizations may feel compelled to adopt strategies to protect their position by concealing their knowledge assets (Guo et al., 2021; Yao et al., 2020).

Conversely, organizations can assist their members in enhancing their skills and boosting their knowledge (Lee et al., 2022). This aligns with a fundamental principle of COR Theory, specifically the concept of passageways, which suggests that "environmental conditions that support, maintain, enrich, and protect individual resources" can mitigate the effects of resource loss and lead to resource gains (Hobfoll, 2011). Within higher education institutions, a supportive environment can be fostered by encouraging a knowledge-sharing climate. The culture of an organization plays a crucial role in shaping member behavior and influencing their views on knowledge management (Radaelli et al., 2011). Organizations should cultivate a knowledge-sharing climate to encourage positive employee behavior regarding knowledge exchange (Kim & Park, 2020). In such an environment, knowledge-hiding behaviors will not benefit those who engage in them, as they will forfeit opportunities to enhance their competencies and improve the quality of their knowledge through collaboration with colleagues (Černe et al., 2014). Fostering this positive climate will help members of the organization perceive knowledge hiding as a detrimental behavior that hinders individuals from reaping mutual benefits through knowledge exchange (Černe et al., 2014).

A knowledge-sharing climate can be built in three ways: justice, innovation, and affiliation (Bock et al., 2014). Fair organizational practices will build trust among employees and can motivate individuals to share their knowledge (Al-Kurdi et al., 2020; Bock et al., 2014). Innovativeness will build trust between organizational members because they believe that the organization values creativity and innovation (Al-Kurdi et al., 2020), encouraging individuals to collaborate by sharing knowledge. A climate that encourages knowledge sharing is expected to decrease the likelihood of knowledge-hiding behavior. The organizational climate will influence their decision to share or store their knowledge with others (Chatterjee et al., 2021); if the organization has a conducive climate, then they will be more open to exchanging the knowledge they have. So, we draw the hypothesis:

> H1: Knowledge-sharing climate has a negative impact on knowledge-hiding behavior.

COR theory posits that positive emotions and behaviors are contagious, spreading from one individual to another (Hobfoll et al., 2018). This concept suggests that the qualities of ethical leadership—such as honesty, responsibility, and concern for others—can be passed from leaders to their followers (Anser et al., 2021). Moreover, Anser et al. (2021) indicate that employees who exhibit concern for their colleagues and a sense of responsibility are more inclined to positively respond to knowledge requests rather than withholding information. From the perspective of COR theory, we propose that ethical leader behavior serves as a resource pathway that aids in acquiring new personal resources. This aligns with COR theory's assertion that supportive environmental factors can mitigate the

effects of resource loss and facilitate resource gain (Hobfoll, 2011). Ethical leaders promote positive behaviors characterized by respect, fair treatment, and assurance of personal and professional support, which enables employees to maintain and develop additional resources, both psychological (such as self-esteem) and personal (like relationships) (Agarwal et al., 2022). The attention and encouragement provided by ethical leaders empower employees to access these additional resources, thereby reducing unethical behaviors, such as knowledge hiding (Hobfoll & Shirom, 2000).

Ethical leadership offers numerous advantages for both employees and the organization as a whole. Research has demonstrated that ethical leadership practices can lead to positive outcomes, such as enhanced employee behavior, improved work results, and increased satisfaction in family life, which can also extend to organizational performance (Ko et al., 2018). In the realm of knowledge management, ethical leaders play a significant role in promoting knowledge sharing by eliminating structural obstacles, fostering trust among employees, and encouraging a sense of fair reciprocity for contributions and resource sharing (Bavik et al., 2018). Additionally, ethical leadership can help deter knowledge hiding through various leadership actions (Anser et al., 2021). To mitigate knowledge-hiding behaviors, leaders should actively cultivate a culture of knowledge sharing. This can be achieved through leadership practices that include: 1) establishing a shared language to facilitate knowledge exchange, 2) encouraging experimentation and the application of new ideas, 3) viewing mistakes as learning opportunities, and 4) promoting a more informal environment for knowledge sharing among team members (Lei et al., 2019). By leveraging their influence, ethical leaders can enhance the knowledge-sharing climate within their organizations, ultimately reducing instances of knowledge hiding among individuals.

We assume that the influence of the climate of disseminating knowledge in the institutional environment of higher education in preventing the intensity of knowledge hiding among lecturers will be even more decisive with the example of ethical leaders. Furthermore, we assume that the level of strength of leadership influence will differ based on the perceptions of lecturers with varying backgrounds, such as age, the context of their institutional form, gender, and length of service. Therefore, we hypothesize:

H2a: Ethical Leadership moderates the negative influence of Knowledge Sharing Climate on Knowledge Hiding. This negative influence can be strengthened by the presence of high Ethical Leadership. The moderating effect of Ethical Leadership is higher as perceived by the group of lecturers from state universities

H2b: Ethical Leadership moderates the negative influence of Knowledge Sharing Climate on Knowledge Hiding, this negative influence can be strengthened by the presence of high Ethical Leadership. The moderating effect of Ethical Leadership is higher as perceived by the group of lecturers from the millennial generation

H2c: Ethical Leadership moderates the negative influence of Knowledge Sharing Climate on Knowledge Hiding. This negative influence can be strengthened by the presence of high Ethical Leadership. The moderating effect of Ethical Leadership is higher as perceived by the male lecturer group

H2d: Ethical Leadership moderates the negative influence of Knowledge Sharing Climate on Knowledge Hiding, this negative influence can be strengthened by the presence of high Ethical Leadership. The moderating effect of Ethical Leadership is higher as perceived by the group of lecturers who have worked for less than five years

RESEARCH METHODS

This study was designed to examine the impact of the knowledge-sharing climate on the knowledge hiding and to investigate the role of ethical leadership as moderating variable in this relationship. Quantitative data were collected through self-administered questionnaires distributed to respondents. A probability sampling method was employed to select the sample. According to Hair (2010), a minimum sample size of 100 is necessary for data analysis using the SEM-PLS method.

Consequently, the study involved a sample of 156 lecturers from various private and public universities in Indonesia. Data analysis was conducted using the partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) technique, which is commonly utilized for analyzing models with multiple variables, including a moderator, with the assistance of the WarpPLS 8.0 software.

All variables are assessed using a 1-5 Likert scale, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 5 indicating strong agreement. The measurement of the knowledge-sharing climate variable adopts an instrument developed by Faraj and Sproull (2000), which consists of 4 items. The instrument from Peng (2013), which consists of 3 items, is used to measure the knowledge-hiding variable. The ethical leadership variable was assessed using a 10-item scale developed by Brown et al. (2005).

The samples obtained were dominated by 96 (61.6%) males and 60 (38.4%) females. Respondents' age group varied from 20 to 30 years (49.3%), 31 to 40 (35.9%), 41 to 50 (10.2%), and more than 50 (4.4%). They came from state universities (48 samples or 30.8%) and private universities (108 samples or 69.2%). Their working tenure ranged from <5 years (64.1%), 6 to 10 years (16.7%), 11 to 15 years (13.4%) and 16 to 20 years (5.8%). Most of their educational background is master's graduates (90.3%), followed by doctoral graduates at 9.7%.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
Validity and Reliability Testing

Table 1 provides a summary of the model measurement results, while Table 2 summarizes the outcomes of the discriminant test. All variables demonstrate Cronbach Alpha and composite reliability values exceeding 0.7, suggesting that all instruments are consistent (Hair et al., 2010). The findings reveal that the loading factor values for all instrument items are greater than 0.7, and the AVE values are above 0.5, confirming that there are no issues with convergent validity. Furthermore, all instruments meet the criteria for discriminant validity, as shown by the square root AVE values for each instrument, which are higher than the correlations with other constructs (Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

Table 1. Model Measurement

Items	Factor Loadings	Cronbah's Alpha	Composite Reliability	AVE
KSC1	0.861	0.779	0.858	0.601
KSC2	0.733			
KSC3	0.778			
KSC4	0.918			
EL1	0.912	0.946	0.954	0.678
EL2	0.698			
EL3	0.792			
EL4	0.845			
EL5	0.865			
EL6	0.788			
EL7	0.786			
EL8	0.833			
EL9	0.856			
EL10	0.895			
KH1	0.919	0.741	0.854	0.664
KH2	0.872			
KH3	0.768			

Note: KSC= Knowledge-sharing climate; EL= ethical Leadership, KH= Knowledge Hiding
Source: primary data processed (2024)

Tabel 2. Discriminant Validity (Fornell & Lacrker criteria)

Note: KSC= Knowledge-sharing climate; EL= ethical

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
KSC	**0.776**						
EL	0.423	**0.823**					
KH	-0.420	-0.238	**0.815**				
Age	-0.141	-0.098	-0.130				
Gender	0.017	0.094	-0.098	-0.078			
Education	0.088	0.162	-0.111	0.434	0.055		
Work Tenure	-0.071	-0.001	-0.062	0.777	-0.022	0.232	
Institutional Origin	-0.165	-0.308	0.100	-0.008	-0.101	-0.018	-0.192

Leadership, KH= Knowledge Hiding The square root value of AVE is indicated in bold numbers.
Source: primary data processed (2024)

The goodness of fit of a model is estimated using the SEM-PLS technique with WarpPLS software by the criterion suggested by Kock (2021). Several indicators indicate the goodness of the model; APC, ARS, and AARS values, all of which should be significant. It concluded to be a fit model if the value of AVIF and AFVIF is less than 5 and the GoF value is up to 0.36. Results show that APC, ARS, and AARS were significant; the AVIF value was 1,261, AFVIF of 1,769, and GoF of 0.445. All these data indicate that the model is fit. Table 3 displays a summary of the results from the model fit tests.

Tabel 3. Results test for Model Fit

Indicators	Value	Requirements	Note
APC	0.261***	P sig.	Accepted
ARS	0.236***	P sig.	Accepted
AARS	0.226***	P sig.	Accepted
AVIF	1.140	Accepted if ≤ 5, ideal value = ≤ 3.3	Ideal
AFVIF	1.229	Accepted if ≤ 5, ideal value = ≤ 3.3	Ideal
GoF	0.416	*Small* ≥ 0.1, *Medium* ≥ 0.25, *Strong* ≥ 0.36	Strong Model

Note: ***P <.001, n= 156. Source: primary data processed (2024)

Hyphotesis Testing

We tested the hypothesis by first testing the direct influence of knowledge sharing climate on knowledge hiding (H1). Moreover, a multigroup analysis technique was used to analyze the moderating role of ethical leadership on several sample groups (H2a-d). The sample groups analyzed include age, gender, institutional origin and work tenure.

Hypothesis 1 states that knowledge-sharing climate has a negative effect on knowledge hiding. The results show that the path coefficient (β) is -0.444 with a significance of <0.001, so H1 is supported. This means that a more conducive climate of knowledge sharing built in an organization will reduce individuals' intentions to hide knowledge. In the context of a higher education institution's workplace, a sporty climate and upholding the exchange of knowledge will prevent lecturers from hiding their knowledge from colleagues because it is considered to be detrimental to the hider. Hypothesis 2a assumes that ethical leadership moderates the negative influence of knowledge sharing climate on knowledge hiding. The moderating effect of ethical leadership in the group of lecturers from state universities has a value of -0.228 with a p-value of 0.045, so H2a is supported. This result means that the perception of organizational members towards their ethical leaders will strengthen the influence of the developing knowledge-sharing climate to inhibit members' knowledge-hiding intentions. The higher level of moderation effect in the sample group from state universities is likely due to the encouragement of Indonesian government regulations that require institutional leaders to act under the code of ethics that binds them, causing positive perceptions of lecturers towards their leaders. Hypothesis H2b, which posits that the moderating effect of ethical leadership is more pronounced among lecturers from the millennial generation, is not supported by the findings. The results reveal a moderation effect value of -0.050, and the p-value indicates that this effect is not significant. This finding probably occurred because the sample of lecturers from the millennial generation was not very interested in being open and sharing their knowledge with others because they had a stronger sense of territoriality, even though ethical leaders had encouraged them to build a climate of knowledge-sharing.

The proposed H2c that the moderating effect of ethical leadership is higher in the male lecturer group is supported by the results of data analysis (β= -0.175, p= 0.038). This means that the perception of ethical leadership will strengthen the influence of a knowledge-sharing climate in reducing the intention of knowledge hiding, which is more felt by male samples. This could be because male lecturers find it easier to assess ethical leaders as role models who arouse their interest in not wanting to hide knowledge. H2d states that the moderating effect of ethical leadership is higher in the group of lecturers with less than five years of service. The results show that the value of the moderating effect of ethical leadership in the group of lecturers with less than five years of service is higher (β= -0.184, p= 0.028) than in the group of lecturers with more than five years of service (β= -0.170, p= 0.090), thus H2d is supported. This shows that the longer a person works in an organization, the more they will experience ethical leadership practices from their leaders, increasing the reinforcement level for not doing knowledge hiding. A summary of the hypothesis test results is shown in Table 4.

Tabel 4. Summary of Hypotheses Test Result

Path	SE	β	P value	Remarks
KSC → KH (H1)	0.073	-0.444	<0.001	Supported
KSC → KH*EL				
Institusional type group				Supported
(H2a)	0.132	-0.228	0.045	
state universities	0.093	0.126	0.089	
private universities				
Generation group (H2b)				Not
gen X	0.106	0.209	0.206	Supported
gen millenial	0.086	-0.050	0.281	
Gender group (H2c)				Supported
male	0.097	-0.175	0.038	
female	0.016	0.298	0.006	
Work tenure group (H2d)				Supported
<5 years	0.095	-0.184	0.028	
>5 years	0.126	-0.170	0.090	

Source: primary data processed (2024)

Discussion

The analysis of the data confirms the first hypothesis, indicating that a knowledge-sharing climate negatively affects knowledge hiding. These findings are consistent with the research conducted by Radaelli et al. (2011) and Chatterjee et al. (2021), which also identified a negative relationship between knowledge-sharing climates and knowledge hiding. This result is in line with the COR Theory perspective, which suggests that environmental conditions that foster, sustain, enhance, and safeguard individual resources can alter the effects of resource loss and lead to resource gain (Hobfoll, 2011). A supportive environment in an organization can be demonstrated by helping its members develop skills and contributing to increasing their knowledge (Lee et al., 2022) so that they will not intend to hide their knowledge because they will get replacement resources in the form of new experiences, skills, and knowledge that they will receive from their colleagues. The climate of knowledge sharing as a supportive condition can be formed from fair organizational practices in exchanging information that will build trust among employees to share knowledge. Innovation carried out by members will build their trust because they believe that the organization values creativity and innovation (Al-Kurdi et al., 2020). In addition, organizations can address knowledge-hiding behavior by

fostering a "knowledge-centered culture" and promoting collaboration at the organizational level (Lei et al., 2019). This approach will motivate individuals to work together and enhance the frequency of knowledge sharing. Moreover, an organizational climate that encourages teamwork and knowledge exchange among members will facilitate organizational learning by prompting discussions of ideas among colleagues (Kim & Park, 2020). In essence, a more supportive culture for knowledge sharing within an organization correlates with a decreased likelihood of members engaging in knowledge hiding.

The results indicate that the hypothesis regarding ethical leadership's moderating role in enhancing the impact of a knowledge-sharing climate on knowledge hiding is supported among the sample groups based on institution type, gender, and tenure. However, in the generational sample group, no moderating effect was observed in the relationship between knowledge-sharing climate and knowledge hiding. This finding adds to existing research that has provided empirical support for the connection between ethical leadership and knowledge hiding (e.g., Abdullah et al., 2019; Anser et al., 2021; Koay & Lim, 2022). Unlike earlier studies that identified ethical leadership as a precursor to knowledge hiding, this research positions ethical leadership as a moderating variable. This suggests that ethical leadership can enhance an organizational culture that promotes knowledge sharing, thereby decreasing members' intentions to conceal knowledge. The moral characteristics demonstrated by leaders by emphasizing honesty, fairness, and responsibility will be a model for members to follow to build an ethical organizational culture. This underscores the significant role of leaders in shaping an ethical organizational culture, inspiring a sense of positivity in employees' minds, fostering good relationships, and encouraging knowledge sharing and other experiences (Mohsin et al., 2021). Another reinforcement that can be done by leaders to avoid potential employee knowledge hiding behavior is to encourage a more informal knowledge sharing climate among employees (Lei et al., 2019). This finding further supports the idea presented in the Conservation of Resources (COR) theory that

positive emotions and behaviors can be shared and passed from one individual to another (Hobfoll et al., 2018). The attention and encouragement of ethical leadership transmit positive employee attitudes, one of which is wanting to share the knowledge they have (Hobfoll & Shirom, 2000).

CONCLUSION

This study sought to investigate how the knowledge-sharing climate within organizations impacts knowledge-hiding behaviors in higher education institutions. The findings offer empirical evidence showing that a positive knowledge-sharing climate negatively affects knowledge hiding among lecturers at universities in IndonesiaThese findings suggest that organizations should work towards fostering a work environment that encourages knowledge sharing among employees, as this can help diminish individuals' tendencies to engage in knowledge hiding. Additionally, the study met its second research objective by confirming the hypothesis regarding the moderating effect of ethical leadership on the negative relationship between knowledge-sharing climate and knowledge hiding. Out of the four proposed moderation hypotheses, only one was rejected: the moderating influence of ethical leadership among different generational sample groups. It means that ethical leadership is perceived to strengthen the conducive effect of a knowledge-sharing climate in negating the knowledge hidden by most sample groups.

The findings have several theoretical and practical implications. First, these findings enhance the literature on knowledge management by exploring factors that can prevent knowledge hiding among individuals within an organization, specifically through the lens of a knowledge-sharing climate. This provides new insights that build on previous research, which has been limited in investigating the antecedents of knowledge hiding in the context of organizational support, such as the studies conducted by Radaelli et al. (2011). Second, this study is the first to compare organizational members' perceptions of ethical leadership played by their leaders with different sample group backgrounds. The results show interesting insights from each group in perceiving the effect of ethical leadership combined with a

knowledge-sharing climate to prevent members from hiding their knowledge. Third, this study confirms the model proposed by Oliveira et al. (2021) by providing empirical evidence that a knowledge-sharing climate serves as organizational motivation associated with knowledge hiding.

For managerial practice, this study opens up new insights into how the phenomenon of knowledge hiding occurs in higher education institutions, an ironic thing that should not be practiced by lecturers as knowledge carriers in the central circle where knowledge is collected and shared. Therefore, leaders of higher education institutions need to eliminate the barriers to knowledge exchange by creating a conducive climate for knowledge exchange and fostering them to act as leaders who always prioritize ethics and morals. It also needs to be strengthened by regulations from national-level higher education managers, especially in Indonesia, which regulates standard operational procedures for creating a culture of knowledge sharing in higher education environments, both in state and private institutions. In addition, HRM managers in other business sectors also need to ensure that their employees do not hide knowledge by facilitating a climate of knowledge sharing to gain benefits in the form of ever-increasing knowledge resources.

This study has several limitations, including the low response rate of the research sample. Given the thousands of higher education institutions registered with the Ministry of Education, Culture, and Research and Technology of the Republic of Indonesia, the validity of the study's findings would be strengthened by increasing and diversifying the sample size through more suitable sampling methods that include universities of various formats. Moreover, this study only involves two variables tested as antecedents of knowledge hiding. Incorporating additional variables in the research will offer valuable insights into the factors that may help prevent knowledge hiding among employees. Finally, this study was conducted with cross-section data based on employee perceptions so that it cannot capture more deeply how the climate of knowledge sharing has been running and the quality of ethical leadership practiced in each institution. Further research is suggested to

use time series data to reveal more accurately the reality of the phenomena that occur in these topics, especially in the variables of leadership and organizational culture.

REFERENCES

Abdullah, M. I., Dechun, H., Ali, M., & Usman, M. (2019). Ethical leadership and knowledge hiding: A moderated mediation model of relational social capital, and instrumental thinking. *Frontiers in Psychology, 10*(OCT), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02403

Abdullah, M. I., Dechun, H., Ali, M., & Usman, M. (2019). Ethical leadership and knowledge hiding: A moderated mediation model of relational social capital, and instrumental thinking. *Frontiers in Psychology, 10*(OCT), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02403

Anser, M. K., Ali, M., Usman, M., Rana, M. L. T., & Yousaf, Z. (2021). Ethical leadership and knowledge hiding: an intervening and interactional analysis. *Service Industries Journal, 41*(5–6), 307–329. https://doi.org/10.1080/02642069.2020.1739657

Agarwal, U. A., Gupta, M., & Cooke, F. L. (2022). Knowledge hide and seek: Role of ethical leadership, self-enhancement and job-involvement. *Journal of Business Research, 141*, 770–781. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.11.074

Al-Kurdi, O. F., El-Haddadeh, R., & Eldabi, T. (2020). The role of organisational climate in managing knowledge sharing among academics in higher education. *International Journal of Information Management*, 50, 217–227. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2019.05.018

Anand, A., Offergelt, F., & Anand, P. (2022). Knowledge hiding – a systematic review and research agenda. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 26*(6), 1438–1457. https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-04-2021-0336

Bock, G.-W., Zmud, R. W., Kim, Y.-G., & Lee, J.-N. (2014). Behavioral intention formation in knowledge sharing: Examining the roles of extrinsic motivators, social-psychological forces, and organizational climate. *International Journal of Managing Information Technology, 51*(11), 1–340.

Brown, M. E., Treviño, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 97*(2), 117–134. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2005.03.002

Černe, M., Nerstad, C. G. L., & Dysvik, A. (2014). What goes around comes around: Knowledge hiding, perceived motivational climate, and creativity. *Academy of Management Journal, 57*(1), 172-192. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2012.0122

Chatterjee, S., Chaudhuri, R., Thrassou, A., & Vrontis, D. (2021). Antecedents and consequences of knowledge hiding: The moderating role of knowledge hiders and knowledge seekers in organizations. *Journal of Business Research, 128*(February), 303–313. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.02.033

Connelly, C., Zweig, D., Webster, J., & Trougakos, J. P. (2012). Knowledge hiding in organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33, 64–88. https://doi.org/10.1002/job

Demirkasimoglu, N. (2016). Knowledge hiding in academia: Is personality a key factor? *International Journal of Higher Education, 5*(1). https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v5n1p128

Evans, J. M., Hendron, M. G., & Oldroyd, J. B. (2015). Withholding the ace: The individual- and unit-level performance effects of self-reported and perceived knowledge hoarding. *Organization Science, 26*(2), 494–510. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2014.0945

Faraj, S., & Sproull, L. (2000). Coordinating expertise in software development teams. Management Science, 46(12), 1554–1568.

Feng, J., & Wang, C. (2019). Does abusive supervision always promote employees to hide knowledge? From both reactance and COR perspectives. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 23*(7), 1455–1474. https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-12-2018-0737

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research, 18*(1), 39–50.

Ghani, U., Zhai, X., Spector, J. M., Chen, N. S., Lin, L., Ding, D., & Usman, M. (2020). Knowledge hiding in higher education: role of interactional justice and professional commitment. *Higher Education, 79*(2), 325–344. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-019-00412-5

Guo, L., Cheng, K., Luo, J., & Zhao, H. (2021). Trapped in a loss spiral: how and when work alienation relates to knowledge hiding. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 33*(20), 4004–4033. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2021.1937672

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate Data Analysis* (7th ed.). Prentice Hall International.

Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist, 44*(3), 513–524. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.44.3.513

Hobfoll, S. E. (2001). The influence of culture, community, and the nested-self in the stress process: Advancing conservation of resources theory. *Applied Psychology, 50*(3), 337–421. https://doi.org/10.1111/1464-0597.00062

Hobfoll, S. E. (2011). Conservation of resource caravans and engaged settings. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 84*(1), 116–122.

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.2010.02016.x

Hobfoll, S. E., Halbesleben, J., Neveu, J.-P., & Westman, M. (2018). Annual review of organizational psychology and organizational behavior conservation of resources in the organizational context: The reality of resources and their consequences. *Annual Review Organizational Psychological Organizational Behavior, 5,* 103–131. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-

Hobfoll, S. E., & Shirom, A. (2000). *Conservation of Resources Theory. In R. T. Golembiewski (Ed.), Handbook of Organizational Behavior* (2nd ed., pp. 57–81). Marcel Dekker.

Huo, W., Cai, Z., Luo, J., Men, C., & Jia, R. (2016). Antecedents and intervention mechanisms: A multi-level study of R&D team's knowledge hiding behavior. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 20*(5), 880–897. https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-11-2015-0451

Jasimuddin, S. M., & Saci, F. (2022). Creating a Culture to avoid knowledge hiding within an organization: The role of management support. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*(March). https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.850989

Kim, E. J., & Park, S. (2020). Transformational leadership, knowledge sharing, organizational climate and learning: an empirical study. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 41*(6), 761–775. https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-12-2018-0455

Ko, C., Ma, J., Bartnik, R., Haney, M. H., & Kang, M. (2018). Ethical leadership: An integrative review and future research agenda. *Ethics and Behavior, 28*(2), 104–132. https://doi.org/10.1080/10508422.2017.1318069

Koay, K. Y., & Lim, P. K. (2022). Ethical leadership and knowledge hiding: testing the mediating and moderating mechanisms. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 26*(3), 574–591. https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-02-2021-0091

Lee, S., Yang, X., Kim, J., & Byun, G. (2022). Effects of motivational climate on knowledge hiding: The mediating role of work alienation. *Behavioral Sciences, 12*(81), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs12030081

Lei, H., Do, N. K., & Le, P. B. (2019). Arousing a positive climate for knowledge sharing through moral lens: the mediating roles of knowledge-centered and collaborative culture. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 23*(8), 1586–1604. https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-04-2019-0201

Li, S., & Chen, Y. (2018). The relationship between psychological contract breach and employees' counterproductive work behaviors: The mediating effect of organizational cynicism and work alienation. *Frontiers in Psychology, 9*(July), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01273

Mohsin, M., Zhu, Q., Wang, X., Naseem, S., & Nazam, M. (2021). The empirical investigation between ethical leadership and knowledge-hiding behavior in financial service sector: A moderated-mediated model. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12*(December), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.798631

Oliveira, M., Curado, C., & de Garcia, P. S. (2021). Knowledge hiding and knowledge hoarding: A systematic literature review. *Knowledge and Process Management, 28*(3), 277–294. https://doi.org/10.1002/kpm.1671

Peng, H. (2013). Why and when do people hide knowledge? *Journal of Knowledge Management, 17*(3), 398–415. https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-12-2012-0380

Radaelli, G., Mura, M., Spiller, N., & Lettieri, E. (2011). Intellectual capital and knowledge sharing: The mediating role of organisational knowledge-sharing climate. *Knowledge Management Research and Practice, 9*(4), 342–352. https://doi.org/10.1057/kmrp.2011.29

Rahaman, H. M. S., Camps, J., Decoster, S., & Stouten, J. (2020). Ethical leadership in times of change: the role of change commitment and change information for employees' dysfunctional resistance.

Personnel Review, 50(2), 630–647. https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-03-2019-0122

Ulfa, A. K., Mujib, M., Kusuma, P. J., & Sari, R. A. A. R. P. (2023). Membangun budaya knowledge sharing sebagai upaya pencegahan perilaku knowledge hiding pada dosen. *Jurnal Eksos, 19*(2), 163–172.

Xia, Q., Yan, S., Li, H., & Duan, K. (2022). A bibliometric analysis of knowledge-hiding research. *Behavioral Sciences*, 12, 1–19.

Xiao, M., & Cooke, F. L. (2019). Why and when knowledge hiding in the workplace is harmful: A review of the literature and directions for future research in the Chinese context. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources, 57*(4), 470–502. https://doi.org/10.1111/1744-7941.12198

Xu, Q., & Jiesen, Y. (2022). Effects of knowledge hiding in dual teaching methods on students' performance—evidence from physical education department students. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*(February), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.833285

Yadi, E., Rahmat, A., & Abdillah, M. R. (2022). ethical leadership and knowledge hiding behavior: mechanism moral identity. *Jurnal Manajemen, 26*(2), 240–258. https://doi.org/10.24912/jm.v26i2.858

Yao, Z., Zhang, X., Luo, J., & Huang, H. (2020). Offense is the best defense: the impact of workplace bullying on knowledge hiding. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 24*(3), 675–695. https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-12-2019-0755

Zutshi, A., Creed, A., Bhattacharya, A., Bavik, A., Sohal, A., & Bavik, Y. L. (2021). Demystifying knowledge hiding in academic roles in higher education. *Journal of Business Research, 137*(August), 206–221. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.08.030