Influence of Intraorganizational Social Connection, Neuroticism, and Family-Work Conflict in Knowledge Sharing

Rodrigo Alexandre de Melo, Carla CristianeSokulski, Wesley Vieira da Silva, Claudimar Pereira da Veiga, and Jansen Maia Del Corso

Pontifical University Catholic of Parana(PUC PR) – Business School
Corresponding author email: rodrigomelo09@hotmail.com

Abstract

Knowledge sharing is an important element to the performance of organizations, considering intraorganizational relations. Thus, is observed a lot of variables which impact Knowledge Sharing positively or negatively. The objective of this study is to examine in what extent the factorsIntraorganizationalSocial Connection, Neuroticism, and Family-Work Conflict influence on Knowledge Sharing. Results indicated that only the correlation between Intraorganizational Social Connection and Knowledge Sharing was significant (0.338). The study concludes that the individual really will share more knowledge if hehas more social connections, also stating that Neuroticism and Family-Work Conflict was not significant in the correlation.

Introduction

Knowledge sharing is considered an important factor in the search of good results in organizations[1]. Because, the importance and contribution of knowledge to organizational competitiveness start at the time that knowledge is perceived by the people who possess it, using it in a useful way in the organizational context [2]. This occurs when people realize that the source of this knowledge is not just on databases, but also in themselves[2]. Thus, the Knowledge Sharing covers the need to share the knowledge from one individual to another,seeking organizational survival, because the concentration of knowledge in one individual limits those organizationsto use this knowledge in a strategic approach, this is, consideringin a broad sense[3]. So,the importance of share knowledge reflects in the need of organizations remain alive, without exclusive dependence of a single individual. By sharing knowledge, the professionals also have the possibility to stay updated on his market; in addition, others colleagues in the same organization can get knowledge to solve a problem that is occurring [4]. In this sense, Knowledge Sharing can impact in different ways the processes in organizations [5].

Currently, it is perceived the importance of Knowledge Sharing,because individuals know how to share, but there is a difficulty to share this knowledge[4]. Thus, it is considered that the behavior of individuals to share knowledge is influenced by contextual factors and individual perceptions [6]. Before these influences on Knowledge Sharing process in organizations [5], this study aims to examine in what the extent the factorsIntraorganizational Social Connection, Neuroticism, and Family-Work Conflict influence Knowledge Sharing. Such, the concept of Knowledge Sharing is defined in this study as the dissemination of

knowledge of one individual to his colleagues in an organization, where two or more parties are involved in this process [7]. The analysis of this concept allows us to understand some factors that contribute to an individual share the knowledge and how other factors affect for this to occur [8].

In what concerns about Knowledge Sharing in organizations, internal relations must be considered (i.e., networks), where the mere existence of ties between the nodes of the system refersthat the individuals (i.e., actors) are socially connected [9]. When these relationships between the individuals are more frequent, the possibility of positive connection is higher, reflecting behaviors associated with the roleof inclusion in the network [10], and promoting greater Intraorganizational Social Connection [11]. Furthermore, must be considered also factors related to the influences caused by the individual's personality, being considered in this study the variable Neuroticism, which is conceptualized by John and Srivastava [12] as the contrast between emotional stability to negative emotions, such as anxiousness, nervousness, sadness and tension. Finally, must consider that the relationship between the individual and his work can be characterized by a strong influence of work in the various spheres of individual's life (e.g. personal and family), which doesn't allows autonomy between them and causes profound changes and imbalances [13]. So, it is important to consider the influence of the relationship between the organization and contexts of the family, through the variableFamily-Work Conflict. Family and work are the two most important areas of the life for most adults [14].Family tensions can influence the role that individual plays in his work [15], being necessary to analyze the influence of Knowledge Sharing with other colleagues in face of Family-Work Conflict.

Thus, this research seeks to answer the following research problem: what is the influence of IntraorganizationalSocial Connection, Neuroticism, and Family-Work Conflict on Knowledge Sharing? To reach this research problem, this article is organized into five sections summarized. After this brief introduction, is presented the literature review presenting the hypotheses of the study, then the methodological procedures, soon after, results and finally conclusions.

Knowledge Sharing In Organizations

Knowledge in organizations is materialized through social relationships and is not concentrated in a single agent [16]. It is worth considering that knowledge doesn't come from zero, but through a process of interaction in the environment through language, symbols and knowledge that allow contextualization of abstract knowledge and inter-subjective validation [17] through social interactions [18]. In the moment that an individual shares his knowledge with other colleagues, there are influences in innovation processes and competitiveness [19], generating benefits to the organization. Knowledge Sharing models in the literature utilize factors related to both individual and environment. Regarding the individual, [20] uses to analysis the motivational factors, [21] discusses motivation and attitudes, and [22] use factors related to personality traits, skills and motivation. In addition, [23] consider that Knowledge Sharing can also be considered as a culture of social interaction between employees through exchange of skills and knowledge for each department or organization as a whole.

According to Polanyi [24], knowledge consists of tacit and explicit knowledge. This was described by some authors through various models present in the literature, which do an inter-relationship of these components, such as the model of socialization, externalization, combination, and internalization of Nonaka and Takeuchi [5]. This sharing of knowledge is

regarded as an intentional exchange aimed at creating new knowledge [25]. Also, generates numerous benefits for the organization, ranging from the improvement of human resources to the optimization of intellectual capital [26], helping in the development of competitive advantage through innovation and improving productivity [27]. Even with the advantages presented, Rivera-Vazquez et al. [25] points out that some studies identify the existence of cultural barriers to these Knowledge Sharing activities occurs in organizations. These barriers are classified into two levels, the macro level that is based on national cultural dimensions of Hofstede [28], and the micro level that is based on the national culture of the individuals belonging to the organization [25].

Knowledge sharing is considered the process in which the knowledge of one person becomes to be understood and used by others, resulting in a conscious and voluntary act of exchange of knowledge, without any obligation to do it[20]. Therefore, there is a need to identify variables that can influence the Knowledge Sharing. In this article the Knowledge Sharing was analyzed according to the extent of exchanges of information and experiences during social interaction between each actor in the network compared to its colleges[18]. Since the existing studies analyze a plurality of possible variables, it is clear the need for researches to study the influence of Intraorganizational Social Connection,Neuroticism, and Family-Work Conflict in relation to the Knowledge Sharing, so this article aims contribute to the filling of this gap existent in the literature.

Intraorganizational Social Connection, Neuroticism, Family-Work Conflict

Knowledge sharing in organizations results of social variables related to individuals. According [29], it is important to analyze that organizations need to be considered as networks which interrelate their activities and where consequently emerges the learning process. In the relational approach, involving the interaction between actors [30], an important factor for understanding the transfer process of knowledge is the level of IntraorganizationalSocial Connection between the parties. The higher level of the interaction between the actors, higherthe exchange of experiences[31]. Grant [10] states that, at the time occurs frequent interactions between two organizational actors, the possibility of positive affect tends to be higher than the possibility of negative affect. An organizational actor develops a role perspective front to others organizational actors who holds more frequent interactions and strong connection ties [32]. Thus, it is important to consider that social networks of individuals favor the development of interpersonal connections, while an advanced culture expands social circles to which individuals belong [33].

Thus, IntraorganizationalSocial Connection is important as it allows the evaluation of organizational social ties that are part of intraorganizational networks, these networks that are formed by the behavior of the actors who belong to the organization[34]. The construct Intraorganizational Social Connection was developed by [34], considered the evaluation of the quality of direct links from a mainactor. This evaluation starts with a comparison between the expectations and the inclusion behavior, performed by the constant interaction with certain common social actors [34]. According[32], the higher interaction between two social actors generates strengthening ties. [11,34] also emphasizes that the direct and more frequent contacts make the individual feel included in the intraorganizational network, where the implications of these contacts (i.e., connections) are transferred to other fields of individual's social networks(e.g., organizational actors). Thus, the construct Intraorganizational Social Connection contributes to know in what extent the contacts make the organizational actor feels that is belonging to the organization who are socially connected to the

intraorganizational network, as part of a cohesive group, and also, that is part of a family group [11,34]. Thus, it is stated that:

H1: IntraorganizationalSocial Connection is positively related withKnowledge Sharing.

On the other hand, Neuroticism is part of the model called "Big Five", which seeks to understand the essence of human nature from the individual differences. This model analyzes the constitution of personality through five major lines: (i) extraversion, (ii) socialization, (iii) scrupulosity, (iv) neuroticism, and (v) openness to experience [34]. Neuroticism refers to chronic level of maladjustment and emotional instability, where individuals go through emotional patterns experiences related to a psychological discomfort caused by distress, anguish and suffering [35]. According to [36], individuals with high levels of neuroticism are more prone to psychological suffering, and may have considerable levels of anxiety, depression, hostility, vulnerability, self-criticism, and impulsivity. The Neuroticism when present at higher levels can bias ideas dissociated from reality, lower frustration tolerance, negative affect, lower capacities of control the excitement and low self-esteem [36].

The Neuroticism is described by [37] as a dimension made up of many individual differences that tend unpleasant and distressing emotions, with both cognitive and behavioral traits. More than a temporary emotional state, Neuroticism is a stable personality trend, having strong links to robust negative judgments interpretations related to the assessment cognitive affective processes [38]. [35]state that to be related to emotional characteristics of individuals, Neuroticism refers to chronic level of adjustment and emotional instability. Furthermore, Neuroticism factor refers to the individual differences in emotional patterns related to psychological discomfort, cognitive aspects and behaviors. High levels of neuroticism may be associated with conflicts related to the professional environment, with emphasis on personality traits that include the difficulty of dealing with stressful situations [35]. Based on these, the study looked for to confirm the following statement:

H2: Neuroticism is negatively related with Knowledge Sharing.

Finally, is important the presence of Family-Work Conflicton Knowledge Sharing, Family-Work Conflict considersthat family responsibilities can spoil job performance [39, 40]. This occurs because family and work are considered the key domains in the individual’s live[14, 41]. Until recently, researches had its focus on the work and its influences in the family domain, being approached by the label Work-Family Conflict [15,42]. Besides, the influence that the family exercised toward work was perceived, and considered as a form of conflict between roles, in which the demands created by the family interfere in the performance of professional responsibilities, covered by the label ofFamily-Work Conflict[42, 43). In this approach, one of the contributions that elucidate this conflict was made by [43], which corroborated exemplifying that a child's disease influences in the frequency of the individual at work, resulting in Family-Work Conflict.

According [42],Family-Work Conflict is a form of inter-roles conflict, that occurs at the time when the demands of work and family roles are mutually conflicting, by the fact that the action of a role (e.g. family) is complicated by the actions of another role (e.g. work), this model is based on time, needs and behavior. [42]consider that there is conflict between family and work by the fact that the demands of a role can compromise the performance expected by the individual in another role, such as when the obligations that the individual

has at home with your family entail losses in their performance at work [42]. In an organizational context approach, the problem of Family-Work Conflict can affect the performance of employees, and therefore the company's outcomes[44]. According to [44], due to this conflict there is an increase in the pressure for the implementation of supportive policies and quality of life at work, aiming to ease the stress of employees both in the professional and personal context. [44] also emphasize that all of these studies which emphasize the dynamics of conflicts between personal and professional life, can help organizations in developing practices aimed at the balance between both domains, allowing better use of resources and provides a more productive organizational environment. Therefore, there is a possible influence ofFamily-Work Conflictto Knowledge Sharing, deduced by the following statement:

H3: Family-Work Conflict is negatively related with Knowledge Sharing.

Methodology

As a research method to test the hypotheses was opted for the survey. It was defined as social context of research the departments of Human Resources and Safety and Occupational Medicine of a higher education institution in the south of Brazil. In order to preserve the company and individuals for any association with results of the survey, the name of the institution will not be divulged. During the collection of the data period, the department had approximately 130 employees, of whom 114 answered questionnaires, and of these, 113 questionnaires were validated. Only one questionnaire was invalidated by the fact that was not completely answered. Thus, it is a non-probabilistic sampling by adhesion, implying only possibilities of analytical generalization, this is, to the theory. The data were treated with a factorial analysis, correlation and regression by means of the SPSS software. Was used as instrument of data collection a structured questionnaire composed of five Knowledge Sharing indicators [11, 34], four indicators of Intraorganizational Social Connection[11], eight indicators of Neuroticism [12], and four indicators of Family-Work Conflict[45]. It was used a Likert scale of five points considering that 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree.

Validation Of The Measures

The measures applied in the research were examined in terms of validity and reliability,was applied the factorial analysis, and as an initial condition the normality of the data was verified. According[46] a visual check of the histogram comparing the values of the observed data with a near normal distribution is the simplest diagnostic test to verify the normality of the data. Furthermore, [46] argue that the normality refers to the distribution of data for an individual metric variable and its correspondence with the normal distribution. The normal range is considered as a reference standard for statistical methods, because if the observed values are far from normal, all resulting statistical tests are invalid [46]. The validation of the measures occurs by the analysis of the normality of the variables, observed graphically indicating closeness to normality.However, to support the validation of these measures were employed statistical methods.

The measure Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) of sampling adequacy relates to the variation in the proportion of the variance of the common data to all the variables, and the closer to 1, better the result [46]. In addition, Bartlett test ofsphericity attempts to determine the adequacy of the factorial analysis to examine the entire correlation matrix, this is, through

a statistical test which shows the presence of correlations between variables [46].The results obtained were 0.785 for the KMO measure and significance (Sig.) 0.000 for the Bartlett test of sphericity, these results indicate a possible correlation between the variables, and also the adequacy of the data, it being possible to perform the factorial analysis. The reason for application of a factorial analysis assumes what[46] addresses, the factorial analysis deal with the problem of analyzing the structure of correlations between a large number of variables, defining a set of common latent dimensions, this is, factors. From the factorial analysis, the total variance explained showed that the data were retained in only four components, explaining up to 61% of the total variability, despising others, because after the fifth component the variance was considered low, so it is justifiable disregard other factors. However, the proposed model is constituted by factors which are the first four components as shows Table 1.

Table 1: Total variance explained

Total variance explained

Component	Initial own values			Extraction sums of the loadings squared			Rotating sums of the loading squared		
	Total	% of variance	% cumulative	Total	% of variance	% cumulative	Total	% of variance	% cumulative
1	5.889	28.043	28.043	5.889	28.043	28.043	4.599	21.900	21.900
2	3.310	15.761	43.804	3.310	15.761	43.804	3.472	16.532	38.431
3	2.163	10.300	54.104	2.163	10.300	54.104	3.152	15.008	53.439
4	1.470	7.001	61.105	1.470	7.001	61.105	1.610	7.666	61.105
5	1.179	5.614	66.719						
6	.882	4.200	70.920						
7	.777	3.698	74.618						
8	.729	3.474	78.092						
9	.689	3.279	81.371						
10	.579	2.756	84.127						
11	.530	2.522	86.649						
12	.513	2.445	89.094						
13	.441	2.102	91.196						
14	.366	1.743	92.939						
15	.331	1.577	94.516						
16	.272	1.295	95.811						
17	.269	1.280	97.091						
18	.230	1.097	98.189						
19	.165	.787	98.976						
20	.123	.585	99.560						
21	.092	.440	100.000						

Source: elaborate by the authors.

After analysis total variance explained, the validation of measurements followed with the method of principal components extraction, applyingthe method of orthogonal rotation VARIMAX, demonstrating that each factor is distributed in only one component.In a general way, the rotated matrix present the set of questions that explain the component, as shows Table 2, indicating if the measuresmeasure what they really what to measure, this is an internal consistency of the scale, and the distribution of each factor in its respective component. [46]consider that the effect of rotating the factorial matrix is to redistribute the variances of the first factors to the last in order to achieve a simpler factor pattern, and theoretically more meaningful. The VARIMAX rotation criterion focuses on simplifying the columns of the factorial matrix, maximizing the sum of the variances from the required loads [46].

Finally, Cronbach's Alpha is a measure of reliability ranging from 0 to 1, based on the values from 0.60 to 0.70 as the lower limit of acceptability, and reliability is the extent to which a variable or a set of variables is consistent with the measures, that is, considering consecutive measurements performed, the measures will present reliability if indicate consistent results [46]. Thus, a reliability analysis of the measures was performed to find out if the sets of questions (i.e. components) actually measure what is proposed. It verified the reliability of the instrument, by measuring the Cronbach's Alpha for each component, with values of 0.909 for Intraorganizational Social Connection, 0.877 for Neuroticism, 0.739 for Family-Work Conflict, and 0.828 for Knowledge Sharing.

Table 2: Component matrix rotating'

Component matrix rotating				
Variables	Component			
	1 (Neuroticism)	2 (Intraorganizational Social Connection)	3 (Knowledge Sharing)	4 (Family-Work Conflict)
My family / friends complain about how many times I show myself preoccupied with work when I'm home.				.561
At work I have so many activities that they make me forget my personal (interests) things.				.602
I am considered someone well connected here in company with many contacts.				.540
Because of my contacts I'm one of the first to hear company news.				.525
I am a person who is stressed in nervous situations.	.803			
I am a person who cares too much about others things.	.642			
I am a person who can't deal well with stressful situations.	.610			
I am a person who gets stressed.	.725			
I am a person who gets angry easily.	.827			
I am a person who gets nervous easily.	.821			
I am a moody person that can quickly change mood.	.749			
I am a person that can be easily upset by things that go wrong.	.617			
I share my experiences of working with colleagues that need need.			.733	
When I discuss in group I do everything to share my experiences.			.698	
I always show the information that my colleagues may need to work.			.770	
Whenever I think of something that can improve the work of colleagues I say.			.786	
I let my colleagues to see how I do things at work for them to learn.			.829	
My contacts at work do I feel like I am part of the organization.		.887		
My contacts at work make me feel included in the organization.		.881		
My contacts at work make me feel like I was at home.		.743		
My contacts at work do I feel like I am part of an integrated group.		.864		

Source: elaborate by the authors.

Analysis and Discussion of the Results

In the correlation and regression analysis was applied the test of the hypothesis. Table 3 showscorrelation coefficients of the model, which considers the Knowledge Sharing as the dependent variable and the remaining variables as independent. Thus, the first hypothesis was the only corroborated, which states that Intraorganizational Social Connection is positively related with Knowledge Sharing, and its Pearson correlation coefficient 0.338, where, the higher Knowledge Sharing, the higher Intraorganizational Social Connection. The second hypothesis states that Neuroticism is negatively related with Knowledge Sharing, but this hypothesis was refuted, because doesn't show significance in the correlation model, Finally, the third hypothesis, which states that Family-Work Conflict is negatively related with Knowledge Sharing, was also refuted, because doesn't show significance.

Highlights that there is a correlation between Family-Work Conflict and Neuroticism, with a positive correlation coefficient of 0.405, this is, the higher Family-Work Conflict, higher the Neuroticism and vice versa. There is also a negative correlation between Family-Work Conflict and Intraorganizational Social Connection, the higher Family-Work Conflict, lower the Intraorganizational Social Connection. Another negative correlation occurs between Neuroticism and Intraorganizational Social Connection, the higher Neuroticism, lower the Intraorganizational Social Connection and vice versa.

Table 3: Correlations

Correlations

	Family-Work Conflict	Neuroticism	Knowledge Sharing	Intraorganizacional Social Connection
Family-Work Conflict	1			
Neuroticism	.405***	1		
Knowledge Sharing	-.023	-.141	1	
Intraorganizacional Social Connection	-.295***	-.301***	.338***	1

Source: elaborate by the authors.
***p< 0.01 (*two-tailed*).

In the regression model, the adjusted coefficient of determination (adjusted R^2) is a measure of the adjusted coefficient of determination (R^2), that considers the number of independent variables included in the regression equation, and the sample size [46].Besides, the variance inflation factor (VIF) is an indicator to the effect of other independent variables to the standard error of regression coefficient, it is directly related to the value of tolerance, so high values of VIF indicate high degree of collinearity or multicollinearity between the independent variables [46]. Table 4 shows the regression coefficients, where only Intraorganizational Social ConnectionBeta is significant, corresponding to fist hypothesis, wherein Knowledge Sharing is the dependent variable, and correlates positively with Intraorganizational Social Connection. In general, the model is significant, with F value = 5.219, whereas 0.102 R^2 adjusted, where the power of explanation model is a maximum of 10.20%, considering what was addressed as Knowledge Sharing. Furthermore, the data indicate that the VIF measure is less than 5 for the independent variables, thus it is concluded that there is no multicollinearity between measurements.

Table4: Regression

Intraorganizational Social Connection	.347***
Family-Work Conflict	.117
Neuroticism	-.084
R^2	.127
Adjusted R^2	.102
F	5.219***

Source: elaborate by the authors.

*** p< 0.01 (*two-tailed*).

As discussed in the literature, the Knowledge Sharing aims to analyze the extent of exchanges of information and experiences during social interactions between each actor in the network compared to its colleges[18]. The literature indicated that the higher the level of interaction, will also be greater exchange of experience between them [31]. Was identified a gap in the literature, because the existing research analyzed several variables, but wasn't identified studies concerned about the influences of Intraorganizational Social Connection,Neuroticism, and Family-Work Conflict regarding the Knowledge Sharing. Thus, this work aims to contribute filling this gap.

The first hypothesis presents Intraorganizational Social Connection, and seeking to assess the extent which contacts of the organizational actor make him have a sense of belonging to the organization [11]. Thus, this hypothesis was confirmed, andIntraorganizational Social Connection is positively related to the Knowledge Sharing. The base of second hypothesis was the concept of [44], where high levels of neuroticism are associated with conflicts related to the professional environment, such as personality traits address the difficulty of dealing with stressful situations. However, it was refuted, thus the Neuroticism is not related negatively with Knowledge Sharing. The third hypothesis was based on the concept of [42], in which the authors assume the existence of conflict between work and family, due to the fact that the demands made on a role can compromise the performance expected by the individual in another role. But, the third hypothesis was refuted, because Family-Work Conflict is not negatively related with Knowledge Sharing.

Conclusions

This article aimed to examine in what extent the factors Neuroticism, Intraorganizational Social Connection, and Family-Work Conflict influence Knowledge Sharing. Was important consider these factors because Knowledge Sharing can impact in different ways processes in organizations coming from the interactions between the individuals[5]. So, the behavior of individuals to share knowledge is influenced by contextual factors and individual personal perceptions [6], in this study was considered three of a huge amount of variables. Faced with this context, was noted that the literature presented a study opportunity, thanwas evaluated some variables that could had positive or negative effect on Knowledge Sharing, they are: Intraorganizational Social Connections, Neuroticism, and Family-Work Conflict.

The discussion started from the premise that Knowledge Sharing in organizations should consider the internal relations, considering ties between nods of the system referred to individuals who are socially connected [9]. It was understood that the variables Intraorganizational Social Connection, Neuroticism, and Family-Work Conflict constitute and determine the internal relations of the actors. Social Connection, according [31], indicates that the higher the level of interaction between the actors, higher the exchange of experience between them. Thus, the IntraorganizationalSocial Connection corroborates with

what [16] points, that knowledge in organizations is maintained through social relationships and is not concentrated in one individual. When relations between individuals are more frequent, there is a greater possibility of positive connection [10], promoting greater Intraorganizational Social Connection [11,34].Whereas, [36] state that Neuroticism when present in high levels of individual's personality can bias ideas dissociated from reality, and compromise the relations. In the other hand, Family-Work Conflict indicates, according to [15], that the family tensions can influence the role the individual plays in their work. So [42] indicate that claims of work and family are mutually conflicting. From the relationship between Knowledge Sharing literature and the other independent variables, the deduction of some assertions that presupposed the correlation between the variables, positive or negative was possible.

However, the research problem was answered by checking the influence of Intraorganizational Social Connection,Neuroticism, and Family-Work Conflict on Knowledge Sharing. Thus, the main contribution of this paper is focused on results that show how Intraorganizational Social Connection really has influence on Knowledge Sharing, whereas Family-Work Conflict and Neuroticism were not confirmed as influencers of Knowledge Sharing. The individual share the same amount of knowledge with the presence of Neuroticism and Family-Work Conflict, not affecting negatively the Knowledge Sharing as originally thought. But, the individual actually share more knowledge if he lodge more social connections, making possible to fill a space of the gap that this paper set out to meet. About the limitations, this study may not be generalizable in a probabilistic way, only analytical generalization is possible. Thus, future research suggestions may address how the Knowledge Sharing occurs in other sectors, under different condition, as well considering other independent variables. Another suggestion is to examine the influence of the independent variables that were significantly correlated.

References

1. Davenport, T.H. and Prusak, L., (1998),“Conhecimento empresarial: como as organizações gerenciam o seu capital intellectual”, Rio de Janeiro: Campus.
2. Binotto, E. and Nakayama, M. K., (2009). “Um Método de Análise da Criação de Conhecimento para a Realidade do Agronegócios”, *Revista Eletrônica de Administração*, Vol. 15, pp: 01-29.
3. Choo, C.W., (2006), “A organização do conhecimento: como as organizações usam a informação para criar significado, construir conhecimento e tomar decisão”, 2ed. São Paulo: SENAC São Paulo.
4. Tonet, H.C. and Paz, M.G.T., (2006), “Um modelo para o Compartilhamento do Conhecimento no trabalho”, *Revista de Administração Contemporânea*, Vol. 10, N. 2, pp: 75-94.
5. Nonaka, I. and Takeuchi, H., (1997).Criação de conhecimento na empresa: Como as empresas Japonesas geram a dinâmica da inovação. 3 ed. Rio de Janeiro: Campus.
6. Lin, M.J.J., Hung, S.W. and Chen, C.J., (2009), “Fostering the determinants of knowledge sharing in professional virtual communities”, *Computers in Human Behavior*, Vol.25, pp: 929-939.
7. Ryu, S., Ho, S.H. and Han, I. (2003),“Knowledge sharing behavior of physicians in hospitals”, *Expert Systems with Applications*, Vol. 25, N. 1, pp: 113-122.
8. Usoro, A., Sharratt, M.W., Tsui, E. andShekhar, S., (2007),“Trust as an antecedent to knowledge sharing in virtual communities of practice”, *Knowledge Management Research & Practice*, Vol. 5, pp: 199-212.

9. Wasserman, S. and Faust, K., (2009),“Social Network Analysis. Cambridge”: Cambridge University Press.
10. Grant, A.M., (2007),“Relational job design and the motivation to make a posocial difference”,*Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 32, N. 2, pp: 393-417.
11. Maciel, C.O., (2014),“Conexão social intraorganizacional: proposta conceitual e avaliação de seus efeitos em três domínios relacionais”, In: Simpósio de gestão da inovação tecnológica, Belo Horizonte. Anais… Belo Horizonte: ANPAD, pp: 1-16.
12. John, O. P. and Srivastava, S., (1999), “The big-five trait taxonomy: history, measurement, and theoretical perspectives”,In: Pervin, L.A., John, O.P. (Ed.), Handbook of personality: theory and research. New York: Guilford Press, Vol.2.
13. Lima, G.S., Lima, M.S. and Tanure, B., (2009),“Os Desafios da Carreira da Mulher Executiva no Brasil”, In: EnGPR, Encontro de gestão de pessoas e relações de trabalho, II, Curitiba - PR. Anais... Rio de Janeiro ANPAD, pp: 1-15.
14. Andrews, E. andWithey, S., (1976),“Social indicators of well-being”. New York: Plenum Press.
15. Cooke, R.A. and Rousseau, D.M., (1984), “Stress and strain from family roles and work role expectations”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 69, N. 2, pp: 252-260.
16. Tsoukas, H., (1996),“The firm as a distributed knowledge system: a constructionist approach”, *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 17, N. 1, pp: 11-25.
17. Tywoniak, S.A., (2007),“Knowledge in four deformation dimensions”, *Organization*, Vol.14, N. 1. pp: 53-76.
18. Casimir, G., Lee, K. and Loon, M., (2012),“Knowledge sharing: influences of trust, commitment and cost”, “*Journal of Knowledge Management*”, Vol. 16, N. 5, pp: 740-753.
19. Avdimiotis, S., Kokkinis, G. andKamenidou, E., (2012), “Sharing knowledge between the peers of a winery network: The case of wine routes in Northern Greece”, *China-USA Business Review*, Vol.11, pp: 38-51
20. Ipe, M., (2003),“Knowledge sharing in organizations: a conceptual framework. *Human Resource Development Review*”, Vol. 2, N. 4, pp: 337-359.
21. Lin, H., (2007),“Intrinsic motivation on employee knowledge sharing intentions”,*Journal of Information Science*, Vol. 33, N. 2.
22. Cho, N., Li, G.Z. and Su, C., (2007),“An empirical study on the effect of individual factors on knowledge sharing by knowledge type”, “*Journal Global Business and Technology*”, Vol. 3, N. 2, pp: 1-15.
23. Lin, H., Lee, H. and Wang, D.W., (2009),“Evaluation of factors influencing knowledge sharing based on a fuzzy AHP approach”,*Journal of Information Science*, Vol. 35, N. 1, pp: 25-44.
24. Polanyi, M., (1966),“The tacit dimension”,New York: Anchor Day Books.
25. Rivera-Vazquez, J.C., Ortiz-Fournier, L.V. and Flores, F.R., (2009), “Overcoming cultural barriers for innovation and knowledge sharing”, *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 13, N. 5, pp: 257-270.
26. Edvardsson, I.R., (2006),“Knowledge management in SMEs: The case of Icelandic firms”, *Knowledge Management Research & Practice*, Vol. 4, N. 4, pp: 275-282.
27. Vajjhala, N.R. andRojba, G., (2012), “Alternative approaches to knowledge sharing within small and medium-sized enterprises”, Poland: TIIM–Technology, Innovation, and Industrial Management Conference.
28. Hofstede, G., (1984), “The cultural relativity of the quality of life concept”,*Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 9, N.3, pp: 389-398.
29. Casey, A., (2005), “Enhancing individual and organizational learning: a sociological model”, *Management Learning*, Vol. 36, N. 2. Pp: 131-147.

30. Albino, V., Garavelli, A.C. andSchiuma, G., (1999), “Knowledge transfer and inter-firm relationships in industrial districts: the role of the leader firm”,*Technovation*, Vol. 19, pp. 53-63.
31. Van Wijk, R.V., Jansen, J.J.P. and Lyles, M.A., (2008),“Inter and intra-organizational knowledge transfer: a meta-analytic review and assessment of its antecedents and consequences”,*Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 45, N. 4, pp: 830-853.
32. Granovetter, M., (1973),“The strenght of weak ties”, *American Journal of Sociology*”, Vol. 78, N. 6, pp: 1360-1380.
33. Kadushin, C., (1966),“The friends and supporters of psychotherapy: on social circles in urban life”, *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 31, N. 6, pp: 786-802.
34. Maciel, C.O. and Chaves, C.E., (2014),“Status informacional em organizações de conhecimento intensivo: o papel do compartilhamento do conhecimento e das lacunas estruturais. In: Simpósio de Gestão da Inovação Tecnológica, Belo Horizonte. Anais… Belo Horizonte: ANPAD, p. 1-14
35. Mccrae, R.R. and John, OP., (1992),“An introduction to the five-factor model and its applications”,*Journal of Personality*, Vol. 60, N. 2. pp: 175-215.
36. Nunes, C.H.S.S. and Hutz, C.S., (2002),“O modelo dos Cinco Grandes Fatores de personalidade”, Em R. Primi (Org.), Temas em Avaliação Psicológica, Campinas: IBAP.
37. Costa, P. and Mccrae, R., (1987),“Neuroticism, somatic complaints, and disease: Is the bark worse than the bite?” *Journal of Personality*, Vol. 55, pp: 299-316.
38. Robinson, M.D and Neighbors, C., (2006),“Catching the mind in action: Implicit methods in personality research and assessment”,In: Eid, M.; Diener, E. (ed.) Handbook of multimethod measurement in psychology. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
39. Carr, J.C., Boyar, S.L. and Gregory, B.T., (2008),“The moderating effect of work-family centrality on work-family conflict, organizational attitudes, and turnover behavior”, *Journal of Management*, Vol. 34, N. 2, pp: 244-262.
40. Premeaux, S.F., Adkins, C.L. and Mossholder, K.W., (2007),“Balancing work and family: a field study of multi-dimensional, multi-role work-family conflict”, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 28, N.6, pp: 705-727.
41. Campbell, A., Converse, P.E. and Rodgers, W.L., (1976), “The quality of American life”, New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
42. Greenhaus, J.H. and Beautell, N.J., (1985),“Sources of conflict between work and family roles”, *Academy of Mangement Review*, Vol. 10, N. 1, pp: 76-88.
43. Aryee, S., Fields, D. andLuk, V., (1999),“A cross-cultural test of a model of the work-family interface”,*Journal of Management*, Vol. 25, N. 4, pp: 401-415.
44. Beauregard, T.A. and Henry, L.C., (2009),“Making the link between work-life balance practices and organizational performance”, *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol.19, N.1, pp: 9-22.
45. Gutek, B. A., Searle, S. and Klepa, L., (1991),“Rational versus gender role explanations for work-family conflict”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 74, N. 4. Pp: 560-568.
46. Hair Jr, J.F., Anderson, R.E., Tathan, R.L. and Black, W.C., (2005),“Análisemultivariada de dados”. Porto Alegre: Bookman, 5 ed.