The Impact of Trust on Knowledge Sharing
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Abstract

In every organization the knowledge sharing in a group is very important. It is clear that there are different kinds of trust that impact the knowledge sharing. But still we do not know that what elements of trust are more crucial for sharing knowledge. In this study the objective is showing the important aspects of trust that affect knowledge sharing. Therefore for providing a new framework many studies were investigated.
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1. Knowledge sharing

The degree to be able to share the knowledge is related to a person’s skill to communicate her or his social behavior. The properties of knowledge might not be shared because people cannot communicate and describe them (Nonaka, 1995). Therefore, many elements can influence the willingness. One factor that has a key role is pride of ownership for the person’s expert knowledge. The limitation in time as a result of imagined or real overload of information might reduce the preparedness to cooperate in sharing knowledge actions. At last, often employees fear that if they share their own knowledge with other people then they will be in danger for losing their position inside the firm.

This might take place in firms with strong policy that knowledge is very powerful. According to these circumstances, knowledge sharing in an efficient way is not possible.

Also, the proper climate of organization plays a crucial role for bringing the proper culture for suitable knowledge sharing. Inside the human brain the knowledge is created not visibly. Just the right climate of firm is able to persuade individuals for creation, revealing, sharing and using them. The reason is that the knowledge factor of human that is flexible and evolving is
very desirable and also the factors which are motivational for create, share and use of knowledge are very crucial.

The managing of knowledge is not only obtaining tacit knowledge that is transformed in more explicit knowledge. It is not also just creating big repositories for knowledge and the best practices as well. While the knowledge is known as a property for developing norms and values of firm then the organization will be successful for managing knowledge. It can support the sharing and creation of knowledge.

The knowledge sharing concept was narrowed down with knowledge management and it is mainly is the capture of expertise from a firm or person while it distribute and reside it for helping and providing the huge returns of the firm and individual (Krogh, 2000).

By means of sharing knowledge among the coming person and leaving person there will be a big difference for the organization. This is the sharing knowledge which is so important for managing knowledge like capture, store and distribution of the information, experiences, ideas and the knowledge as well.

The sharing of knowledge is not only a usual information exchange that impacts the working relations, power distribution, influential patterns and modifies how people will explain their duties and responsibilities (Willett, 2002).

The sharing of knowledge means the actions for transfer and disseminate of knowledge from a group, person, organization and other things (Lee, 2001). In managing knowledge, the knowledge is known as the production part of resources that should be applied, shared and also improved for the creative ideas which are generative to a defined issue and problem (Wang, 1999).

Based on statements of Wang (1999) while the tacit knowledge changes into explicit knowledge this is knowledge sharing and also the opposite is possible and the knowledge goes from people to the firm and then comes back. He believes that knowledge of organization mainly is for each person in the firm. While, the employees share the explicit and tacit knowledge by their daily activities and interactions the knowledge that is original will be spread. The sharing knowledge and the acquisition of it is spiraling that individuals just achieve the knowledge by socialization and improve it by combination of knowledge.

2. Trust

For most of the processes which are related to knowledge trust is important for instance knowledge transparent creation, sharing and utilizing knowledge (Gilbert et al, 2000).
having no proper reason most of the people will not share the knowledge if they do not have good feeling and trust (Ellis, 2001). With having no trust, the maximum brain potential will not be achieved by the firm (Geoffrey, 1997). According to Aride de Geus and his Business review from Harvard related to long living organizations: inside these companies the money is not the positive factor of motivation. If it is not enough then individuals are not satisfied but also having money more than the threshold also does not motivate them to give their knowledge to the firm. The important factor is the mutual trust (Ann, 1993). In these days knowledge economy it is very crucial to provide trust among employer and employee for retaining and motivating the knowledge workers.

One of the approaches to showing the employee that his or her ideas are important is consulting them to corporate for the problems and issues. This issue should be at the same time both amenable and substantive to impact (Frances, 1999). By this approach, the response will be faster from employees and also surprising. The reason is that employees like to be asked related to their thoughts and if they just believe that the contribution from them must be assumed seriously (Asgharian et al., 2013).

Every knowledge management will not be successful only if firms consider the existed knowledge inside the firm and also care about the individuals otherwise the knowledge sharing will not happen effectively. There are differences in caring because it contains aiding individuals to share and also learn. The managers should provide the context to reveal that they do care and feel for their employees and also the enterprise success (Douglas and Wykowski, 1999). Therefore, individuals must explain their feelings in order to bring many helpful information and knowledge. It should be mentioned that each person’s involvement and experience should act as a partner in implementing and sharing managing knowledge in the firm.

In other words, providing signposts and maps constantly means guidance therefore the learners are aware that where are they and how to achieve what they desire to become (Asgharian et al, 2013). For supporting this there should be encouragement and providing help while necessary and it should be done as motivating individuals to continue cooperation for the knowledge context. So, by having guidance and support inside the firm they will show that firm is caring about the learning process and knowledge sharing and also its effects.

Trust and confidence in organizations’ leadership made a more cooperative knowledge sharing environment (Goman, 2002).

In this way, team members’ knowledge, views and contribution shall be shared among themselves. Besides that, team building that emphasizes ‘trust’ and ‘confidence’ in fellow
team members tend to reduce conflict (Robbins, 2003). Management therefore needs assistance in evaluating trends and deciding on appropriate tactics and strategies. Besides that, good long term relationships provide employers and employees with incentives to invest trust in their organization (Sonnenberg, 1994).

Good knowledge management initiatives create trust that helps to break down cultural barriers and alter the way individuals and groups to share knowledge. There are five propositions established under the factor of trust presented below to investigate the connection between the variables and the development of knowledge sharing culture.

3. Proposed Framework

The concept of trust is problematic with respect to the definition of trust itself, and antecedents and outcomes of trust are often confused (Wasko et al., 2005). Drawing on the existing body of literature concerning the organizational setting, trust is defined as the belief in, and willingness to depend on, another party (e.g., Mayer et al., 1995). In terms of knowledge sharing, a trusting person is more willing to give useful knowledge to others. Trust is regarded as a facilitator of effective knowledge sharing.

In the past studies related to sociologist it was mentioned that trust is not related only to belief of people about other ones but rather their willingness and desire for using knowledge for impacting actions of future (e.g., Luhmann, 1979; Lewis and Weigert, 1985), and for the context of social psychologist as well (see Rempel et al., 1985). According to this, two forms of principal from trust are defined (e.g., Chowdhury, 2005; Lewis and Weigert, 1985; McAllister, 1995).

Firstly, the trust that is based on cognition is related to though if people about other’s confidence and also good reasons which are the proofs of worth of trust. Next type, the trust based on affect is found in the affective bonds among mutual care of people’s involvement and their concern. In the similar way, in 1995 Mayer et al provided a difference among the benevolence that has a huge powerful component and also competency that focuses on cognition aspect as the key aspects of the trust. Also, in 1980 Cook and Wall mentioned trust as “faith in the trustworthy intentions of others” and “confidence in the ability of others”.

Anyways, this paper assumes four aspects for the trust which are support, care, confident and guidance as well as relationship in long term.
4. Conclusion
Sharing knowledge inside and among the teams is very crucial for the firms. The impact of various kinds of trust generally for the sharing knowledge is obvious. The capability of knowledge sharing is mainly related to the person’s skill to communicate his or her behavior socially. The properties of knowledge might not be transferred because people are not capable to define and explain them. Therefore, the degree of eagerness is impacted by many elements. The ownership pride for a person’s expert knowledge has a crucial role. Limitation of time because of imagined or real information overload might also decline preparedness to participate in activities of sharing knowledge. At last, the individuals often scare from passing knowledge to other ones because they think that they will lose their position inside the firm. For most of the processes related to knowledge the trust is very important for instance providing transparent of knowledge or utilizing and sharing it. Many individuals do not like to risk for sharing knowledge with having no logical reason to trust. If trust does not exist then the firm will not achieve maximum potential of brain. By studying the literature, four dimensions have been highlighted by this paper which are care, guidance and support, long term relations and finally confident.
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