Less or More Knowledge Sharing Caused by Managerial Fear in the Hospitality Sector[1]

Priyanka Kapanwar[2]
Hakan Satiroglu[3]

Abstract

Managers' fear of losing power, revealing knowledge gaps, and facing criticism can lead to a restrictive flow of information, negatively impacting collaboration and service quality. In order to analyze the dynamics of managerial fear and its impact on knowledge sharing (KS), this research employs the SECI model and qualitative methodology, including semi-structured interviews with six industry professionals from the UK hospitality industry. Thematic analysis followed four distinct knowledge-sharing quadrants: Active, Reluctant, Passive, and Hesitant Knowledge Sharers. Active sharers exhibited minimal fear and actively engaged in knowledge sharing, fostering innovation and positive organizational dynamics. Findings reveal that managerial fear can inhibit the sharing of tacit knowledge, essential for customer satisfaction and service quality in the hospitality industry. The study introduces a new taxonomy for KS, that could provide insights into how managerial fear manifests and proposing strategies to mitigate its adverse effects. In contrast, hesitant sharers demonstrated significant reluctance, often due to fear of repercussions or lack of trust, contributing to organizational silence and diminished collaboration.

Keywords: Managerial fear, Knowledge sharing, SECI model, Tourism and Hospitality industry, Tacit knowledge
JEL Classification: D83, M12, L83

Yönetimsel Korkunun Yol Açtığı Azalan veya Artan Bilgi Paylaşımı

Öz

Yöneticilerin güç kaybetme, bilgi boşluklarını ortaya çıkarma ve eleştiriyle karşılaşma korkusu, bilgi akışının kısıtlanmasına yol açarak işbirliğini ve hizmet kalitesini olumsuz etkileyebilir. Bu araştırma, yönetimsel korkunun bilgi paylaşımı (KS) üzerindeki etkilerini analiz etmek amacıyla İngiltere'deki misafirperverlik sektöründen altı sektör profesyoneliyle yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmeler gerçekleştirmiş ve SECI modeli çerçevesinde nitel bir metodoloji benimsemiştir. Tematik analiz, dört ayrı bilgi paylaşım kategorilerini takip etmiştir : Aktif, İsteksiz, Pasif ve Kararsız Bilgi Paylaşanlar. Aktif paylaşımcılar, düşük düzeyde korku sergileyerek bilgi paylaşımına aktif katılım göstermiş ve bu durum yenilikçiliği ve olumlu organizasyonel dinamikleri desteklemiştir. Buna karşılık, çekingen paylaşımcılar, tepki korkusu veya güven eksikliği nedeniyle bilgi paylaşımına isteksiz yaklaşmış, bu da kurumsal sessizliğe ve azalan iş birliğine yol açmıştır. Bulgular, yönetimsel korkunun müşteri memnuniyeti ve hizmet kalitesi için kritik olan örtük bilginin paylaşımını engelleyebileceğini ortaya koymaktadır. Çalışma, yönetimsel korkunun nasıl ortaya çıktığını anlamaya yönelik yeni bir KS sınıflandırması sunarak, bu olumsuz etkileri azaltmaya yönelik stratejiler önermektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Yönetimsel korku, Bilgi paylaşımı, SECI modeli, Turizm, Konaklama ve Otelcilik sektörü, Örtük bilgi
JEL Sınıflandırması: D83, M12, L83

---

[1] *Authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose. Data collection and preliminary analysis were solely completed within dissertation process. Whie authors have used interview data from master's dissertation at Bath Spa University. However, the theoretical framework is completely unique from dissertation.*
[2] *Master's Student: Bath Business School, kapanwarpriyanka@gmail.com, ORCID: 0009-0003-2448-7079*
[3] *Lecturer: Bath Business School, h.satiroglu@bathspa.ac.uk, ORCID: 0000-0001-7483-4305*

1. Introduction

Knowledge sharing (KS) acts as a key enabler for innovation, service excellence, and sustained competitive advantage in the hospitality sector (Scott and Laws, 2006; Patwary et al., 2022). Effective KS practices facilitate the exchange of \ideas and experiences among staff, enhancing organizational learning and enabling hotels to remain adaptable in meeting the dynamic demands of customer service and satisfaction (Luu, 2021). However, the process of knowledge sharing within organizations is often impeded by several internal barriers, one of the most critical being managerial fear. This fear can manifest in various forms, from reluctance to share information due to concerns over losing power and control, to apprehension about revealing knowledge gaps that could undermine authority (Kumar et al., 2022). Such fears not only restrict the flow of information but also hinder collaboration, which is essential in hospitality settings where timely and effective communication directly impacts service quality (Kim and Lee, 2013).

Employees tend to remain silent due to manager's action which is often felt at work (Spreitzer, 1996; Sugarman, 2001). Not only upper management, but the supervisor's propensity to quiet has an impact on subordinates' silence. According to Sparrowe and Liden (2005), a superior who shows concern for his subordinates and their problems would be regarded as an example by them. Though many research stress that in the presence of a disturbing fear and strong supervisor, subordinates are more sensitive to the hazards of talking than the advantages, authority and prestige of the supervisor can still have an impact on subordinates' quiet (Edmondson, 1996).

Cakici's (2007) detailed discussion on silence proposes a definition from Turkish literature dictionary that silence is the language of many emotions such as love, anger, resentment, confusion, forgetfulness, fear, and loyalty. Furthermore, she added Morrison and Milliken (2000) comments who had approached silence as a collective phenomenon and developed the concept of organizational silence. While Morrison and Milliken (2000) extended the details of their orientation, we have embraced and investigated the emotion of fear in our study as a source of organizational silence in current study. Additionally, Pinder and Harlos (2001) explained the mechanism of silence as a response to injustice, defined employee silence as the withholding of genuine thoughts regarding one's behavioral, cognitive, and/or emotional evaluations on organizational matters from those perceived to have the power to influence or correct the situation. Based on these definitions, silence in organizations can be described as the conscious decision of employees due to managerial fear to withhold their knowledge and opinions on technical and/or behavioral matters related to the job or workplace for the sake of improvement and development.

Numerous studies have addressed managerial fear (Yasar, 2024; Bellini et al., 2022; Copp, 2020; Dalgıç, 2019; Udovik, 2011; Suárez 1994). However, there remains a gap in understanding how managerial fear specifically inhibits knowledge sharing and contributes to organizational silence. The first phase recruited 6 interviewees and focused on exploring the extent and implications of managerial fear.

How does managerial fear impact Knowledge Sharing and ultimately knock on organizational silence?

Our study contributes to the literature in two significant ways: first, by shifting the focus from traditional examinations of managerial fear at the employee or manager level to its influence on knowledge sharing and organizational silence; and second, by introducing and validating a new taxonomy for knowledge sharing that considers managerial fear at organizations.

In a service-oriented industry like hospitality, where customer interactions and service delivery are paramount, knowledge sharing becomes not just advantageous but essential (Guzzo et al., 2021). With rapid shifts in consumer behavior and the growing influence of digital platforms, hospitality businesses must continuously adapt by leveraging the collective knowledge of their workforce (Masood et al., 2023). Therefore, this study has a scope of the hospitality industry. This research draws from both theoretical perspectives on KS and applied studies in organizational psychology, offering an in-depth analysis of how the hospitality industry experiences managerial fear and KS practices in the UK. The qualitative approach with semi-structured interviews has provided an in-depth understanding of how such fears manifest and what strategies could mitigate their negative effects.

In detail of employees' fear is investigated by Yasar et al. (2024). Existing literature on workplace fear has predominantly focused on solely employees' fear (Yasar, 2024), its relation to well-being (Yasar, 2024; Bellini et al., 2022; Hasan et al., 2021), and its impact on organizational behavior (Ballı

and Çakıcı, 2019; Dalgıç, 2019). By addressing the gap in existing literature, particularly regarding how manager's fear how effects KS in the hospitality industry, the current study might provide practical insights beyond knowledge sharing or improving internal communication, because enhancing knowledge sharing ultimately improves innovation (Satiroglu, 2024; Saleem et al., 2023), and overall performance (Donate et al., 2015; Yahyapour et al., 2015) including service quality.

2. Theoretical View

The SECI model by Nonaka and Takeuchi (2000), explains the dynamic interactions between tacit and explicit knowledge in the process of knowledge conversion (Hoe, 2006). This model introduces the four modes of knowledge conversion, however, the main point of SECI is sharing and exchanging knowledge through socialization, externalization, combination, and internalization, offering a structured approach to understanding knowledge dynamics. Furthermore, collective learning occurs through shared practices, creating a repository of organizational knowledge and expertise (Storberg-Walker, 2008).

The idea of SECI and tacit knowledge resonates with the hospitality industry, where knowledge is a key driver of innovation and customer satisfaction, there are unique challenges to effective knowledge sharing. Tacit knowledge—comprising personal insights, intuition, and experiential know-how—plays a critical role, as this type of knowledge is often the basis for service quality and customer experience (Iuga and Kifor, 2014; Luu, 2021). However, the barriers to sharing such tacit knowledge can be significant, often requiring deliberate organizational strategies to cultivate an environment conducive to open exchange (Lombardi, Sassetti, and Cavaliere, 2019). Therefore, the elimination of fear in the case of knowledge sharing is a fundamental element (Satiroglu, 2024).

Referring to eliminating fear, within the SECI model could further explain how knowledge sharing should ideally occur in organizations and contribute learning. Therefore, there is a need to highlight what and why are the reasons that could inhibit these processes. Satiroglu's (2024) framework contextualizes the essence of why these processes (Knowledge sharing and SECI) could be stopped or broken down, particularly in the presence of causes related to the individuals who prefer holding back rather than actively knowledge sharing. Furthermore, we have specifically aimed to enlighten our understanding of how managerial fear impacts knowledge sharing within organizations. This framework is particularly relevant for our study as it helps categorize the different ways of KS in which managers might withhold or share knowledge based on their levels of fear and readiness. Hence, we have synthesized holding back as part of our framework (in figure 1) which would resonate with studies: managerial anxiety is a multifaceted phenomenon often rooted in concerns over loss of control, criticism from subordinates, and threats to job security (Nisar et al., 2021), and behaviors undermine the culture of trust and openness necessary for effective knowledge exchange, particularly in high-pressure environments like hospitality (Ahmad and Bilal, 2022).

Moreover, organizational culture plays a crucial role in either exacerbating or mitigating managerial fear. It is assertive that hierarchical and control-oriented cultures tend to amplify fear and worsen knowledge sharing, leading to protective behaviors or organizational silence such as information gatekeeping (Nisar et al., 2021). In contrast, cultures that promote transparency, continuous learning, and participative decision-making can significantly reduce managerial anxiety and foster a more collaborative environment (Edmondson, 2019; Surucu and Sagbas, 2020). In the hospitality industry, where responsiveness and adaptability are essential, a culture that supports open communication and knowledge sharing is integral to both service quality and organizational resilience (Raes et al., 2013; Luu, 2021).

3. Methodology

This research employed a qualitative methodology to explore the complex dynamics of managerial fear, knowledge sharing, and organizational silence within the hospitality industry. The sample universe consisted of hotel professionals from various types of establishments across the UK, including boutique hotels, large chains, and mid-sized operations (Wilson, Onwuegbuzie, and Manning, 2016). The recruitment process involved identifying key hospitality establishments and professional networks, followed by direct outreach through emails and phone calls to gauge interest in participation (Deterding and Waters, 2021). Participants were selected to ensure a diverse range of perspectives based on the size and type of hotel, management level, and years of experience.

The data collection method centred around in-depth semi-structured interviews, which lasted approximately 45-60 minutes each. These interviews were conducted in a confidential setting to allow participants to candidly discuss their experiences with manager's fear and its impact on knowledge sharing (Wilson, Onwuegbuzie, and Manning, 2016). A flexible interview guide with open-ended questions enabled the interviewer to explore emergent themes while covering critical topics related to the study's objectives (Deterding and Waters, 2021).

The research design has been set as a two-phase study with recruiting 6 participants (table 1), with four males and two females. Their ages ranged from 26 to 39 years. Participants were from various departments, including Operations, Health and Safety, Customer Service, Human Resources, and Training & Development. The education level varied, with most holding degrees, except for one participant who did not disclose educational details. Their experience in the industry ranged from 6 to over 15 years.

Table 1: Demographic Information of the Participants

Participant	Gender	Age	Education	Experience (years)	Department
I01	Male	34	Degree	13	Operations
I02	Male	39	Degree	Over 15	H&S
I03	Male	26	n/a	6	Customer Service
I04	Female	38	Degree	10	HR
I05	Male	33	Degree	11	Training and Development
I06	Female	35	Degree	8	Operations

The qualitative nature of the research emphasized capturing the emotional and psychological complexities of these issues, making thematic analysis the ideal approach for data analysis (Clarke, Braun, and Hayfield, 2015). Thematic analysis was conducted iteratively, involving the coding of transcripts, identifying patterns, and refining themes to ensure they accurately represented the participants' insights (Riger and Sigurvinsdottir, 2016). This methodological approach allowed the study to uncover nuanced perspectives and address the research questions in a manner that quantitative methods could not achieve (Frith and Gleeson, 2011). Furthermore, we have applied Satiroglu's framework to analyze interview data collected from hotel managers. For example, **I01** and **I05** demonstrated characteristics of **Active Knowledge Sharers** by actively mentoring and sharing innovative ideas, reflecting low fear and high readiness to share knowledge. Conversely, **I02** and **I06** exhibited traits of **Passive Knowledge Sharers**, showing significant fear that constrained their willingness to share crucial information despite their readiness. Therefore, we have contributed to literature of manager's fear and knowledge sharing this new taxonomy.

4. Analysis and Findings

The result model for study has been presented in table 1. Themes of managerial fear onto the knowledge sharing quadrants effectively, Table1 identify how each theme relates to the levels of knowledge sharing readiness and fear described in each quadrant. For **fears leading to silence**, active knowledge sharing is associated with minimal fear and consequently minimal organizational silence. In contrast, hesitant knowledge sharing also features high fear but leads to excessive fear isolation and organizational silence. When examining the **emotional impact of silence**, Reluctant knowledge sharing is marked by moderate stress and dissatisfaction, which affects engagement to a moderate degree. Passive knowledge sharing, however, is linked with high levels of stress, dissatisfaction, and isolation. Finally, the **organizational effects of silence** indicate that active knowledge sharing might have a positive impact on performance, innovation and team dynamics. In contrast, Hesitant knowledge sharing results in a severe negative impact, causing erosion of trust and collaboration.

In 2024, while comprehensive framework of Satiroglu for the distinguishment between passive and active knowledge sharers within organizations, this framework has been synthesized with two critical dimensions in figure 1: manager's fear and knowledge sharing readiness. According to Satiroglu, passive knowledge sharers are characterized by their willingness to share knowledge but are hindered by significant fear or hesitation (2024).

As highlighted in Satiroglu's thesis (2024), the presence of innovative leadership is conducive for KS. Therefore, the detail of passive sharing: *"The holding back needed to be more articulation; if individuals presented passiveness in a way of observation and stepping back, their position was not dismissing their zeal for knowledge sharing. Hence, we can say that employees could be passive knowledge sharer even in less managerial fear environment. It was rather in the middle of seeker and donator of knowledge sharing"*. This observation suggests that passive sharers are ready to share knowledge but are restrained by internal or external factors, positioning them between active seekers and donors of knowledge. Active knowledge sharers, on the other hand, are those who exhibit low levels of fear and engage proactively in sharing their knowledge.

Figure 1: Readiness for Knowledge Sharing (Passive and Active Knowledge Sharer)

Knowledge Sharing Readiness		
	High (knowledge seeker/donator)	Low (knowledge seeker/donator)
Managerial Fear — Low	Active Knowledge Sharing	Reluctant Knowledge Sharing
Managerial Fear — High	Passive Knowledge Sharing	Hesitant to Knowledge Sharing

Source: Adapted from Satiroglu (2024), p. 205.

Practitioners could be in favor of proactive behavior that often supports knowledge sharing by a conducive organizational culture and effective communication channels. Although passive and active knowledge sharers are well articulated in the paper, we argue that high managerial fear could inhibit knowledge sharers. Thus, we synthesize Reluctant and Hesitant knowledge sharers and categorized these types of dynamics, and we have extended them into the four distinct quadrants, offering valuable insights into how different levels of fear impact knowledge sharing practices. Furthermore, we are aware that these kinds of frameworks are to be called for further investigation for the sake of knowledge seeker, as suggested by Tassabehji et al. (2019), which extends the literature on knowledge donating and seeking. This detail of our understanding helps in identifying how various factors influence knowledge sharing and provides essence to foster a more open and collaborative environment.

Active Knowledge Sharers (top-right quadrant) are both ready and eager to share knowledge without hesitation, actively mentoring and contributing insights. Reluctant Knowledge Sharers (top-left quadrant), despite having little fear, lack the motivation or readiness to share knowledge, resulting in minimal engagement and classified as reluctant knowledge sharing. Passive Knowledge Sharers (bottom-left quadrant) are prepared to share valuable knowledge but are restrained by managerial fear, often hesitating due to concerns about potential negative outcomes or not feeling prepared for certain knowledge sharing. Hesitant Knowledge Sharers (bottom-right quadrant) are presented with neither readiness nor willingness to share knowledge and we have reasoned not attenting knowledge sharing to the experiencing of high managerial fear. This profile often avoids sharing due to a lack of motivation or perceived relevance. To foster a culture of knowledge sharing, organizations should identify which quadrant managers fall into, and tailor strategies accordingly: support and encourage Active Knowledge Sharers, boost motivation for Reluctant Knowledge Sharers, address fears for Passive Knowledge Sharers, and work on increasing readiness and willingness for Hesitant Knowledge Sharers.

4.1. Active Knowledge Sharing

The main theme of Active Knowledge Sharing involves participants who demonstrate a proactive and supportive approach to sharing knowledge within their organizations. The sub-themes in this

category include fostering innovative ideas, encouraging clear communication, and providing growth opportunities.

Table 2: Active Knowledge Sharing Sub-Themes

Sub-Themes	Participants
Sharing Innovative Ideas	I01, I05
Encouraging Open Communication	I03, I05
Supporting Growth and Development	I05

Participants expressed their active roles in promoting knowledge sharing within their organizations. I01 mentioned how an innovative idea from a staff member was implemented: *"So, the I01, who was a bar man, previously, he invented a cocktail and then we tested it, and we applied it to the menu, and it's right for growth is teamwork is a very important."* This shows a collaborative environment where staff contributions are valued and encouraged.

I03 highlighted the importance of effective communication in meetings: *"I need to be very careful like doing the meetings or something. I need to be very, sharing knowledge in a good way and that all."* This reflects a proactive approach to ensuring knowledge is shared clearly and consistently.

Moreover, I05 emphasized their commitment to staff development: *"We do training reviews every month, and we ask the staff if they're willing to, get on. We have like, a Bright Slides future thing, which is like academic as well."* The participant's focus on continuous learning and offering staff opportunities to grow demonstrates a strong culture of active knowledge sharing.

4.2. Reluctant Knowledge Sharing

The main theme of Reluctant Knowledge Sharing involves participants who exhibit hesitation or fear when sharing knowledge, often due to concerns about negative consequences or competition. Sub-themes include limited communication, fear of information leakage, and personal motivation influenced by external factors.

Table 3: Reluctant Knowledge Sharing Sub-Themes

Sub-Themes	Participants
Limited Communication	I01, I03
Fear of Information Leakage	I02, I05
External Motivation Influences	I03

Participants expressed reluctance on sharing knowledge due to various reasons. I01 acknowledged challenges in communication from management to subordinates without addressing fear: *"So, yeah, so I would scale, from the management level, we will say I will rate seven. And from management to the subordinates, I would say, five."* This reflects motivation to improve communication flow is suppressed and suggests some level of reluctance.

I02 emphasized concerns about leaking sensitive information: *"Sometimes it is like this because when I share the knowledge with like, I pass on some information to them. So always there's a fear because something, which is so related to the organization and which not supposed to be get leaked outside."* This quote illustrates low knowledge sharing or hesitation to share fully due to potential risks rather than any managerial fear.

4.3. Passive Knowledge Sharing

It is characterized by a readiness to share knowledge tempered by significant fear or hesitation, often due to concerns about negative outcomes which could be emerged from managerial fear. This behaviour reflects a willingness to contribute valuable information but is constrained by fears about potential repercussions or lack of trust. The main theme of Passive Knowledge Sharing includes participants who are willing to share knowledge but are held back by fears related to sensitive information or potential

negative outcomes. Sub-themes include fear-driven communication, limited knowledge disclosure, and balancing readiness with caution.

Table 4: Passive Knowledge Sharing Sub-Themes

Sub-Themes	Participants
Fear-Driven Communication	I02, I06
Limited Knowledge Disclosure	I03, I04
Balancing Readiness with Caution	I03, I06

Participants discussed how they manage knowledge sharing cautiously. I02 expressed significant avoidance about sharing sensitive operational details: *"There's been many health and safety features... if we tell those things to the subordinates, might be, there's some cases that by mistake they keep this sales team……….. So, it will affect me and affect the organization."* The participant's fear of unintended consequences restrains their willingness to share knowledge openly due to possible adverse impact on organizational impression.

I04 highlighted that they only share limited aspects of their experience: *"When I share any kind of knowledge, like I have some limitations, like, I just only share like how to deal with the people, how to like, live in a how to behave with our team members."* This reflects a cautious approach, where certain knowledge is withheld to avoid potential issues.

I06 provided an example of withholding information due to media pressure: *"Only management were told about the shutting down of the cinema. I was hesitant about saying anything to the other cinema hosts because first, the media was involved."* This indicates a passive stance on knowledge sharing, primarily driven by external pressures.

4.4. Theme 4: Hesitant Knowledge Sharers

The main theme of Hesitant Knowledge Sharing involves participants who express reluctance to share knowledge due to fear, sensitivity of topics, or lack of trust. Sub-themes include fear of repercussions, filtering information, and concerns about relevance.

Table 5: Hesitant Knowledge Sharing Sub-Themes

Sub-Themes	Participants
Fear of Repercussions	I02, I03
Filtering Information	I01, I02
Concerns About Relevance	I03, I04

Participants expressed hesitation and uncertainty in sharing knowledge. I02 mentioned fears about sharing knowledge due to possible repercussions: *"I always have a fear of, like, there's a manager which is coming in. And he will say the thing if I do things wrong."* This reflects how fear can act as a barrier to open communication.

I03 pointed out the need to filter information when sharing: *"Yeah, some topics are in the business. Like, if you share to other people, it's more sensitive."* This highlights a tendency to selectively share information based on its perceived importance or sensitivity.

I04 discussed their reluctance to share experiences fully: *"I will definitely like will not share my experience and everything and skills to my other colleagues or like other employees."* This indicates a preference to hold back certain knowledge, often driven by concerns about competition or relevance.

4.5. Organisational Silence as an output of Managerial Fear's impact on Knowledge Sharing

The concept of organizational silence emerged prominently. This phenomenon was examined through several key themes: fears leading to silence, emotional impact of silence, responses to silence, and organizational effects of silence.

4.5.1. Fears Leading to Silence

Participants worry about the potential fallout from voicing concerns or sharing opinions, leading to silence. I01 remarked, *"There's a real fear that if I speak up, it could negatively impact my career or standing within the company."*. Fear has been manifested differently over judgement and criticism at I02's narrative *"I avoid sharing my ideas because I'm concerned, they'll be criticized or dismissed."* Lastly, I06 said, *"If I share too much, I fear it could be used against me or misrepresented."* This quote could be reflected in Fears regarding the misuse of shared information led to reluctance in communicating openly.

Table 6: Fears Leading to Silence and its Sub-Themes

Theme	Sub-Theme	Participants
Fears Leading to Silence	Fear of Negative Repercussions	I01, I03, I06
	Fear of Judgment and Criticism	I02, I05, I06
	Fear of Repercussions from Misuse	I01, I06

4.5.2. Emotional Impact of Silence

The pressure to conform and avoid speaking up leads to significant stress. I02 described, *"The constant worry about potential backlash if I speak up creates a lot of stress."* Organizational silence affects overall job satisfaction. I01 explained, *"Not being able to express my thoughts or concerns impacts my job satisfaction and makes me feel undervalued."* The inability to communicate freely leads to feelings of isolation. I03 noted, *"I feel like I'm on my own when I can't discuss issues openly, leading to frustration and a sense of being disconnected from the team."*

Table 7: Emotional Impact of Silence and its Sub-Themes

Theme	Sub-Theme	Participants
Emotional Impact of Silence	Increased Stress and Anxiety	I02, I03
	Reduced Job Satisfaction	I01, I06
	Feelings of Isolation and Frustration	I03, I06

4.5.3. Responses to Silence

This theme explores the ways participants cope with or respond to the experience of organizational silence. To avoid potential issues, some participants withdraw from active participation. I01 shared, *"I tend to stay quiet and avoid engaging in discussions to steer clear of conflict or negative consequences."*

Participants become more cautious in their communications to avoid repercussions. I05 said, *"I'm very careful about what I say and to whom, ensuring I don't say anything that could be taken the wrong way."* Some seek feedback from trusted colleagues before making any statements. I05 mentioned, *"I consult with a colleague I trust before sharing any thoughts or feedback to ensure it is received well."*

Table 8: Responses to Silence and its Sub-Themes

Theme	Sub-Theme	Participants
Responses to Silence	Withdrawal from Engagement	I01, I02, I06
	Increased Cautiousness in Communication	I05, I03
	Seeking Validation from Trusted Peers	I05

4.5.4. Organizational Effects of Silence

Organizational silence affects the broader organizational environment. While I01 said that silence leads to a lack of new ideas and stunted organizational development, I03 indicated that silence deteriorates team dynamics.

I01 *"When people are silent, it hampers innovation and limits growth opportunities."*

I03 explained, "Without open dialogue, team cohesion weakens, and relationships become strained."

Lastly, organizational silence erodes trust and hampers collaboration. I06 stated, *"The lack of communication breeds mistrust and makes collaboration more difficult."*

Table 9: Organizational Effect of Silence and its Sub-Themes

Theme	Sub-Theme	Participants
Organizational Effects of Silence	Stunted Innovation and Growth	I01, I06
	Deterioration of Team Dynamics	I02, I03
	Erosion of Trust and Collaboration	I05, I06

5. Discussion

Participants engaging in active knowledge sharing reported experiencing low stress and job dissatisfaction, which fostered positive engagement and contributed to an open and collaborative work environment. This aligns with the related literature, which highlights the importance of creating an environment that enhances psychological well-being and engagement through knowledge sharing. In particular, the related study involving volunteers in European organizations found that knowledge sharing acts as a catalyst for engagement, identity reinforcement, and a sense of belonging, ultimately positioning engaged individuals as valuable assets within their organizations (Fait et al., 2020).

Table 10: Knowledge Sharing Quadrant with Managerial Fear

Knowledge Sharing Quadrant	Themes for Managerial Fear	Interpretation of Themes
Active Knowledge Sharing	Minimal; individuals' active engagement which overcome the fear	- Minimal fear impact, so less organizational silence. - Low emotional impact. - Proactive responses. - Positive organizational effects.
Reluctant Knowledge Sharing	Some fears might interfere but do not significantly hinder KS	- Moderate fear impact. - Moderate emotional impact. - Cautious responses. - Neutral organizational effects.
Passive Knowledge Sharing	Expected some negative repercussions and misuse, leading to a strong presence of silence.	- High fear; strong organizational silence. - High stress, dissatisfaction, and isolation. - Significant withdrawal and cautious communication. - Strong negative impact on performance.
Hesitant Knowledge Sharing	Fears might exacerbate significant reluctance in sharing knowledge, and lead to the extension of silence.	- High fear; significant reluctance. - High stress and dissatisfaction. - Significant withdrawal; minimal engagement. - Severe negative impact on performance.

In contrast to the other knowledge-sharing quadrants, where fear and silence hinder open communication, the active knowledge-sharing quadrant represents an ideal state where minimal fear results in enhanced collaboration and organizational performance (Hammad, 2022). Furthermore, Oliveria et al (2023) conducted a systematic review and concluded that KS practices such as face-to-face interaction and informal conversation appear to build trust and improve knowledge sharing. Therefore, remedies are given for reluctant knowledge sharing that could be tackled with as the contextual fear is low. Cullen et al. (2023) have found that the reluctancy of knowledge sharing moderately spreads, if privacy norms existed in the context: for example, salary information (Cullen et al., 2023), negative emotion towards the organization reduces the knowledge sharing appetite (Rasheed, 2020). Although Cullen et al. and Rasheed did not include managerial fear, their studies could be

interpreted that there is a delicate balance with knowledge sharing. Therefore, we conclude that moderate managerial fear impact on knowledge sharing with the behaviour of cautious responses.

Organizational-level effects may not apparent or felt as Organisational Silence. Because management would not realize whether they must create a conducive environment due to not visible reluctancy in knowledge sharing. Nevertheless, the limited research over managerial fear and knowledge sharing has restricted the further evaluation and caused a shift in researcher focus to review organisational supports that has been found limited impact on KS (Lu et al., 2006). Their finding has underline importance of evaluating different dimensions which have been offered in this study. Also, it has been proven that the selection process of managers plays an important part in KS (Abdul et al., 2020). Also, leadership conscientiousness, openness, and self-efficacy has positively impact on KS (Abdul et al., 2020; Lu et al., 2006). In this sense, these findings could be reflected as leaders have a warm, open, and respectful approach. And therefore, these findings align with study outcome that leadership traits foster culture of talking about vulnerabilities without a fear of negative perceptions.

To reference the high managerial fear, knowledge sharing manifested in two-way passive knowledge sharing and hesitant knowledge sharing. These knowledge sharing activities are supposed to be occurred in a situation that consist of higher readiness but lower action orientation in the phase of KS activities. Furthermore, this is not a first attempt to categorize knowledge sharing, for example, van Dyne et al. (2003) named defensive silence that described as withholding information (not sharing knowledge) out of fear or negative consequences, such as criticism or ostracism. Organizational silence literature enlightened due to inhibiting element deter employees to share knowledge that has been empirically proven by Akgunduz (2014) who also presented that trust deficits between employees and managers might result in silence and reduced engagement. This fear is exacerbated by a culture that does not support open communication and lead to both isolation from knowledge sharing and organisational silence. Moreover, the hospitality industry has a delicate balance over reliance on responsive service quality (Saleh et al., 1991), therefore difference between forms of knowledge involvement is a crucial for practitioners who may want to continue innovation and open communication in this sector.

The current findings are confirmed the bases of SECI model (Nonaka and Takeuchi, 2000) in that managerial fear could create a barrier or disrupt the knowledge combination and externalisation. Thus, it is evident for organisational silence. In the meantime, the current study provides a rich insight into KS and managerial fear, the small sample size and limited scope with hospitality would constraint the generalisability of findings. Hence, Future research might extend the scope by employing larger population to validate proposed knowledge sharing taxonomy.

References

Abdul Manaf, H., Harvey, W. S., Armstrong, S. J., & Lawton, A. (2020). Differences in personality and the sharing of managerial tacit knowledge: an empirical analysis of public sector managers in Malaysia. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, *24*(5), 1177-1199. https://doi.org/10.1108/jkm-01-2020-0014

Ahmad, B., & Bilal, S. (2022). Does fear of COVID-19 undermine career optimism? A time-lagged quantitative inquiry of non-managerial employees. *Kybernetes, 52*(9), 3223–3240. https://doi.org/10.1108/k-10-2021-1036

Akgündüz, Y. (2014). Otel çalışanlarının örgütsel sessizliği tercih etmelerinde örgütsel güvenlerinin etkisi. *Organizasyon ve Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi, 6*(1), 184-199.

Baloch, Q. B., Meng, F., Anwar, M., Abbas, M., & Asad, M. (2022). Revitalization of tourism and hospitality sector: Preempting pandemics through lessons learned. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 29*(55), 83099–83111. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-022-21392-7

Beheshtifar, M., Borhani, H., & Moghadam, M. N. (2012). Destructive role of employee silence in organizational success. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 2*(11), 275.

Bellini, D., Rasoolimanesh, S. M., Mohammed, I., & Schiuma, G. (2022). Understanding and exploring the concept of fear, in the work context and its role in improving safety performance and reducing well-being in a steady job insecurity period. *Sustainability, 14*(21), 14146. https://doi.org/10.3390/su142114146

Çakici, A., & Ayşehan, A. (2007). Organizational silence: Fundamentals of silence and its dynamics. *Çukurova Üniversitesi SB Dergisi, 16*(1), 145–162.

Clarke, V., Braun, V., & Hayfield, N. (2015). Thematic analysis. In *Qualitative Psychology: A Practical Guide to Research Methods* (3rd ed., pp. 222–248).

Copp, T. (2020). Dealing with anxiety of Polish and Chinese managers. *Zeszyty Naukowe Wyższej Szkoły Humanitas Zarządzanie, 21*(4), 211–224. https://doi.org/10.5604/01.3001.0014.7994

Dalgıç, A. (2019). The impact of a climate of fear on hotel employees' positivity, creativity, and collaboration. In *The Third International Congress on Future of Tourism: Innovation, Entrepreneurship and Sustainability* (pp. 75-82). Mersin: Turizm Fakültesi Yayınları.

Donate, M. J., & Guadamillas, F. (2015). An empirical study on the relationships between knowledge management, knowledge-oriented human resource practices, and innovation. *Knowledge Management Research & Practice, 13*(2), 134–148. https://doi.org/10.1057/kmrp.2013.36

Deterding, N. M., & Waters, M. C. (2018). Flexible coding of in-depth interviews: A twenty-first-century approach. *Sociological Methods & Research, 50*(2), 708–739. https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124118799377

Edmondson, A. C. (2019). *The Fearless Organization: Creating Psychological Safety in the Workplace for Learning, Innovation, and Growth*. John Wiley & Sons.

Edmondson, A. C. (1996). Learning from mistakes is easier said than done: Group and organizational influences on the detection and correction of human error. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 32*(1), 5–28. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886396321001

Fait, M., & Sakka, G. (2020). Knowledge sharing: An innovative organizational approach to engage volunteers. *EuroMed Journal of Business, 16*(3), 290–305. https://doi.org/10.1108/emjb-10-2019-0131

Frith, H., & Gleeson, K. (2011). Qualitative data collection: Asking the right questions. In *Qualitative Research Methods in Mental Health and Psychotherapy* (pp. 55–67). https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119973249.ch5

Fung, W. S. L., & Richard, Y. K. F. (2010). Knowledge security for the hospitality industry. In *Marketing and Management Sciences* (pp. 305-308).

Guzzo, R. F., Wang, X., Madera, J. M., & Abbott, J. (2021). Organizational trust in times of COVID-19: Hospitality employees' affective responses to managers' communication. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 93*, 102778. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2020.102778

Hasan, Z., Zehra, N., Ahmed, S., & Wamiq, M. (2021). Factors influencing fear and its subsequent effects on self-confidence: An analysis on HR perspective. *KASBIT Business Journal, 14*(3), 142–152.

Hammad, A. J. (2022). The role of knowledge sharing in reducing the causes of organizational silence: An exploratory study in the applied research for a sample of nurses in Salah El-Din General Hospital. *Tikrit Journal of Administrative and Economic Sciences, 18*(58, 2), 32–51. https://doi.org/10.25130/tjaes.18.58.2.3

Hoe, S. L. (2006). Tacit knowledge, Nonaka, and Takeuchi SECI model and informal knowledge processes. *International Journal of Organization Theory and Behavior, 9*(4), 490–502. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijotb-09-04-2006-b002

Iuga, V., & Kifor, C. V. (2014). Information and knowledge management and their interrelationship within lean organizations. *Revista Academiei Fortelor Terestre, 19*(2), 31–38.

Kim, N., & Shim, C. (2018). Social capital, knowledge sharing, and innovation of small- and medium-sized enterprises in a tourism cluster. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 30*(6), 2417–2437. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijchm-07-2016-0392

Kumar, M., Ramkumar, M., Srivastava, A. P., & Annamalai, V. (2022). Organizational IT support and knowledge sharing behavior affecting service innovation performance: Empirical evidence from the hospitality industry. *VINE Journal of Information and Knowledge Management Systems, 54*(2), 256–279. https://doi.org/10.1108/vjikms-07-2021-0124

Lombardi, S., Sassetti, S., & Cavaliere, V. (2019). Linking employees' affective commitment and knowledge sharing for an increased customer orientation. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 31*(11), 4293–4312. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijchm-03-2018-0261

Lu, L., Leung, K., & Koch, P. T. (2006). Managerial knowledge sharing: The role of individual, interpersonal, and organizational factors. *Management and Organization Review*, 2(1), 15-41. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-8784.2006.00029.x

Luu, T. T. (2021). Knowledge sharing in the hospitality context: The roles of leader humility, job crafting, and promotion focus. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 94*, 102848. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2020.102848

Masood, A., Rahman, M., Riaz, S., Islam, T., & Azim, M. (2022). Linking enterprise social media use, trust, and knowledge sharing: Paradoxical roles of communication transparency and personal blogging. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 27*(4), 1056–1085. https://doi.org/10.1108/jkm-11-2021-0880

Nisar, Q. A., Rasheed, M. I., & Sadaf, R. (2021). Depletion of psychological, financial, and social resources in the hospitality sector during the pandemic. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 93*, 102794. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2020.102794

Oliveira, M., Teixeira, J., Curado, C., & Araújo, C. (2023). Practices that mitigate organizational knowledge hiding: A systematic literature review. *European Conference on Knowledge Management, 24*(2), 1338–1345. https://doi.org/10.34190/eckm.24.2.1579

Patwary, A. K., Omar, M., & Tasnim, M. (2022). Knowledge management practices on innovation performance in the hotel industry: Mediated by organizational learning and organizational creativity. *Global Knowledge Memory and Communication*. https://doi.org/10.1108/gkmc-05-2022-0104

Raes, E., Kyndt, E., Decuyper, S., Van den Bossche, P., & Dochy, F. (2012). Facilitating team learning through transformational leadership. *Instructional Science, 41*(3), 423–443. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-012-9240-1

Ravichandran, S. K., & Suryaprakasa Rao, K. (2021). A study on knowledge management for hotel industry. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 25*(10), 2127–2143. https://doi.org/10.1108/jkm-10-2018-0624

Riger, S. and Sigurvinsdottir, R. (2016) *'Thematic analysis', Handbook of methodological approaches to community-based research: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods*. Oxford University Press Nueva York, pp. 33–41.

Saleh, F. and Ryan, C. (1991) Analysing service quality in the hospitality industry using the SERVQUAL model. *Service Industries Journal*, *11*(3), pp.324-345.

Satiroglu, H (2024). *An investigation into the role of leadership and knowledge sharing on enhancing innovation capability in manufacturing small medium enterprises (SMEs) in the UK food industry*. PhD thesis, Bath Spa University. https://doi:10.17870/bathspa.00016401

Singh, J. P. (2018). Measuring employee engagement: A review of the measurement scales and implications for future research. *Vikalpa, 43*(2), 91–105. https://doi.org/10.1177/0256090918774688

Sithole, P. (2016). Knowledge management and learning organisations. *VINE Journal of Information and Knowledge Management Systems, 46*(4), 574–592. https://doi.org/10.1108/vjikms-04-2016-0024

Tavakoli, M., & Salamzadeh, A. (2022). The role of knowledge management and intellectual capital on innovation and financial performance in hotels. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 107*, 103297. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2022.103297

Zhu, J., & Kroll, L. (2016). Knowledge hiding as a barrier to psychological safety in teams. *Management Research Review, 39*(8), 898–914. https://doi.org/10.1108/mrr-06-2015-0149