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**Abstract**

Knowledge hiding is ubiquitous among graduate students, which impedes knowledge sharing and transfer, and influences knowledge learning and scientific research. As far as Sri Lanka is concerned, Sri Lanka is also not the exception to the worldwide phenomenon of knowledge hiding, which has yet to be explored in more detail. This study, which draws from 200 Sri Lankan undergraduates, emphasizes that performance prove goal orientation directly influences knowledge hiding. Furthermore, the findings of this study imply that undergraduates who focus on group feedback will also have high level of knowledge hiding when with high level of performance prove goal orientation. Accordingly, it is also concluded that undergraduates who focus on individual feedback will not have high level of knowledge hiding when with high level of performance prove goal orientation. The study also highlights the insights that motivate the student in such a way to enhance the knowledge sharing behavior and practice among the students.
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# Introduction

Knowledge hiding is the intentional act or behavior of an individual restricting themselves or concealing their knowledge even though it is requested by someone. It is the act of not sharing or helping others by sharing their knowledge. Connelly et al., (2012)surveyed and revealed that “Knowledge hiding formally defines as an intentional attempt to conceal or to withhold knowledge that others have requested” Knowledge hiding creates a sense of distrust, negativity, and lack of career growth and it creates rivals with more competition and many unfavorable consequences. Some researchers have stated that knowledge hiding is positive relation with interpersonal distrust (Connelly et al., 2012), as per the researchers (Connelly & Zweig, 2015) it harms interpersonal relationships.

Knowledge hiding is conceptualized as a goal-directed behavior (Webster et al., 2008) through which the individual achieves the maximum interest and desire. when exploring in depth about this conceptualization, recent research like (Rhee & Choi, 2017) has incorporated goal orientation as a primary individual antecedent of knowledge hiding.

Performance goal orientation is one of the categories of goal orientation which is when an individual are believed to approach a situation to gain approval from others, they prove and demonstrate their competence by comparing it with those of others in such a way of ensuring that their performance is better than others.

Knowledge sharing is significant as it leads not only to sharing knowledge an individual possesses but also increases the strength of the individual knowledge. (Cabrera & Cabrera, 2002) surveyed and said that the exchange of information among organizational employees is a vital component of the knowledge management system and that employees are expected to share their knowledge with their co-workers. Many organization are taking step to increase employee knowledge sharing among employee by providing reward system (Castaneda, 2015), enhancing social network and interpersonal relationship (Jarvenpaa & Majchrzak, 2008) and crafting organizational culture that facilitate the organization culture that support knowledge sharing (Connelly & Kevin Kelloway, 2003). Despite the organizational benefit of knowledge sharing among employee, many workers are reluctant to share knowledge. Therefore, this leads to the question of why employees are reluctant to share the knowledge and although they recognize that knowledge sharing may benefit the broader group. Various researches are undertaken regarding the knowledge hiding among employees (Connelly et al., 2012) and (Webster et al., 2008) whose studies finds out that the employees withhold their knowledge.

And when broadening the concept toward the other fields, in the academic sector the similar problem is noticeable. Previous researcher pays much attention to motivations of knowledge sharing, and little attention are paid to why people hiding knowledge, let alone what graduate students’ knowledge hiding in educational context(Pan & Zhang, 2014). Despite the increase attention on knowledge hiding among employees, knowledge hiding among students is yet to be explored.

Various researchers has discussed the antecedents of KH among the students as Pan & Zhang, (2014) stated that Knowledge hiding among graduate can be due to wuli aspect, where complexity of knowledge may lead to KH, Shili aspects, individuals behavior are largely influenced by surroundings, Renli aspects where behavior, psychology and relationships of both sides would lead to KH, Webster et al., (2008) noted that individual character is an important antecedent of KH. Relatedness with peers, territoriality of knowledge and performance motivation(Garg et al., 2021), students perceived interactional justice(IJ)(Ghani et al., 2020), organizational relations (Serenko & Bontis, 2016), time pressure (Skerlavaj et al., 2018) ,five big personalities(Wang et al., 2014) but the variable that lead to KH among the undergraduates are diverse and can be explored further. As far as Sri Lanka is concerned, Sri Lanka is also not the exception to the world-wide phenomenon of KH and is yet to be explored in more detail.

There are researchers who has focused on student knowledge behavior and its driving factors, which induce the transmission in educational context. There are researches on KH in field such as organizational behavior, knowledge management, but very few in educational sector. Therefore, it is important to explore the different dimension and driving mechanism of KH behavior in education to minimize those in future educational and knowledge leaders. For the purpose of initiating the research by conforming the existence of knowledge hiding among the undergraduates a pilot study was undertaken to identify whether the KH exist among the undergraduates of Sri Lanka. In this study, the self-administered questionnaire was used. The data for this study was collected from a sample of 15 undergraduates who filled the survey which was measured with five-point scale ranging from 1= “Strongly disagree” to 5= “Strongly agree”. 12‐item scale was used to assess the knowledge hiding of students (Connelly et al., 2012). The participants of the pilot study consisted of undergraduates from university of Colombo, Jaffna, Peradeniya, Jayewardenepura from different degree and academic years and they agreed that the knowledge hiding exist among the undergraduates of Sri Lanka and paved way for more to study on the topic.

This study aims to provide a descriptive picture on knowledge hiding along with the influence of the variable of performance prove goal orientation as one of the antecedents of KH that is yet to be discussed in the context of Sri Lanka.

## Research Questions

To gain a more comprehensive understanding of the factors influencing the knowledge hiding, my study addresses three broad research questions:

1. Does performance - prove goal orientation influence knowledge hiding among undergraduate students in Sri Lanka?
2. Does group focus feedback moderate the relationship between the performance - prove goal orientation and knowledge hiding among undergraduate students in Sri Lanka?
3. Does individual focus feedback moderate the relationship between the performance - prove goal orientation and knowledge hiding among undergraduate students in Sri Lanka?

The researcher extends the understanding of drivers of knowledge hiding in several ways. First, to integrate factors from organizational and educational domains in a single study for gaining comprehensive understanding of factors leading to KH. Second, this study is also the first study in terms of examining the relationship between PPGO and KH among the undergraduates in Sri Lanka. Third, my study is also the first study in terms of examining the moderating effects of GFF and IFF on the relationship between PPGO and KH. My study also extends the generalizability of the KH to the entire island. To date, most KH studies utilize samples from all the majority of the universities in Sri Lanka. This study will attempt to identify more about knowledge hiding, its causes and consequences in undergraduate students.

# Literature review and hypotheses development

## Knowledge hiding

Connelly et al., (2012) stated that “Knowledge hiding is an intentional attempt by an individual to withhold or conceal knowledge that has been requested by a co-worker. Knowledge hiding is difficult to study because of the inherent complexity of examining perceptions of a behavior that has been intentionally concealed.(Connelly & Zweig, 2015).Knowledge hiding is an obstacle of knowledge sharing and transfer among students, which influences students’ knowledge learning and scientific researches. As a complex multidimensional concept, Knowledge hiding involves the attributes of knowledge, organizational regulations, knowledge hider and seeker (Pan & Zhang, 2014).

Connelly et al., (2012) proposed that “knowledge hiding”, “knowledge hoarding” and “knowledge sharing” constructs are potentially related and knowledge hiding is a unique construct as a component of knowledge transfer phenomenon. They defined the knowledge hiding structure as “an intentional attempt by an individual to withhold or conceal knowledge that has been requested by another person”. A similar concept called as knowledge hoarding is different from knowledge hiding in the sense that a person may be unable to share the knowledge by mistake or ignorance.

## Knowledge hoarding and knowledge hiding

Knowledge hoarding represents the act of accumulating knowledge that may or may not be shared at a later date (Hislop, 2003).Both knowledge hiding and hoarding can be characterized as a repertoire of possible behaviors that can be classified as withholding knowledge. However, in contrast to knowledge hiding, which represents an intentional concealment of knowledge requested by another, knowledge hoarding captures the accumulation of knowledge that has not necessarily been requested by another individual(Webster et al., 2008). Theoretically, knowledge hiding and Knowledge hoarding differ on three main aspects: intentionality, request, and scope. Empirically, they are found to be weakly correlated and to demonstrate discriminant validity among their indicators (Holten et al., 2016).Evans et al., (2015) noted that “Knowledge hoarding is particularly important, as it also captures elements of knowledge that are not necessarily explicit and understood by others. This type of knowledge may be impossible to request, yet essential for an organization to succeed.

## Knowledge hiding and knowledge sharing

Knowledge sharing, as a way to create, sustain, and transfer knowledge, has been found to affect individual (Quigley et al., 2007). Szulanski, (2000)described that knowledge transfer is defined as a “dyadic exchange of organi­zational knowledge between a source and a recipi­ent unit in which the identity of a recipient matters. Knowledge Sharing is not considered the opposite of hiding or hoarding academicians(Connelly et al., 2012). Connelly et al., (2012) suggest that knowledge hiding and knowledge sharing result from different motivational sources and they demonstrate this difference empirically. For example, knowledge hiding might be motivated by instrumental or anti-social drives, whereas knowledge sharing is often pro-socially motivated. In addition, a lack of knowledge sharing is not an intentional attempt to hide knowledge.

## Conceptual framework
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**Figure 2.1 Conceptual Model**

## Performance prove goal orientation and knowledge hiding

Pan & Zhang, (2014) noted that Knowledge hiding is an obstacle of knowledge sharing and transfer among students, which influences students’ knowledge learning and scientific researches. Goal orientation reflect one’s goal preference in achievement situation (Dweck & Leggett, 1988). In the literature three type of goal orientation are identified. They are mastery, performance approach and performance avoidance. The individuals focus on developing once competence through an emphasis on learning, understanding through the goal of mastery goal orientation also known a learning goal orientation. Student with a performance prove goal orientation are focused on the demonstration of competence relative to other by trying to outperform relevant other. conversely, student with a performance avoidance goal orientation is focused on avoiding looking incompetent and being outperformed by other(Elliot, 2005)**.** In our study performance prove goal orientation is focused as the antecedent of knowledge hiding(Rhee & Choi, 2017). Performance prove goal orientation defines peoples focus on performance as their ability to outperform and look better than others (Fisher et al., 2013). Jelinek et al., (2006) revealed that the higher a person’s performance prove goal orientation is, the greater that persons performance actually becomes. Individuals with high level of Performance prove goal orientation are constantly comparing themselves to others around them to try and outperform anyone who is competition(Dietz et al., 2015). Rhee & Choi, (2017) stated found a positive relationship between performance prove goal orientation and knowledge hiding with empirical evidence that employees with high performance prove goal orientation has an inherent drive to compete with and outperform others and are more likely to hide knowledge from their peers.

Employees with a high performance‐prove goal orientation reported that they were inclined to hide knowledge, depending on comparison and competition targets (group members or other groups) signaled by the performance feedback they received (Zhu et al., 2019).

Thus, based on the literatures and empirically finding, it is hypothesized that:

***H1****: Performance prove goal orientation positively influence and knowledge hiding**.*

PERFORMANCE-PROVE GOAL ORIENTATION

GROUP-FOCUSED FEEDBACK

## Moderating role of Group focused feedback, Individual focused feedback on the relationship between KH and PPGO

Feedback can be defined as information about the effects of one’s actions or efforts on some criterion of interest (Herold & Greller, 1977) .Performance feedback has a directive function because it directs the attention and actions of individuals to certain tasks and toward the right track to achieve desired outcomes (Nadler, 1979). Goal orientation theory discuss how learning and performance goal orientation lead to differential response pattern after individuals have experienced feedback from challenging task (Deck & L, 1988). Feedback allows an individual to identify his performance towards the goal achievement. Through feedback, individuals also obtain information on their progress toward goal achievement, enabling them to adjust performance strategies accordingly (Locke & Latham, 2002). Saavedra et al., (1993) stated that individual-focused feedback direct individual member’ attention to their own performance and stimulate their effort and corresponding behavioral strategies toward achieving the individual goal they pursue and in contrast group‐focused feedback directs members' attention to the group's goals. In a group context where feedback focuses more (vs. less) on individual performance, employees tend to perceive themselves as independent and are motivated to think and act to improve their own performance (Van der Vegt et al., 2010).

When individual focused feedback is provided it emphasis that personal benefit and rewards depend on individual performance and every individual targets to perform better than the other member toward the goal achievement. In such a situation, the desire to outperform others, inherent in performance‐prove goal orientation, is likely to play out at the interpersonal level, leading employees to see group members as proximal targets of comparison and competition(Dietz et al., 2015). Employees with a high performance‐prove goal orientation tend to strategically withhold or conceal knowledge from group members (Poortvliet et al., 2009).

People with a high performance‐prove goal orientation concentrate more on social comparison and compete against others. Integrating goal orientation theory and the literature on feedback, we can identify that the feedback determines whether comparison and competition targets of performance‐prove goal orientation are group members or other groups, such that individual‐ and group‐focused feedback differentially moderates the relationship between performance‐prove goal orientation and knowledge hiding. In group focused feedback, the employee tends to perceive the performance of each member in the group while on individual feedback the individual perceives that personal benefit depend on the individual performance. employees with a high performance‐prove goal orientation tend to strategically withhold or conceal knowledge from group members (Poortvliet et al., 2009).By hiding knowledge, employees with a high performance‐prove goal orientation can maintain their competitive advantage and impede group members from performing well (Poortvliet et al., 2012),thus increasing their own chances of outperforming group members.

Therefore, the hypotheses are formed;

**H2**: *Group focused feedback will moderate the positive relationship between Performance prove goal orientation and knowledge hiding such that the relationship is weaker when feedback focus more on group performance*

**H3:** *Individual focused feedback will moderate the positive relationship between Performance prove goal orientation and knowledge hiding such that the relationship is stronger when feedback focus more on individual performance*

# Methodology

## Participants and procedures

This study adopted mono method. That selected method was questionnaire which is one of the main data collection methods in quantitative methodology. This method selection aligns with the clear symmetry between epistemological positions and associated techniques of social research in the quantitative methodology at positivist paradigm (Bryman, 1984).The population of this study is based on the undergraduates of Sri Lankan universities all over the island. The primary data were collected through questionnaire from around 200 sample of undergraduates of Sri Lanka. In this survey, a self-completion questionnaire is developed. The following Table 3.1 shows the total population, sampling method of the study.

**Table 3.1 Sampling Framework**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Number** | **Faculties** | **Sample size (No. of undergraduate students)** |
| 01 | Management field | 45 |
| 02 | Medical field | 35 |
| 03 | Engineering field | 30 |
| 04 | Arts field | 50 |
| 05 | other | 40 |
|  | **Total Sample size**  | 200 |

The questionnaire incorporated 30 items and comprised 4 sections. A cover letter was included in the questionnaire to inform the participants about the aim of the research. demographic variables: age, gender, marital status, working status, work experience, and university, faculty, and academic year are included. Section A included 5 items relating to performance prove goal orientation. Section B comprised of 4 items relating to individual focus feedback. Section C consisted of 3 items relating group focus feedback. Finally, Section D included 18 items relating to knowledge hiding.

## Measures

## Performance – prove goal orientation

Performance‐prove goal orientation was measured using a four‐item scale (α = .78) from (Vandewalle, 1997), e.g., “I'm concerned with showing that I can perform better than my coworkers”. All items relating to each dimension of Performance‐prove goal orientation were measured on a five-point scale ranging from 1= “Strongly disagree” to 5= “Strongly agree”. The scores of the items were averaged to form a single scale score. have reported good reliability for this measure. Vandewalle, (1997) has reported a Cronbach’s α of 0.78.

## Knowledge hiding

 Knowledge hiding was measured with the 12-item scale developed by (Connelly et al., 2012) .I followed Connelly et al., (2012) in adopting the critical incident technique with the following instruction: “In a specific episode in which a particular group member requested knowledge from you and you …” and a sample item is, “I told him/her that I would help him/her out later but stalled as much as possible.” All items relating to KH was measured on a five-point scale ranging from 1= “Strongly disagree” to 5= “Strongly agree”. The scores of the items were averaged to form a single scale score. High scores therefore indicate high level of KH. Connelly et al., (2012)have reported a Cronbach’s α of 0.92 for this measure.

## Group focused and Individual focused feedback

The researcher measured individual‐ and group‐focused feedback using the scales developed by (Van der Vegt et al., 2010). The participants were informed to think of feedback on job performance at work. Three items (α = .70) were used to measure individual‐focused feedback: “I receive individual feedback about my own performance,” “When I do not perform well, I am held responsible as an individual,” and “I regularly receive feedback about how good or bad I performed.” Three items (α = .82) were used to measure group‐focused feedback: “We receive feedback as a group about the group performance,” “When we do not perform well, we are held responsible as a group,” and “We regularly receive feedback about how good or bad we performed as a group.” All items relating to each dimension of GFF and IFF were measured on a five-point scale ranging from 1= “Strongly disagree” to 5= “Strongly agree”. The scores of the items were averaged to form a single scale score have reported good reliability for this measure, Van der Vegt et al., (2010) reported a Cronbach’s α of .70 and .82 respectively.

# Data analysis

## Reliability

In this survey, there are total 161 feedbacks from sample population. For the four constructs that this study focused on, it is necessary to measure internal reliability of each construct with its different number of items. To test the internal reliability, the Cronbach’s alpha is calculated for items designed for the same construct. If the items are multi-dimensional, Cronbach’s alpha will generally be low, in which case, it can either make use of factor analysis or the correlation matrix of the items to select a subset of items that tend to be unidimensional. For the 4 constructs I have, 4 of them have Cronbach’s alphas larger than 0.7 (a level considered “acceptable” in most social science research). The Cronbach’s alpha for PPGO is 0.716, KH is 0.727, IFF is0.734 and for GFF is 0.744. Thus, the criteria towards ensuring reliability are duly satisfied.

**Table 4. 1 Cronbach Alpha Coefficients for the variables**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variables** | **Number of items** | **Cronbach’s Alpha** | **Rule of thumb** |
| Performance Prove Goal Orientation | **05** | **0.716** | **Good** |
| Knowledge hiding | **18** | **0.727** | **Good** |
| Group Focus Feedback | **3** | **0.744** | **Good** |
| Individual Focus Feedback | **4** | **0.734** | **Good** |

## Correlation analysis

 In this study the relationship between the KH and PPGO is closer to 1 as r=0.199. so, their high strong correlation between the two variables. That is change in PPGO are strongly correlated with the change in KH. The correlation coefficient is positive therefore increase in value of PPGO, KH value will also increase. The significant value of PPGO and KH is 0.011 which is less than the 0.05, therefore there is statistically significant correlation between the variable PPGO and KH.

Therefore, there is positive relationship between the PPGO and KH. And in study the relationship between the KH and GFF is closer to 0 as r=0.037. so, there is weaker correlation between the two variables. That is change in GFF are weakly correlated with the change in KH. The correlation coefficient is positive therefore increase in value of GFF, KH value will also increase. The significant value of GFF and KH is 0.637 which is more than the 0.05, therefore there is no statistically significant correlation between the variable GFF and KH. And in study the relationship between the KH and IFF is closer to 0 as r=0.030. so, there is weaker correlation between the two variables. That is change in IFF are weakly correlated with the change in KH. The correlation coefficient is positive therefore increase in value of IFF, KH value will also increase. The significant value of IFF and KH is 0.710 which is more than the 0.05, therefore there is no statistically significant correlation between the variable IFF and KH.

**Table 4. 2 Correlation analysis**

|  |
| --- |
| **Correlations** |
|  | KH | GFF | IFF | PPGO |
| KH | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .037 | .030 | .199\* |
| Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .637 | .710 | .011 |
| N | 161 | 161 | 161 | 161 |
| GFF | Pearson Correlation |  | 1 | -.184\* | -.063 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) |  |  | .019 | .424 |
| N |  | 161 | 161 | 161 |
| IFF | Pearson Correlation |  |  | 1 | .187\* |
| Sig. (2-tailed) |  |  |  | .018 |
| N |  |  |  | 161 |
| PPGO | Pearson Correlation |  |  |  | 1 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) |  |  |  |  |
| N |  |  |  | 161 |
| \*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). |

## Hypothesis Testing

**Table 4. 3 Hypothesis Testing**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variables** | **Hypothesis** | **P value** | **B- Coefficients** | **Conclusion** |
| PPGO |  There is a significant relationship between PPGO and KH | 0.011 | 0.199  | There is positive influence between PPGO and KH |
| GFF | There is no significant relationship between GFF and KH | 0.637 | 0.037 | There is positive influence between GFF and KH |
| IFF | There is no significant relationship between IFF and KH | 0.710 | 0.030 | There is positive influence between IFF and KH |

## Impact of PPGO on KH

**Table 4. 4 Model Summary of PPGO and KH**

|  |
| --- |
| **Model Summary** |
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
| 1 | .199a | .040 | .034 | 6.19182 |
| a. Predictors: (Constant), PERFORMANCEPROVEGOALORIENTATION |

The prediction model is statistically significant, F=6.551, as the significant value is less than 0.05 (P<0.05) which is 0.11 and accounted approximately 3.4% of the variance of KH is explained by the PPGO and the rest of the percentage is explained by other variable that has not been considered for the study. For PPGO (B=0.815, P<0.05) has positive impact on KH. Students with high PPGO are, more likely to hide their knowledge. The coefficient value indicates that when PPGO is increase by 1 unit the KH increase by 0. 815.

## Moderating effect of GFF on relationship between PPGO and KH

**Table 4. 5 Model Summary of moderated multiple regression**

|  |
| --- |
| **Model Summaryc** |
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics |
| R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1 | .205a | .042 | .030 | 6.20322 | .042 | 3.471 | 2 | 158 | .033 |
| 2 | .221b | .049 | .031 | 6.20045 | .007 | 1.141 | 1 | 157 | .287 |
| a. Predictors: (Constant), GROUP‐FOCUSEDFEEDBACK, PERFORMANCEPROVEGOALORIENTATION |
| b. Predictors: (Constant), GROUP‐FOCUSEDFEEDBACK, PERFORMANCEPROVEGOALORIENTATION, PPGO.GFF |
| c. Dependent Variable: KNOWLEDGEHIDING |

 As per the r squares shows the increase in variation by the addition of the interaction term. The R2 is 0.007, which is the proportion.in percentage R2 is 0.7% which is the percentage increase in the variance explained by the addition of the interaction term.ve can also see that this increase is not statistically significant because the significant value 0.287 is greater than 0.05(p> 0.05) that we obtain from the significant F change.

## Moderating effect of IFF on relationship between PPGO and KH

**Table 4. 6 Model Summary of moderated multiple regression**

|  |
| --- |
| **Model Summaryc** |
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics |
| R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1 | .199a | .040 | .027 | 6.21119 | .040 | 3.260 | 2 | 158 | .041 |
| 2 | .271b | .073 | .056 | 6.12009 | .034 | 5.739 | 1 | 157 | .018 |
| a. Predictors: (Constant), INDIVIDUAL‐FOCUSEDFEEDBACK, PERFORMANCEPROVEGOALORIENTATION |
| b. Predictors: (Constant), INDIVIDUAL‐FOCUSEDFEEDBACK, PERFORMANCEPROVEGOALORIENTATION, PPGO.IFF |
| c. Dependent Variable: KNOWLEDGEHIDING |

 As per the r squares shows the increase in variation by the addition of the interaction term. The R2 is 0.034, which is the proportion.in percentage R2 is 3.4% which is the percentage increase in the variance explained by the addition of the interaction term.ve can also see that this increase is statistically significant because the significant value 0.018 is less than 0.05(p< 0.05) that we obtain from the significant F change.

# Discussion and conclusion

## Performance prove goal orientation and knowledge hiding

Finding showed that Performance prove goal orientation was a significant predictor of knowledge hiding. Therefore, the finding confirms the argument that undergraduates hide their knowledge when they consider the performance prove goal orientation. This finding is also consistent with the research that reported positive relationship between the Performance prove goal orientation and knowledge hiding. Rhee & Choi, (2017)found out a positive relationship between Performance prove goal orientation and knowledge hiding with empirical evidence that employees with high performance prove goal orientation has an inherent drive to compete with and outperform others are more likely to hide knowledge from their peers. Employees with high performance prove goal orientation reported that they were incline to hide knowledge, depending on comparison and competition targets (group members or other groups) signaled by the performance feedback they received (Zhu et al., 2019).

## Moderating effect of group focus feedback on the relationship between performance prove goal orientation and knowledge hiding

As performance prove goal orientation would be less salient driving force for knowledge hiding for those who focus more on group focus feedback. As Zhu et al., (2019) stated that the interaction term involving performance prove goal orientation and group focus feedback was significantly related to knowledge hiding such that the relationship between the performance prove goal orientation and knowledge hiding was negative. However, contrary to the expectation, the result showed that the positive relationship of performance prove goal orientation and knowledge hiding is not weaker when feedback focus more on group. It is because even though the group focus feedback is provided, each and every member of the group will try to show off their performance as an individual so that they can get individual recognition and identification even in a group focus feedback and group performance. Finding of my study implies that undergraduates who focus on group feedback will also have high level of knowledge hiding when with high level of performance prove goal orientation.

## Moderating effect of individual focus feedback on the relationship between performance prove goal orientation and knowledge hiding

As Poortvliet et al., (2009) noted that on individual feedback the individual perceives that personal benefit depend on the individual performance. employees with a high performance‐prove goal orientation tend to strategically withhold or conceal knowledge from group members. However, contrary to the expectation, the data collected did not support the pat literature. the result showed that the positive relationship between the of performance prove goal orientation and knowledge hiding is not stronger when feedback focus more on individual. Finding of my study implies that undergraduates who focus on individual feedback will not have high level of knowledge hiding when with high level of performance prove goal orientation.

## Theoretical and practical implication

This study contributes to the literature focusing on the influence of performance prove goal orientation on knowledge hiding on undergraduate with moderating effects of IFF and GFF. Previous studies have disconnectedly examined this relationship in common context with employees. This this study advances the literature on knowledge hiding by examining the influence by performance prove goal orientation with moderating effects of IFF and GFF among the undergraduates a they are the growing seeds of future to be discovered.

 Secondly, the relationship of knowledge hiding is studied in different context around the world (Servin & De Brún, 2005), but there are researches yet to be done in Sri Lanka context regarding the PPGO and KH among the undergraduate of Sri Lanka. Thus, this study extends the understanding of the Sri Lanka undergraduates’ behavior with regards to knowledge hiding. Thirdly, the knowledge hiding is explored with many antecedent (Connelly et al., 2012) ; (Peng, 2013), but the antecedent of PPGO is yet to be studied, so my study would have given more idea and discussion regarding it.

The results of my study are likely to have important implication for practitioners. The result of this study indicates that performance prove goal orientation is a significant predictor of knowledge hiding among undergraduates. Therefore, this study provides useful insight for the universities and Academic researcher to develop and implement strategies with different characteristics of the students. They can use the insight to motivate the student in such a way to enhance the knowledge sharing behavior and practice among the students.

Universities and educational institutions can invest on the growing society in such a way that they would realize the negative consequences of knowledge hiding and the importance and benefits of knowledge sharing. The universities can improve and develop a system that provide huge benefits to the students and their surroundings as a result of knowledge sharing.

##  Limitation and suggestions for future directions and conclusion

 This research has several limitations. First, the cross-sectional nature of the study limits conclusions about the causal relationships among the variables. Longitudinal designs are necessary in order to validate the findings over time, and in order to provide insights regarding causality. It is my hope that my study will yield a theoretical contribution beyond the previous studies, and will create a new understanding of knowledge hiding and an ability to manage it more effectively, thus creating new directions for future research. My study focused only on the undergraduate of Sri Lanka focusing on their knowledge hiding behavior, future researcher should replicate the model that embodies other categories of students so that the knowledge hiding behavior of all the academic sector participant can be identified. Further my study has focused only on performance prove goal orientation as a variable that influence knowledge hiding, future researches should focus not only on it but also the other factors from different aspect and context. As a conclusion my study took the task of understanding the influence of performance prove goal orientation on knowledge hiding among the undergraduates on Sri Lanka with the moderating variables group focus feedback and individual focus feedback. the hypotheses tested in this study extend the theoretical and empirical understanding of the antecedents of knowledge hiding. Further, it has been found out that performance prove goal orientation has significant impact on knowledge hiding, while group and individual focus feedback has no significant impact.
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