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Abstract
Knowledge sharing is exclaimed able to enhance the quality of the public sector system and increase the productivity of personnel in the public sector. Police forces are a significant and essential part of the public sector. Research suggested that in order to foster knowledge sharing among public sector personnel, it is important to understand the factors affecting the employees’ interest to share knowledge. It is also believed that individual characteristics play a major role in knowledge sharing behaviour. This study aims to examine the Knowledge Sharing Behaviour from personality differences and relationship of variances of personality with decision-emotions among police officers as explained by the Trait Emotional Intelligence.

1.0 INTRODUCTION
Knowledge sharing is exclaimed able to enhance the quality of the delivery system and enrich the efficiency of public sector personnel (Yusof, Ismail, Ahmad, & Yusof, 2012). Police forces are important and an essential part of the public sectors (Moore & Braga, 2004) where their main responsibility of the police is to preserve law and order, defend life and property, and prevention and discovery of crime (Luen & Al-Hawamdeh, 2001). Previous research suggested that in order to foster knowledge sharing among public sector, it is important to understand the factors affecting employees’ interest to share knowledge (Amayah, 2013). As such, finding the forecasters of employees’ knowledge sharing behaviour is a prospective research area and is imperative for practice in order to have a better understand on factors that motivate employee’s sharing behaviour (Tangaraja, Rasdi, Ismail, & Abu Samah, 2015b). Concerning the reality that economies become more knowledge intensive and previous evidence of knowledge as a valuable resource in most organization (Howell & Annansingh, 2013), this study, therefore, will examine the Knowledge Sharing Behaviour from personality differences among police officers.
2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Knowledge Sharing Behaviour

In the range of knowledge in police function, Luen and Al-Hawamdeh (2001) suggested two definitions based on explicit and tacit knowledge, which are complementary to one another. Explicit knowledge is used as a direction for police actions and decision-making seized based on documentation such as standard operating procedures, policies and general orders. Implicit or tacit knowledge, on the other hand, includes skill, experience and also competency of police personnel. Tacit knowledge is what goes on in the mind of an individual and hence is fast changing and easily lost as compared with documented or explicit knowledge (Luen & Al-Hawamdeh, 2001). Tacit knowledge in relation to the scope of knowledge management in police function is mainly in the areas of delivering and sharing knowledge and information (Luen & Al-Hawamdeh, 2001).

In defining Knowledge Sharing Behaviour, Kumar & Rose (2012) point out that knowledge sharing as a behaviour such as swapping explicit and/or implicit experiences and infuse ideas and skills that facilitate knowledge in the organization (Kumar & Rose, 2012). Similarly, Wang and Noe (2010a), argue that knowledge sharing refers to the provision of job information and facilitation to others in problem solving, developing new ideas, or implementation of policies or procedures (Wang & Noe, 2010b).

For the purpose of this study, knowledge sharing was conceptualized using Yi (2009) definition that sharing involves the dissemination of knowledge in a single direction, from the provider to recipient and entirely depend on the knowledge owner and not the knowledge recipient (Yi, 2009) in this case, the police organization. Sharing of knowledge may happen at different points in organizations ranging from team level, department level to organizational level, (Erhardt, 2003) however, it always begins with the willingness in the individual level (Gurteen, 1999). The degree to which employees actually shares knowledge with other members of the organization is also determined by the intention at an individual level (Chennamaneni, 2007) and depends on the behavioural choice of the person (Dougherty, 1999).

2.2 Trait Emotional Intelligence

Personality represents a set of imperceptible features and habits that lie beneath a fairly persistent form of behaviour in reaction to the different situation (Daft, 2008). Thus, people come from different upbringings and experiences will have diverse norms, values and attitudes. These differences result in distinct personalities of a person that shape to certain actions and behaviours.

Even though studies proposing that people are inclined to certain work attitudes and behaviours (Judge & Bono, 2001b), limited studies have empirically studied the function of individual personality or characters in behaviour (Wang & Noe, 2010a). Thus, this study
suggests that personality variances in behaviour can be partially explained by the way people deal with their emotional intelligence as explain by Trait Emotional Intelligence by Petrides (2009).

Trait Emotional Intelligence is a construct that provides an intrapersonal concept about how people's perceptions of their own emotional abilities (Petrides, Vernon, et al., 2010a). Previous research has proved that Trait Emotional Intelligence (TEI) offers a beneficial framework for the classification of particular skills required in understanding emotion (Stubbs Koman & Wolff, 2008) which could guide behaviour and reasoning in means that improve performance (Santos et al, 2015). This model clearly places Emotional Intelligence (EI) within the personality’s domain.

Previous studies show that there are significant individual differences in people's perceptions of their emotional abilities (Petrides, 2011). Trait emotional intelligence comprises of four factors or subscales that help summarize people’s scores on 13 different Facets (see Figure 1). The four subscales or factors are well-being, self-control, emotionality, and sociability.

Figure 1: The Theoretical four-factor structure of Trait Emotion Intelligence
2.3 Knowledge Sharing Behaviour, Trait Emotional Intelligence and Police Personnel’s Performance

Knowledge sharing is the main practice in knowledge behaviours in police forces. Despite of increasing quantity of effort on knowledge sharing and knowledge management in the public sector (Lin and Hwang, 2014; Muneer et al., 2014; Noaman and Fouad, 2014; Ramayah et al., 2013; Razzaque et al., 2013; Will, 2012; Zhang and Ng, 2012), there are limited study on knowledge sharing in police forces (Seba et al., 2012).

Luen and Al-Hawamdeh (2001) discovered that the quantity of information police personnel in their daily work is extensive. The huge quantity of knowledge that police personnel require performing their routine duties signifies the important of fostering the behaviour of knowledge sharing among the personnel (Seba, Rowley, & Lambert, 2012). Seba et al (2012) also indicate that police personnel are knowledge workforces. According to Berg et al. (2008), a police investigation units which are the main duty of the police, denote a time-critical environment and knowledge-intensive capability (Chen et al., 2003; Hughes & Jackson, 2004). Efficacious police investigations are reliant on effective and efficient of knowledge sharing (Glomseth et al, 2007) and its achievement subject to changing information into evidence (Dean, 1995). Furthermore, a police investigation is an information-rich (Fahsing, Ask, & Granhag, 2004; Puonti, 2004) and knowledge-intensive practice (Chen et al., 2003) where both tacit and explicit knowledge are vital in unravelling criminal cases (Dean, 1995).

Past research shows that knowledge sharing has considerably impacted the performance of both private and public sector organizations (Silvi & Cuganesan, 2006). In relation to public sector’s performances, knowledge sharing is able to improve the productivity level of public sector employees and enhance the quality of the public sector delivery system (Gorry, 2008; Yusof et al., 2012) and innovation capabilities (Kumar & Rose, 2012). Moreover, Wiig (2002) proposes that knowledge sharing can heighten decision-making within public sectors, encourage the public to contribute effectively in policy decision-making, foster competitive public intellectual aptitudes, and work up a knowledge-competitive workforce. Moreover, with many public administration responsibilities and services being knowledge-intensive in nature, excelling in knowledge sharing can feasibly increase public organizations' efficiency (Boer, Berends, & Van Baalen, 2011).

In relation to the police force, Dean et al (2006) observed that knowledge sharing has an important effect on all main activities of the police investigation. Glamseth and Gottschalk (2007) study on Norway’s police re-confirmed the importance of knowledge sharing in the performance of police investigations. Seba et al (2012) argue that police forces require being proactive in managing knowledge, improving their capabilities in knowledge management and in elevating and expediting knowledge sharing. The management of intelligence and knowledge is an important aspect police work in order to promote competent knowledge personnel, who can access and adapt knowledge in an effective and efficient manner. As claimed by Luen and
Al-Hawamdeh (2001), knowledge activities are an instinctive answer to enhance operations and improve police customer service.

Fostering the Knowledge Sharing Behaviour is not an easy task albeit the importance of engaging police with it. Knowledge sharing behaviour is very subjective and it is subject to motivation to partake in such behaviour (Goh & Lim, 2014). Applied to the knowledge-based situation, this demanded emotionally intelligent employees to build mechanisms to entice what they considered to be the finest and brightest knowledge workers (Hess & Bacigalupo, 2010). Organizations often have anticipations regarding what emotions ought to be demonstrated by employees to external and internal clients (Giardini & Frese, 2006). Therefore, it is important for an organization to design an encouraging service environment, which can contribute to employee fulfilment, and emotional support. The harmonizing of those significances necessitates an even higher level of emotional intelligence in the knowledge-based employees (Hess & Bacigalupo, 2010).

2.0 Conclusion
Emotional intelligence has obtained more interest recently in knowledge-based disciplines. Limited studies have empirically examined the role of individual personality or dispositions in knowledge sharing (Wang & Noe, 2010a), although the research proposing that individuals are inclined to particular work attitudes and behaviours (Judge & Bono, 2001). Recent evidence suggested there is a need for a more empirical study on Knowledge Sharing Behaviour from an emotional intelligence perspective. As such, Hess and Bacigalupo (2011) point out that there is little has been contributed to how the behaviours associated with emotional intelligence (Hess & Bacigalupo, 2011). Given its weight and the significance of knowledge activities in police organization, this study, therefore, offers extended research on Knowledge Sharing Behaviour from personality dimension.
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