Mantik Journal, 8 (1) (2024), ISSN 2685-4236 (Online)

Published by:Institute of Computer Science (IOCS)

Jurnal Mantik

Journal homepage: www.iocscience.org/ejournal/index.php/mantik

The role of coopetition, knowledge management and trust towards innovative work behavior

Rizki Matondang[1], Rahmi Fahmy[2], Hafiz Rahman[3]
[1,2,3]Magister Manajemen, Universitas Andalas, Padang 25121

A R T I C L E I N F O

Article history:

Received Mar 24, 2024
Revised Mar 26, 2024
Accepted Apr 01, 2024

Keywords:

Coopetition;
Innovative Work Behavior;
Knowledge Management;
Trust.

ABSTRACT

This research aims to analyze the influence of coopetition and knowledge management on innovative work behavior with trust as a mediating variable. Research data processing was carried out using the SEM (Structural Equation Modeling) method, with the type of Structure Equation Modeling (SEM) used, namely Smart PLS. The research results show that knowledge management, trust have a positive and significant influence on innovative work behavior, and trust can have a mediating effect on the knowledge management variable on innovative work behavior. However, the coopetition variable has not been able to influence innovative work behavior and trust has not been able to act as an intermediary between the coopetition variable and innovative work behavior.

Corresponding Author:

Rizki Matondang,
Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis,
Magister Management, Universitas Andalas
Perintis Kemerdekaan no: 77, Padang, Sumatera Barat, 25121, Indonesia.
Email: rizkimatondang32@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

Companies simultaneously compete and cooperate to pursue common goals, influenced by increasing consumer demand for innovation and product differentiation (Molling et al., 2023). (Uzunbacak, 2021) Innovative work behavior can be measured using four dimensions, namely Idea Generation, Idea Exploration, Idea Generation, Struggling for Ideas, Idea Implementation. The beginning of the innovation process often involves an element of opportunity, the discovery of emerging opportunities or problems. On the one hand, inter-firm coopetition can be considered as a trust-based governance mechanism that facilitates frequent and effective interactions and knowledge sharing among cooperative partners. (Xu et al., 2021).

The cement industry continues to receive awards for its innovative performance from several events held both domestically and abroad. Where to date the total awards received are 2 bronze, 4 silver, 27 gold, 26 platinum, 7 excellent, 13 three stars. This achievement is increasing, the reason is that the innovation work culture of the innovation teams is getting better. (Wu et al., 2023) Coworker support refers to information that leads a person to believe that he or she is cared for, loved, appreciated, and a member of a network of mutual obligations. The innovation achievements obtained by the cement industry cannot be separated from the innovation team's struggle, enthusiasm for improvement and innovation.

Innovative work behavior refers to individual actions to produce new ideas, concepts, products, or solutions that have added value and are different from those that previously existed. To achieve effective innovative work behavior requires teamwork in the

form of collaboration between innovation team members to achieve common goals. Coopetition is a term that combines Cooperation (cooperation) and Competition (competition), referring to cooperation between entities that at the same time also compete in certain respects.

Coopetition creates a paradox in the form of the simultaneous pursuit of cooperation and competition between firms and the tensions that develop at the individual, organizational, and interorganizational levels (Basterretxea et al., 2019). There are many drivers of coopetition which can be grouped into three broad types, namely internal or agent based, external or environmental agent based and relationship based.

According to (Keiser et al., 2023) Knowledge management is defined as the useful use of knowledge resources to ensure compliance with a company's strategic and operational objectives and thereby the continued success of the business. Knowledge management is a systematic approach to collecting, organizing, storing, sharing and utilizing knowledge in an organization or environment aimed at improving company performance, innovation, learning and ability to adapt to change.

Previous research refers to the collection of studies, literature, and research that has been conducted previously related to the topic or problem to be investigated in the new research. Several studies that have been conducted have found that there is an influence of coopetition and knowledge management on innovative work behavior. Research result (Uzunbacak, 2021) stated that employee perceptions of digital leadership have a positive and significant effect on all dimensions of employee innovative work behavior. (Mariani & Belitski, 2022) states that coopetition has a significant effect on first mover advantage and innovation, while the tendency to imitate increases with increasing intensity of coopetition. (Navío-Marco et al., 2021) stated the results of his research that coopetition had a positive and significant effect on organizational innovation.

Next, the researchers conducted a field survey through questionnaires to 93 cement company employees. In terms of coopetition and innovative work behavior, it was found that there was a lack of synchronization or, a lack of suitability between cooperation and competition in certain contexts, the company was not successful in integrating elements of coopetition well in an effort to improve behavior. innovative work. then contextual conditions, where certain factors in the organizational or industrial environment may limit the positive impact of coopetition on innovative work behavior.

Meanwhile, in terms of coopetition and trust, there is a mismatch of values or interests, a mismatch between the values or interests of companies collaborating and competing together (coopetition). This can hinder the development of trust between parties. Then there is a lack of transparency, lack of transparency or inadequate communication regarding objectives, strategies or actions within the framework of coopetition.

Furthermore, in terms of knowledge management with innovative work behavior, it was found that employees were not properly involved in knowledge management activities or did not see the added value to their work. Then there is a lack of accessibility or affordability of information, obstacles to the accessibility or affordability of information shared through the knowledge management system.

Based on the background of the problem above, researchers are interested in conducting further research regarding: "the role of coopetition, knowledge management and trust in innovative work behavior".

2. RESEARCH METHOD

A sample is a portion of the population that is intended to represent the population studied. The number of samples in this study was 50% + 1 from 185 respondents so that the sample in the study was 93 samples. To obtain the data needed in this research, the researcher conducted a survey, namely collecting data by providing or distributing a questionnaire listing statements about coopetition, knowledge management, trust, and IWB with the hope that respondents would provide responses to the list of statements.

Data is measured using a Likert scale or ordinal method. The scale used contains statements regarding coopetition, knowledge management, trust and IWB which are measured by questionnaire items. The indicators for measuring coopetition are adapted from the measures used by (Schiffling et al., 2020) namely 6 indicators. Knowledge management measurements adapted from (Yu et al., 2022) namely as many as 5 indicators. Then the trust indicator was adapted from the measure used by (Chai et al., 2020) namely 6 indicators. Finally, innovative work behavior was adapted from (Mutonyi et al., 2020) which consists of 5 indicators.

In line with the hypothesis formulated, this study analyzes statistical data using smart PLS software starting from model measurement (outer model), model structure (inner model) and hypothesis testing (Ghozali, 2018). PLS comply (Hair et al., 2018) is an approach from covariance-based structural equation modeling to variance-based structural equation modeling (SEM). Covariance-based SEM generally tests causality/theory, while PLS is more of a predictive model. PLS is the method and is used to confirm the study theory. Construct measurement (called an external model in SEM-PLS) is a model that shows the relationship between a construct and indicators of a variable. (Hair et al., 2018). The measurement model is a measurement model to assess the validity and reliability of the model (Hair et al., 2018). The structural model called the inner model in SEM-PLS displays the path relationships between constructs (Hair et al., 2018). The structural model is evaluated using R-square for dependent constructs, Q-square test (Stone-Geisser) to obtain predictive relevance, and path coefficients.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Coopetition is a term that combines two words, namely cooperation (cooperation) and competition (competition). This refers to a situation where companies or individuals compete in one aspect, but also cooperate in other aspects, innovative work behavior can be formed from coopetition situations (Corbo et al., 2023). Based on the results of previous research conducted by (Chai et al., 2020) who found that coopetition had a positive influence on IWB. Next discovery (Le Roy et al., 2022) stated the same thing, namely that coopetition also has a significant relationship with IWB.

H1: Cooperation has a positive and significant influence on innovative work behavior of cement industry employees.

Knowledge Management refers to practices aimed at collecting, storing, managing, and sharing knowledge across an organization (Garcia-Perez et al., 2019). Based on the results of previous research conducted by (Hatami et al., 2023) found that the development of knowledge management significantly optimizes the IWB process.

H2: Knowledge management has a positive and significant influence on innovative work behavior of cement industry employees.

According to (Schiffling et al., 2020) through coopetition situations, competing organizations can cooperate on certain things, such as the development of new products or services, joint research, or sharing resources.Research conducted by (Authors, 2019) which found research results that coopetition had a positive and significant effect in building trust with interdependence, previous experience and reputation, awareness of risks, contractual agreements and dynamic processes.

H3: Cooperation has a positive and significant influence on the trust of cement industry employees.

According to (Idrees et al., 2023) Knowledge management (KM) is a practice that involves the process of collecting, organizing, storing, sharing, and managing knowledge within an organization or environment. Research conducted (Khoa & Huynh, 2023) get the results, namely that knowledge management has a negative and significant effect on trust in work. Likewise with the results of research conducted by (Nova et al., 2023) The research found that knowledge management had a negative and significant effect on trust. H4: Knowledge management has a positive and significant influence on the trust of cement industry employees.

The belief that innovation can help them grow and advance in their careers can be a powerful driver (Pra-bukti et al., 2023). According to (Montag et al., 2023) in tune with (Verhoeven & Ritzen, 2023) who has completed research with the same results, where it is stated that trust has a positive and significant influence on innovative work behavior.
H5: Trust has a positive and significant influence on innovative work behavior of cement industry employees.

Opinion (Burström et al., 2022) when organizations compete and cooperate within a coopetition framework, early trust formation becomes key. Research conducted by (Basterretxea et al., 2019) produced research findings where trust was able to mediate the relationship between coopetition and innovative work behavior.
H6: Trust mediates Coopetition on innovative work behavior of cement industry employees.

According to (Lassur & Tafel-Viia, 2019) The complex relationship between knowledge management, trust, and innovative work behavior forms the basis of innovation culture in organizations. Research conducted by (Belso-Martinez et al., 2018) get the same results, namely that trust can mediate the relationship between knowledge management and IWB.
H7: Trust mediates knowledge management on innovative work behavior of cement industry employees.

To find out the overall characteristics of the respondents in this study, respondents will be grouped based on:

Table 1. Respondent Characteristics

Characteristics	N	Percent
Gender		
Man	51	54,8%
Woman	42	45,2%
Age		
17 - 20 Year	7	7,5%
21 - 25 Year	36	38,7%
26 - 30 Year	25	26,9%
31 - 35 Year	11	11,8%
> 35 Year	14	15,1%
Education		
high school	24	25,8%
Diploma	8	8,6%
Bachelor	54	58,1%

The most dominant number of respondents in the research were 51 male respondents with a percentage of 54.8%. Meanwhile, there were 42 female respondents with a percentage of 45.2%. If we look at the age group, it is known that the number of respondents studied in this study was predominantly 36 respondents aged 21-25 years with a percentage of 38.7%. Followed by 25 vulnerable respondents aged 26-30 years with a percentage of 26.9%. Meanwhile, the lowest respondents aged 17-20 years were 7 people with a percentage of 7.5%. This means that respondents who often behave in innovative work and respondents who have participated in innovation competitions are respondents aged 21-25 and aged 26-30 years.

Furthermore, looking at the most recent education, it is known that the respondents with the most recent education were the most dominant in this study, namely respondents with the most recent education at bachelor's level as many as 54 respondents or 58.1%. For the background of marital status, it can be seen that the most dominant characteristics of respondents based on marital status are 54 people who are unmarried with a percentage of 58.7%, while those who are married are 39 people with a percentage of 41.3%. This means that the most dominant unmarried respondents tend to have innovative work behavior and are more enthusiastic about participating in innovation competitions compared to the number of married respondents.

Based on work position, it can be seen that the respondents with the frequency of respondents based on work position are 31 respondents with human resources work

positions with a percentage of 32.4%. Meanwhile, respondents with frequency based on maintenance work positions were 9 people with a percentage of 9.7%. Meanwhile, the frequency of respondents based on mining work positions and raw material management was 8 people with a frequency of 8.6%. Furthermore, the frequency of respondents based on production work positions was 7 people with a percentage of 7.4%. Apart from that, the frequency of respondents based on other work positions was 38 people with a percentage of 41.9%.

Likewise, by winning innovations in the cement industry, it can be seen that the respondents with the frequency of winning innovations in the cement industry were mostly 70 people with a percentage of 75.3%. Meanwhile, 23 respondents with the frequency of winning innovations in the cement industry have won with a percentage of 24.7%. Apart from that, it can be seen that the respondents with the most dominant frequency of winning national innovations have never won at the national level, totaling 80 people with a percentage of 86%. Meanwhile, the frequency of innovation winners who have won innovation at the national level is 13 people with a percentage of 14%. It is also known that most of the respondents who frequently win international innovations have never won innovation competitions at the international level, totaling 89 people with a percentage of 95.7%. Meanwhile, the frequency of respondents who had won international innovation competitions was 4 people with a percentage of 4.3%.

It is known that the average value of the 6 questionnaire question indicators on the coopetition variable is with an average frequency of 4.32 and an average score of 86.40 in the high category. This indicates that employees often coopetition and have innovative work behavior when working in the cement industry.

The average value of the 5 questionnaire question indicators on the knowledge management variable is with an average frequency value of 4.22 and an average score value of 84.40 in the high category. This indicates the importance of building knowledge management in increasing innovative work behavior in employees and is an important reason for the long-term success of the cement industry.

The average frequency value of the six questionnaire questions on the innovative work behavior variable is 4.16 and the average score is 83.20 in the high category. The assessment with the highest average is in the indicator "New technology has a significant impact on innovative work behavior" with an average frequency value of 4.26 and an average score value of 85.20 in the high category. The indicators were dominated by 42 respondents agreeing and 39 respondents strongly agree. This indicates that employees often behave in innovative work and participate in innovation competitions. Where respondents in this study agree that new technology has a very significant impact on innovative work behavior. This can also increase employees' intention to come up with new ideas to compete in cement industry innovation.

The assessment with the highest average value is in the indicator "Trust builds strong relationships with customers, partners, employees and other stakeholders, which can influence business growth, profitability and sustainability" with an average frequency value of 4.31 and The average score is 86.20 in the high category. The indicators were dominated by 42 respondents strongly agree and 40 respondents agreed. Meanwhile, the value of the indicator "By being someone who can be trusted, you will build and maintain mutual trust so that it helps in achieving success in various aspects of life" with an average frequency value of 4.26 and an average score value of 85.20 with the category tall. The indicators were dominated by 44 respondents agreeing and 38 respondents strongly agreeing. Based on these two indicators, it can be seen that respondents in the study agree that building and maintaining mutual trust will help in achieving success in various aspects of life. Trust has the potential to influence and strengthen innovative work behavior by means of openness and negotiation between innovators to always maintain trust in various contexts, including in creating new ideas.

Outer model analysis is carried out with the aim of analyzing that the indicators used in the research are suitable to be used as a measurement tool in the context of validity and reliability. This analysis serves to clarify the relationship between latent

variables and the indicators. In this outer model analysis, the tests that will be carried out in the research are convergent validity, discriminant validity, and average variance extracted (AVE), and reliability tests consisting of composite reliability and Cronbach's alpha tests.

Convergent validity aims to measure the magnitude of the correlation between the construct and the latent correlation value, with a correlation or outer loading value >0.70 and an average variance extracted (AVE) value >0.50, it will be said to be valid. The following are the results of the convergent validity test for each variable which is seen based on the outer loading value: Analysis of the reliability test is carried out to test and measure the extent to which the measurement tool or indicator can be trusted. The reliability test can be measured by composite reliability and Cronbach's alpha which is > 0.7.

Testing convergent validity on the variables coopetition, knowledge management, trust and innovative work behavior, it was found that all variables have met convergent validity with an outer loading value of > 0.70 so that they meet the value of convergent validity and indicators on the variables coopetition, knowledge management, trust and innovative work behavior can be used for further testing. The average variance extracted (AVE) value for the coopetition, knowledge management, trust and innovative work behavior variables is > 0.5. This means that all constructs used in this research have good validity values.

The discriminant validity value can be measured by paying attention to the cross loading value. The cross loading value aims to assess the adequate level of discriminant validity for each construct by comparing the correlation between constructs. If the cross loading value of the construct correlation value with the measurement item is greater than the correlation value with the other construct values, it will indicate that the latent value can predict their value better than the other values.

The correlation of each indicator on the coopetition, knowledge management, trust and innovative work behavior variables is higher than the correlation between indicators on the other variables. So these results show that all latent constructs show good discriminant validity because they can predict indicators of other constructs. The next stage to see discriminant validity can also be to use a method by comparing the Square Root of Average Variance Extracted (AVE) for each variable with the relationship between the variable and other variables in the model. The model has a good discriminant validity value if the AVE root for each AVE in each construct is greater than the correlation between the construct and other constructs. The test results show that the square root of AVE for each variable consisting of coopetition, knowledge management, trust and innovative work behavior is greater than the correlation between the variable and other variables. This indicates that all variables have good discriminant validity values and are suitable for research. The statements for each variable are all declared valid, this is because the Hetetrait-Monotrait Ratio value is <0.90. Apart from evaluating the Cross Loading and Hetetrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT) values, discriminant validity testing can be determined from the results of the Fornell-Larcker Criterion. The condition for this test is that the variable's correlation with itself must be greater than the variable's correlation with other variables.

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the research that has been conducted, it can be concluded that knowledge management, trust have a positive and significant influence on innovative work behavior, and trust can have a mediating effect on the knowledge management variable on innovative work behavior. However, the coopetition variable has not been able to influence innovative work behavior and trust has not been able to act as an intermediary between the coopetition variable and innovative work behavior.

Coopetition does not have a positive and significant effect on innovative work behavior. This means that coopetition cannot influence innovative work behavior among

cement industry employees. A related possible interpretation is a lack of synchronization or, a lack of compatibility between cooperation and competition in a particular context, the company does not succeed in integrating elements of coopetition well in an effort to increase innovative work behavior.

Coopetition does not have a positive and significant effect on trust. This means that coopetition cannot affect trust in cement industry employees. A possibly related interpretation is a mismatch of values or interests, a mismatch between the values or interests of companies collaborating and competing together (coopetition). This can hinder the development of trust between parties. Then there is a lack of transparency, lack of transparency or inadequate communication regarding objectives, strategies or actions within the framework of coopetition.

Knowledge management does not have a positive and significant effect on innovative work behavior. This means that knowledge management cannot influence innovative work behavior. A possible related interpretation is a lack of employee involvement, employees may not be well involved in knowledge management activities or may not see the added value to their work. Then there is a lack of accessibility or affordability of information, obstacles to the accessibility or affordability of information shared through the knowledge management system.

Knowledge management has a positive and significant effect on trust. This means that the better knowledge management is carried out, the more trust will increase in cement industry employees. A related possible interpretation is transparency, knowledge management may encourage transparency and openness in sharing information, which can build trust between individuals and teams. Then increasing collaboration, knowledge management can facilitate collaboration and exchange of knowledge between individuals or teams, which can strengthen relationships and trust.

Trust has a positive and significant effect on innovative work behavior. This means that the better the trust that is felt, the more innovative work behavior will increase in cement industry employees. A related possible interpretation is that trust drives engagement and collaboration, high trust between individuals or teams might encourage better engagement and collaboration. Then the foundation for open collaboration, high trust may be the basis for open collaboration where ideas and input can be exchanged without fear or worry.

Coopetition does not have a positive and significant effect on innovative work behavior which is mediated by trust. This means that trust cannot mediate the relationship between coopetition and innovative work behavior of cement industry employees. A possible related interpretation is a lack of involvement and participation in coopetition, employees or teams may not be well involved in coopetition practices, which can affect the level of trust and its positive impact on innovative work behavior. Then there is a high level of uncertainty in coopetition, if coopetition is faced with a high level of uncertainty, this can hinder the formation of trust which is needed to support innovation.

Knowledge management has a positive and significant effect on innovative work behavior which is mediated by trust. This means that the better the trust felt by employees through knowledge management, the more innovative work behavior will increase among cement industry employees. A related possible interpretation is the involvement of knowledge in innovation, knowledge management may effectively provide and facilitate access to the knowledge necessary to support innovative practices. then the importance of trust in managing knowledge, trust can act as a mediator that connects the positive influence of knowledge management on innovation.

It is hoped that this research can provide significant implications as well as information to companies regarding increasing collaboration and balanced competition so that companies can optimize results by creating an environment where employees can collaborate to produce innovation, while still maintaining elements of healthy competition, which has an impact on increasing collaboration can leverage innovative

ideas and solutions while maintaining a level of competition that spurs productivity and performance.

Then manage conflict constructively so that companies need to have an effective conflict management mechanism, remembering that coopetition can cause friction between teams or individuals, which has an impact on constructive conflict management which can prevent detrimental conflicts and instead use them as opportunities for learning and improvement.

Furthermore, increasing employee involvement so that employees can collaborate in the process of coopetition and innovation can increase their involvement in work and the company which has an impact on employees who are actively involved and can become a source of innovative ideas and make a positive contribution to company performance.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to express my gratitude to Allah SWT for the blessings of health and prosperity that have been given to me so that I can complete this research. I must also convey my deepest thanks to my lecturer for his patience, motivation and guidance and now I have completed this research.

REFERENCES

Authors, F. (2019). *Article information : Trust-building mechanisms in a coopetition relationship : a case study design*. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-04-2016-1012

Basterretxea, I., Charterina, J., & Landeta, J. (2019). *Coopetition and innovation : lessons from worker cooperatives in the Spanish machine tool industry*. *6*, 1223–1235. https://doi.org/10.1108/JBIM-01-2018-0015

Belso-Martinez, J., Palacios-Marqués, D., & Roig-Tierno, N. (2018). Building resilient clusters through HRM systems: A multiple mediator model. *Management Decision*, *56*(6), 1398–1416. https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-02-2017-0175

Burström, T., Kock, S., & Wincent, J. (2022). Coopetition – Strategy and interorganizational transformation: Platform, innovation barriers, and coopetitive dynamics. *Industrial Marketing Management*, *104*(April), 101–115. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2022.04.017

Chai, L., Li, J., Tangpong, C., & Clauss, T. (2020). The interplays of coopetition, conflicts, trust, and efficiency process innovation in vertical B2B relationships. *Industrial Marketing Management*, *85*(July), 269–280. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2019.11.004

Corbo, L., Kraus, S., Vlačić, B., Dabić, M., Caputo, A., & Pellegrini, M. M. (2023). Coopetition and innovation: A review and research agenda. *Technovation*, *122*(April). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2022.102624

Garcia-Perez, A., Gheriss, F., & Bedford, D. (2019). Metrics for Knowledge Management Capabilities. *Designing and Tracking Knowledge Management Metrics*, 129–143. https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-78973-723-320191008

Ghozali. (2018). *Aplikasi Multivariate Dengan Program IBM SPSS 25*. Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.

Hair, J. F. H., Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2018). The Results of PLS-SEM Article information. *European Business Review*, *31*(1), 2–24.

Hatami, H., Tavallaee, R., Karajabad, M. S., & Toghraie, D. (2023). Development of knowledge management in investigating the rheological behavior of SiO2/SAE50 nano-lubricant by response surface methodology (RSM). *Tribology International*, *187*(May), 108667. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.triboint.2023.108667

Idrees, H., Xu, J., Haider, S. A., & Tehseen, S. (2023). A systematic review of knowledge management and new product development projects: Trends, issues, and challenges. *Journal of Innovation and Knowledge*, *8*(2), 100350. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2023.100350

Keiser, D., Petzoldt, C., Walura, V., Leimbrink, S., & Freitag, M. (2023). ScienceDirect Concept and Integration of Knowledge Management in Assembly Assistance Systems. *Procedia CIRP*, *118*, 940–945. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procir.2023.06.162

Khoa, B. T., & Huynh, T. T. (2023). The effectiveness of knowledge management systems in motivation and satisfaction in higher education Institutions: Data from Vietnam. *Data in Brief*, *49*, 109454. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dib.2023.109454

Lassur, S., & Tafel-Viia, K. (2019). Meso-analysis of Cross-innovation between Tourism and Audiovisual Media: The Case of the Public Sector's Driving Role. *Emergence of Cross-Innovation Systems: Audiovisual Industries Co-Innovating with Education, Health Care and Tourism*, 173–192. https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-78769-977-920191019

Le Roy, F., Robert, F., & Hamouti, R. (2022). Vertical vs horizontal coopetition and the market performance of product innovation: An empirical study of the video game industry. *Technovation*, *112*(December 2020). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2021.102411

Mariani, M. M., & Belitski, M. (2022). The effect of coopetition intensity on first mover advantage and imitation in innovation related coopetition: Empirical evidence from UK firms. *European Management Journal*, *December 2020*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2022.05.001

Molling, G., Hidalgo, G., Santini, M., Monticelli, J. M., & de Matos, C. A. (2023). Coopetition and innovation in high-tech firms: What we can learn from analysis of the semiconductor industry's patents. *World Patent Information*, *72*(November 2022), 102157. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wpi.2022.102157

Montag, C., Kraus, J., Baumann, M., & Rozgonjuk, D. (2023). The propensity to trust in (automated) technology mediates the links between technology self-efficacy and fear and acceptance of artificial intelligence. *Computers in Human Behavior Reports*, *11*(March), 100315. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbr.2023.100315

Mutonyi, B. R., Slåtten, T., & Lien, G. (2020). Empowering leadership, work group cohesiveness, individual learning orientation and individual innovative behaviour in the public sector: empirical evidence from Norway. *International Journal of Public Leadership*, *16*(2), 175–197. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPL-07-2019-0045

Navío-Marco, J., Ibar-Alonso, R., & Bujidos-Casado, M. (2021). Interlinkages between coopetition and organisational innovation in Europe. *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, *36*(9), 1665–1677. https://doi.org/10.1108/JBIM-01-2020-0054

Nova, N. A., González, R. A., Beltrán, L. C., & Nieto, C. E. (2023). A knowledge management system for sharing knowledge about cultural heritage projects. *Journal of Cultural Heritage*, *63*, 61–70. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.culher.2023.07.013

Pra-bukti, J., Kwablah, E., Amoah, A., & Dzeha, G. C. (2023). *Jurnal Pra-bukti*.

Schiffling, S., Hannibal, C., Fan, Y., & Tickle, M. (2020). Coopetition in temporary contexts: examining swift trust and swift distrust in humanitarian operations. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, *40*(9), 1449–1473. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOPM-12-2019-0800

Uzunbacak, H. H. (2021). *From conventional to digital leadership : exploring digitalization of leadership and innovative work behavior*. https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-05-2021-0338

Verhoeven, L., & Ritzen, J. (2023). Globalisation and Trust in Europe between 2002 and 2018. *Research in Globalization*, 100142. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resglo.2023.100142

Wu, C. M., Chen, T. J., & Wang, Y. C. (2023). Formation of hotel employees' service innovation performance: Mechanism of thriving at work and change-oriented organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, *54*(December 2022), 178–187. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2022.12.015

Xu, T., Yang, J., Zhang, F., & Guo, W. (2021). Interfirm coopetition, interfirm knowledge creation, and collaborative innovation performance: The moderating roles of environmental competitiveness and dysfunctional competition. *Industrial Marketing Management*, *99*(September 2020), 123–135. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2021.10.003

Yu, S., Abbas, J., Álvarez-Otero, S., & Cherian, J. (2022). Green knowledge management: Scale development and validation. *Journal of Innovation and Knowledge*, *7*(4). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2022.100244