Anusandhanvallari
Vol 2025, No.1
August 2025
ISSN 2229-3388

Retaining Tacit Knowledge in High-Turnover Indian Automotive Embedded Engineering Companies: An Integrated Theoretical and Practical Framework

[1]Visweswaran R, [2]Benazir Y.

[1]Research Scholar, Sri Krishna Arts and Science College, Coimbatore, India

[2]Assistant Professor, Sri Krishna Arts and Science College, Coimbatore, India

Abstract: Tacit knowledge comprising experiential problem-solving, nuanced technical judgment, and client-specific adaptation—forms the backbone of India's automotive embedded engineering sector, enabling compliance with rigorous standards such as ISO 26262, AUTOSAR, and ASPICE. Yet, this non-codified expertise is increasingly at risk in an environment marked by high turnover due to competitive talent poaching, contract-based staffing, and short job tenures. This study develops an integrated retention framework combining Nonaka et al.'s SECI model, Tan et al.'s live capture methodology, and Mohamed & Nordin's lean tacit transfer strategies with behavioral and generational insights from **Gaghman (2019) and Tokarz &Rosinski (2024)**. A mixed-methods survey of 91 managers and team leads from Chennai, Coimbatore, Bangalore, Hyderabad, and Cochin managing teams of 2–50 members with 3–20 years of experience revealed weak retention systems, unclear competency mapping, high perceived turnover risk, and moderate organizational support. The findings underscore the need for a multi-layered approach that integrates SECI-based workflows, generativity-driven mentoring, trust-based behavioral enablers, and lean-frugal skill transfer platforms, institutionalized within HR policy and operational routines. The proposed framework offers a scalable, context-specific strategy for sustaining tacit knowledge, strengthening organizational resilience, and safeguarding innovation capacity in high-attrition engineering environments.

Keywords: Tacit Knowledge Retention, Automotive Embedded Engineering, SECI Model, Generativity, Knowledge Management Strategies

1. Introduction: The Stakes of Tacit Knowledge Loss in Indian Embedded Engineering

India's automotive embedded engineering sector designs, integrates, and tests complex systems for global OEMs and Tier-1 suppliers. Deliverables range from engine control units to advanced driver assistance systems, all of which must meet stringent safety, quality, and interoperability standards such as ISO 26262, AUTOSAR, and ASPICE (Nonaka, 2002). Meeting these standards relies heavily on tacit knowledge—skills and insights that cannot be easily codified, including problem-solving heuristics, diagnostic intuition, and nuanced client-specific requirements.

High attrition in this sector is driven by multiple factors: aggressive recruitment by competitors, the prevalence of contract staffing models, limited upward mobility, and engineers' preference for frequent job changes to maximize pay and exposure. As evidenced in South African state-owned enterprises (Phaladi & Ngulube, 2024) and European multigenerational R&D teams (Tokarz & Rosinski, 2024), even modest losses of experienced personnel can lead to cascading delays, compliance risks, and quality deterioration.

This research investigated the issue in the Indian setting by surveying 91 managers and team leaders working across five prominent automotive engineering centers: Chennai, Coimbatore, Bangalore, Hyderabad, and Cochin. Respondents managed teams ranging from 2 to 50 members, with professional experience spanning 3–20 years. The cohort included 62 men and the remainder women, providing gender diversity in perspectives.

According to Gaghman (2019), the loss of tacit knowledge is driven not only by procedural deficiencies but also by elements like individual motivation, reciprocal exchange norms, and organizational trust, each interacting with structural enablers or constraints.

2. Literature Review and Theoretical Foundations

2.1 Tacit vs. Explicit Knowledge in Engineering Contexts

Polanyi observed that much of what people know is instinctive or experiential, and therefore not easily articulated (Holste & Fields, 2010). This makes tacit knowledge challenging to formalize, whereas explicit forms—like diagrams or written guides are simpler to capture and access.Tacit knowledge emerges from lived experiences, such as resolving elusive software anomalies, adapting hardware under constraints, or navigating idiosyncratic client approval processes. DeLong (2004) notes that once such expertise is lost, it can take years to replace. According to Gaghman (2019) trust and perceived fairness significantly influence whether employees willingly share this expertise before departure.

2.2 SECI Model and Contextual Ba in India

The SECI model (Nonaka et al., 2000) describes four cyclical modes of knowledge conversion of Socialization, Externalization, Combination, and Internalization it is supported by Ba, a shared knowledge space. While Socialization thrives in informal Indian workplace settings (e.g., tea breaks, peer troubleshooting), Externalization and Combination often fail due to limited time, poor codification tools, and minimal incentives for documentation (Grant, 2013). According to Tokarz and Rosinski (2024), fostering *Ba* in multigenerational teams requires deliberate facilitation of structured interactions and the creation of an environment that ensures psychological safety.

2.3 Live Capture and Digital Knowledge Tools

Tan et al. (2007) advocate embedding live capture tools—decision logs, design repositories, sprint review records—into engineering workflows. Yet, as Dolphin (2021) observes, without leadership enforcement these repositories remain underused. Our survey findings confirm inconsistent repository usage in Indian firms, suggesting that making updates a deliverable could drive adoption.

2.4 Lean Manufacturing, Tacit Learning, and Frugality

Mohamed & Nordin (2017) show that lean principles encourage tacit transfer by exposing employees to diverse tasks under resource constraints. In India, frugal engineering workshops can operationalize this, fostering creative problem-solving and rapid skill diffusion, especially when integrated with SECI phases.

2.5 Knowledge Behavioral Factors and Generativity

Tacit sharing is behaviorally driven—proactive mentoring, reciprocity, and trust influence its occurrence (Gaghman, 2019). Generativity theory (Tokarz &Rosinski, 2024) frames experienced employees as legacy builders, intrinsically motivated to pass on knowledge. Formal recognition and reward systems can channel this motivation into structured mentoring.

3. Integrated Conceptual Framework

The proposed framework conceptualizes tacit knowledge retention in high-turnover Indian automotive embedded engineering firms as a dynamic interplay between Knowledge Loss Drivers, Mediating Enablers, Retention Mechanisms, and Performance Outcomes. Each stage is informed by established theoretical models and enriched by empirical findings from the present study.

Integrated Tacit Knowledge Retention Framework

Category	Elements
Knowledge Loss Drivers	High attrition; Dependency on key individuals; Weak documentation; Lack of structured generational transfer
Mediating Enablers	Trust; Reciprocity; Generativity; Leadership commitment
Retention Mechanisms	SECI workflows + Live capture; Structured mentoring; Behavioural prompts; Competency mapping
Performance Outcomes	Reduced ramp-up time; Fewer errors; Sustained compliance; Organizational resilience

3.1 Knowledge Loss Drivers

The first element of the framework identifies the primary conditions that place tacit knowledge at risk:

- **High Attrition** – Driven by competitive salary offers, career mobility, and limited vertical growth opportunities in embedded engineering roles, attrition leads to the abrupt loss of accumulated, experience-based know-how. This aligns with the findings of Phaladi and Ngulube (2024) in the context of South African public enterprises, but the challenge is even more pronounced within India's highly competitive engineering talent landscape.
- **Dependency on Key Individuals** – Many projects rely on a small number of experts with deep client-specific and technical knowledge. The unexpected loss of these key individuals can lead to workflow disruptions and leave substantial gaps in critical knowledge
- **Weak Documentation Culture** – While explicit knowledge, such as design drawings and test scripts, may be stored, critical decision rationales, troubleshooting approaches, and client negotiation strategies often remain undocumented. This echoes DeLong's (2004) conclusion that documentation alone cannot capture the richness of tacit expertise.
- **Lack of Structured Generational Transfer** – Multigenerational teams exist in many firms, but without deliberate pairing or mentorship programs, opportunities for organic knowledge transfer are missed (Tokarz &Rosinski, 2024).

These drivers collectively form the problem space in which tacit knowledge erosion occurs, highlighting that losses are not solely a function of turnover volume but also structural vulnerabilities in knowledge flow.

3.2 Mediating Enablers

The second element involves mediators that can either buffer against or exacerbate knowledge loss:

- Trust – As Holste & Fields (2010) note, trust is the psychological foundation for voluntary sharing of tacit expertise. In distributed or hybrid engineering teams, building trust requires consistent leadership visibility and transparent communication.

- Reciprocity – Knowledge sharing often operates on a principle of exchange. Employees are more likely to share insights if they perceive that contributions will be reciprocated or acknowledged.
- Generativity – Defined as the intrinsic motivation to pass on knowledge for legacy or professional pride (Tokarz &Rosinski, 2024), generativity is particularly relevant for senior engineers nearing career transitions.
- Leadership Commitment – Leaders act as cultural gatekeepers. Without explicit leadership emphasis on retention, employees are unlikely to prioritize documentation or mentoring in time-pressured environments (Bessick & Naicker, 2013).

These mediators operate in the social space of the framework, influencing whether structural retention mechanisms are embraced or neglected.

3.3 Retention Mechanisms

The third element consists of concrete interventions that integrate structural and behavioral strategies:

1. SECI Workflows with Live Capture – Drawing from Nonaka et al.'s (2000) SECI model, the framework embeds Socialization, Externalization, Combination, and Internalization phases into project workflows. The addition of live capture tools (Tan et al., 2007) ensures that decision-making processes, iterative design adjustments, and real-time problem-solving sessions are documented without placing the entire burden on post-hoc reporting.
2. Structured Mentoring and Cross-Generational Pairing – Formalized pairing between senior and junior engineers facilitates generativity while distributing client-specific knowledge. Unlike ad-hoc mentoring, structured programs track outcomes and set clear skill-transfer goals.
3. Behavioral Prompts and Recognition Systems – Inspired by Gaghman's (2019) findings, recognition-based nudges (e.g., peer acknowledgements, award systems) can encourage engineers to share undocumented expertise proactively.
4. Competency Mapping Linked to Career Progression – As Phaladi & Ngulube (2024) advocate, mapping individual competencies and linking them to career incentives ensures both organizational oversight of skill coverage and employee motivation for knowledge contribution.

This combination ensures that retention is not solely procedural but embedded in daily practice, performance evaluations, and team culture.

3.4 Performance Outcomes

Finally, the model predicts measurable organizational benefits:

- Reduced Ramp-Up Time – New hires can reach productivity faster when tacit expertise is captured and accessible.
- Fewer Errors and Rework Cycles – Documented best practices reduce the risk of repeating past mistakes.
- Sustained Compliance – Safety and quality standards (ISO 26262, AUTOSAR, ASPICE) are better maintained when the underlying rationale for compliance decisions is preserved.
- Stronger Organizational Resilience – Firms develop an internal capability to withstand attrition shocks without major disruption to delivery timelines or quality.

4. Methodology

4.1 Research Design

A mixed-methods design was selected to combine the quantitative measurement of retention-related dimensions with qualitative insights into behavioral and cultural enablers or barriers. This approach aligns with prior KM studies (Bessick & Naicker, 2013; Dolphin, 2021) that emphasize the value of triangulating survey data with narrative responses to capture the nuance of tacit knowledge dynamics.

4.2 Sample and Setting

The study surveyed 91 managers and team leads working in the automotive embedded engineering sector across five major Indian cities—Chennai, Coimbatore, Bangalore, Hyderabad, and Cochin. These cities collectively represent key hubs for both domestic and export-focused automotive engineering work, hosting major R&D centers, Tier-1 suppliers, and contract engineering firms.

Participants managed teams ranging from 2 to 50 members and brought between 3 and 20 years of professional experience, ensuring representation from both emerging leaders and highly seasoned managers. The gender split included 62 male respondents and 29 female respondents, providing moderate gender diversity in managerial perspectives.

4.3 Data Collection Instrument

The primary instrument was a structured survey using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree; 5 = Strongly Agree) to assess four key dimensions:

1. Knowledge Retention Practices – Degree to which organizations have formalized documentation, mentoring, and capture processes.
2. Competency Retention – Presence and accuracy of competency mapping, redundancy in key skills, and vulnerability assessment.
3. Turnover Risk Awareness – Managerial recognition of how attrition impacts project continuity and compliance.
4. Organizational Support – Leadership engagement, budget allocation, and incentive structures supporting retention initiatives.

The survey also included open-ended questions inviting respondents to describe barriers, examples of successful retention, and suggestions for improvement.

4.4 Data Analysis

Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics to determine mean scores for each dimension, while qualitative responses underwent thematic coding to identify recurring patterns in behavioral, structural, and cultural factors. To validate the robustness of these findings, results were cross-referenced with retention challenges and enablers identified in Bessick & Naicker (2013) and Dolphin (2021).

5. Findings

The survey results reveal critical weaknesses in current tacit knowledge retention practices across the sample.

Dimension	Mean (5-pt)	Insight Summary
Knowledge Retention Practices	2.3	Weak documentation standards; reliance on informal transfer; minimal live capture integration.
Competency Retention	3	Skills mapping exists inconsistently; high vulnerability when key individuals leave.
Turnover Risk Awareness	4.1	Strong recognition of attrition as a project risk; managers are aware but lack the necessary mitigation tools.
Organizational Support	3.1	Leadership acknowledgment is present but not matched with sustained action or incentives.

5.1 Weak Retention Practices

With a mean of **2.3**, knowledge retention practices were the weakest-rated dimension. Respondents cited **ad-hoc documentation**, outdated repositories, and the absence of mandatory knowledge handovers. These findings align with Dolphin's (2021) observation that without accountability measures, repositories quickly become obsolete.

5.2 Inconsistent Competency Retention

The competency retention score of **3.0** suggests partial adoption of skill mapping but with major inconsistencies. Many organizations lack a central view of who holds critical knowledge, leading to vulnerability when turnover occurs. This reflects DeLong's (2004) observation that many organizations fail to fully recognize the significant time investment required to rebuild lost tacit expertise.

5.3 High Awareness of Turnover Risk

At **4.1**, turnover risk awareness was the highest-rated dimension, showing that managers understand the potential operational and compliance impacts of knowledge loss. However, this recognition has **not yet translated into systematic action**, creating what Bessick & Naicker (2013) describe as the "awareness-action gap" in KM practice.

5.4 Moderate Organizational Support

Organizational support scored **3.1**, reflecting a mismatch between rhetoric and practice. Respondents described leaders who verbally endorsed KM but did not allocate dedicated resources, enforce compliance, or link retention efforts to performance metrics. This lack of **policy-embedded reinforcement** was also noted by Phaladi & Ngulube (2024) in other high-attrition industries.

6. Discussion

The results of this study reinforce a core principle in knowledge management research: structural enablers alone are insufficient without complementary behavioral drivers. In the context of Indian automotive embedded engineering, this interplay becomes even more pronounced due to the industry's distinctive challenges—short product cycles, safety-critical compliance requirements, and one of the highest attrition rates globally among engineering-intensive sectors.

6.1 Interplay Between Structural and Behavioral Enablers

Structural enablers such as the SECI model (Nonaka et al., 2000), live capture repositories (Tan et al., 2007), and competency mapping frameworks provide the backbone for systematic knowledge retention. However, these tools can only reach their potential if supported by behavioral factors such as trust, reciprocity, and generativity. The data from our 91 respondents suggests that while some organizations have invested in structural elements (e.g., repositories, mentoring initiatives), behavioral foundations remain weak. Neutral-to-low ratings on organizational support and retention practices indicate that these systems are not consistently embedded into daily workflows.

Without active leadership engagement and cultural reinforcement, employees often see documentation as a low-priority, administrative burden rather than an integral part of engineering excellence. This reflects earlier findings by Dolphin (2021) and Bessick & Naicker (2013), where the mere presence of KM tools did not translate into consistent knowledge sharing.

6.2 Generational Diversity as a Knowledge Asset

One of the most significant yet under-leveraged resources in Indian engineering firms is generational diversity. Our survey covered managers with 3–20 years of experience, providing a mix of fresh perspectives and deep institutional memory. Tokarz &Rosinski (2024) argue that Ba, the shared space for knowledge exchange, is enriched when younger engineers bring in digital-native adaptability and older engineers contribute battle-tested heuristics.

However, this potential is often lost in high-turnover environments where teams are in constant flux. Instead of viewing generational diversity as a liability—due to differences in work style or communication—companies can structure cross-generational mentoring programs that intentionally bridge these gaps. When linked to performance metrics, such programs create a self-sustaining loop of knowledge flow that survives attrition shocks.

6.3 Indian Context: Heightened Urgency

While global studies echo the importance of tacit knowledge retention, the urgency in India is heightened by three factors revealed in our survey:

1. High Perceived Turnover Risk – Respondents consistently acknowledged that attrition disrupts project timelines and compromises compliance readiness.
2. Ambiguity in Competency Retention – Lack of formalized skill audits means that even organizations aware of attrition risks often cannot quantify the potential loss in specific competencies.
3. Moderate Organizational Support – Leadership recognition of the problem exists, but tangible commitment—budget allocation, KPI integration, enforcement—is inconsistent.

These factors suggest that Indian automotive embedded engineering companies face a dual challenge: they must first stabilize knowledge flows internally, and then reinforce them through systems that remain resilient to external job market volatility.

6.4 Lessons from Comparative Literature

The patterns observed in our data are consistent with cross-sector findings from Phaladi & Ngulube (2024) in South African SOEs, Dolphin (2021) in Western insurance engineering contexts, and Mohamed & Nordin

(2017) in Malaysian manufacturing. In each case, lack of integration between structural tools and behavioral reinforcement led to weak retention outcomes. The Indian case adds further complexity due to rapid technological change in embedded systems, making tacit expertise not just important, but mission-critical to meet safety and interoperability standards.

7. Conclusion and Recommendations

This study confirms that tacit knowledge retention in Indian automotive embedded engineering companies is both urgent and under-addressed. The evidence from 91 managers and team leads—representing diverse team sizes, experience levels, and locations across Chennai, Coimbatore, Bangalore, Hyderabad, and Cochin—demonstrates that while awareness of turnover risks is high, actionable strategies remain fragmented and inconsistently applied.

The integrated theoretical and practical framework developed here bridges three critical dimensions:

1. Structural Systems – SECI-based workflows, live capture integration, and competency mapping.
2. Behavioral Enablers – Trust, reciprocity, and recognition-driven sharing behaviors.
3. Generational Strategies – Leveraging generativity through structured, measurable mentoring.

7.1 Key Recommendations

1. Institutionalize SECI-Live Capture in Workflows
Each phase of the SECI model should be explicitly embedded in project lifecycles, with live capture tools ensuring that design decisions, troubleshooting approaches, and client-specific adaptations are documented in real time. Compliance with this process should be tracked as a deliverable in project management systems.

2. Embed Mentoring as a Measurable Performance Criterion
Mentorship should not be voluntary or informal alone—it should be a formal KPI in performance reviews, with mentoring outcomes (e.g., skill transfer metrics, onboarding speed for new hires) influencing career progression.

3. Use behavioral Nudges to Prompt Tacit Sharing Before Exits
Structured tacit-focused exit interviews, public recognition of knowledge contributions, and trust-building rituals can motivate departing employees to leave behind their critical expertise. This is particularly important in India's transactional employment culture where loyalty may be limited.

4. Run Lean-Frugal Workshops for Rapid Skill Diffusion
Adapt lean manufacturing principles into short, cross-functional workshops to diffuse niche technical skills. These sessions can simulate real project constraints, fostering creative problem-solving while distributing critical knowledge.

5. Align HR Policy with Knowledge Retention Metrics
HR systems should link promotions, bonuses, and professional recognition to measurable knowledge retention contributions—such as repository inputs, mentoring hours, and documentation quality scores.

7.2 Strategic Implications for Practitioners and Researchers

For practitioners, this framework offers a scalable, context-sensitive roadmap that balances formal systems with cultural realities. It moves tacit knowledge retention from being an HR initiative to becoming an organizational resilience strategy.

For researchers, the integration of behavioral science, generativity theory, and structural KM tools offers fertile ground for further exploration, particularly in emerging economy engineering sectors where the pace of change and attrition pressures are high.

7.3 Final Reflection

The ultimate test of these strategies will be in their ability to preserve critical engineering competencies despite inevitable attrition. By embedding both structural rigor and human-centric practices, Indian automotive embedded engineering firms can not only maintain project delivery standards and compliance integrity but also future-proof their innovation capacity. In a competitive global market, where product lifecycles are shortening and technological complexity is increasing, such resilience will be a decisive differentiator

References

[1] Argote, L., & Ingram, P. (2000). Knowledge transfer: A basis for competitive advantage in firms. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 82(1), 150–169. https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.2000.2893

[2] Bessick, J., & Naicker, V. (2013). Barriers to tacit knowledge retention: An understanding of the perceptions of the knowledge management practices in the public sector. SA Journal of Information Management, 15(2), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.4102/sajim.v15i2.549

[3] DeLong, D. W. (2004). Lost knowledge: Confronting the threat of an aging workforce. Oxford University Press.

[4] Dolphin, R. R. (2021). Knowledge retention in engineering teams: Addressing the silent loss. Engineering Management Journal, 33(1), 28–38. https://doi.org/10.1080/10429247.2020.1840172

[5] Gaghman, A. M. (2019). Behavioural drivers of tacit knowledge sharing in engineering organizations. Journal of Knowledge Management, 23(5), 947–967. https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-07-2018-0457

[6] Grant, R. M. (2013). Reflections on knowledge-based approaches to the organization of production. Journal of Management & Governance, 17(3), 541–558. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10997-011-9184-8

[7] Holste, J. S., & Fields, D. (2010). Trust and tacit knowledge sharing and use. Journal of Knowledge Management, 14(1), 128–140. https://doi.org/10.1108/13673271011015615

[8] Mohamed, M., & Nordin, N. (2017). Lean manufacturing and tacit knowledge transfer: A case study in the Malaysian automotive industry. International Journal of Production Research, 55(14), 4129–4145. https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2016.1211340

[9] Nonaka, I. (2002). A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation. In C. W. Choo & N. Bontis (Eds.), The strategic management of intellectual capital and organizational knowledge (pp. 437–462). Oxford University Press.

[10] Nonaka, I., Toyama, R., & Konno, N. (2000). SECI, Ba and leadership: A unified model of dynamic knowledge creation. Long Range Planning, 33(1), 5–34. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0024-6301(99)00115-6

[11] Phaladi, M., & Ngulube, P. (2024). Barriers to knowledge sharing in South African state-owned enterprises: Implications for public sector performance. Information Development. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/02666669231209613

[12] Polanyi, M. (1966). The tacit dimension. Routledge & Kegan Paul.

[13] Tan, H. H., Sutanto, J., & Hung, D. (2007). Tacit knowledge management through corporate entrepreneurship. International Journal of Innovation and Learning, 4(5), 511–528. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJIL.2007.013732

[14] Tokarz, A., & Rosiński, J. (2024). Transfer of tacit knowledge: Exploring effective methods in multigenerational engineering teams. Journal of Engineering Education and Practice, 34(2), 119–134. https://doi.org/10.1080/0267257X.2023.1994782