KNOWLEDGE SHARING IN TEAMS

[1]VENUGOPAL PRABHAKAR GANTASALA, [2]SAI ANKITH GANTASALA, [3]SUMYATNOE WAI

[1]Associate Dean School of Business Southern Connecticut State University
[2]Student Researcher School of Business Southern Connecticut State University
[3]Student Researcher School of Management New York Institute of Technology
E-mail: [1]gantasalav1@southernct.edu

Abstract - Knowledge sharing is an important activity regardless of the context; in our everyday lives, we share knowledge and receive knowledge from others' experiences and thus mutual benefit and growth is ensured. In the corporate context, companies aim to have their employees engage actively in knowledge sharing. It is through knowledge sharing that even the most mediocre company can come up with groundbreaking ideas and race its way to the top. Hence, employees are encouraged to gain and share as much useful information as they can. However, there are several determinants that influence the probability of such events happening successfully; two of those determinants are trust (in one's team and team leader) and team identification. This study employs quantitative data collection to analyze 40 samples (collected via online platforms and sampled via convenience sampling technique); five hypotheses were proposed, and the survey analyses proved them all correct. The study thus proved that trust and team identification were both positively influenced by knowledge sharing. Alongside the conclusion, the author's comments and suggestions for further research have been included as well.

Keywords - Knowledge Sharing, Teams, Trust, Team Leadership

I. INTRODUCTION

This section is responsible for introducing the reader to the most important parts of the dissertation; in effect, it introduces them to the topic, its background, and the reason for why it's considered important.

II. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The objective of this study is to understand how the element of trust among teams influences their knowledge sharing capabilities. Additionally, it aims to analyze how is team identification related/linked to knowledge sharing. Finally, the research seeks to discover the impacts of work value diversity on knowledge sharing among teams.

III. NEED FOR THE STUDY

Organizations are built upon knowledge and their core competencies and business models are all linked to their efficiency of knowledge acquisition and knowledge sharing among the constituents. Employees are rightly referred to as the most valuable assets of the companies, because of the knowledge and skills they bring to the company. Knowledge is the most crucial resource of any organization, because in its absence, no other resource can be viably utilized; therefore, this driving factor of knowledge makes it crucial to the firm.

As per (Bock & Kim, 2001), knowledge sharing is the factor responsible for separating the top 5% of companies from their competitors in the respective industries. Research from (Srivastava, Bartol, & Locke, 2006) claims that leadership and teamwork are among the main factors to influence the knowledge sharing among employees at organizations and the performance thereof. Employees are likely to be encouraged to gain and share knowledge (intrinsic knowledge, which is not codified) if they are under capable and knowledgeable leaders who motivate them to work harder and gain more knowledge that can help them progress further; they are also likely to engage in acquiring and sharing knowledge if they work in teams (Hu, Horng, & Sun, 2009).

Collaborating on projects may inspire healthy competition among the team members and indirectly motivate them to gain and apply more knowledge to their practical contexts (Staples & Webster, 2008). As per (Ordonez de Pablos, 2002), there are not enough research studies performed in the Middle East that seek to uncover the relationships between knowledge sharing and its relevant factors such as trust among team members, leadership in the teams, etc. Likewise, a study by (Seba, Rowley, & Lambert, 2012) highlights that more studies in the aspect of knowledge sharing must be performed in the UAE as though the importance of knowledge sharing in the organizational context is established, the attention given to it has not been sufficient. This research study aims to fill that gap in research and contribute to the existing body of knowledge.

IV. SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The research paper shall study the effect of team leadership and trust on knowledge sharing. It will however limit itself to an organization in Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates; therefore, while there may be some relevance or similarity between the findings of this study and what might be expected from the Middle East and North Africa region, or more precisely the Gulf Community Countries, but beyond that its utility may be limited.

V. INDUSTRY AND COMPANY SELECTED

To understand the impact of variables such as team leadership, collaboration, and trust on knowledge sharing in organizational settings, the research paper has collected quantitative information from an oil and gas organization in the capital of United Arab Emirates i.e. Abu Dhabi. The selected company has about 1,500 employees in both onshore and offshore operations (technical and administrative); the industry in this case is the oil and gas sector due to the student being a working professional in the said field. From the experience of the student, the majority of the complex projects in the company are handled collaboratively. Therefore, it's probable that valid data can be obtained from the selected organization.

VI. ARRANGEMENT OF THE STUDY

A quantitative approach has been used in this research to collect data and analyze it to find the results of the study. Following on the same, a questionnaire has been prepared with about five sections including 1) trust in team, 2) trust in team leader, 3) team identification, 4) value diversity, and 5) knowledge sharing. Section 1 includes 5 statements, Section 2 and 5 have 7 statements each, Section 3 and 4 have 6 statements each. All those statements can be responded by the individual taking the survey by selecting an option from 1 to 5 wherein selecting a 1 would mean they strongly disagree with the statement while a score of 5 on a statement would infer strong agreement. Only section 4 was reverse – coded, meaning that higher scores inferred higher diversity. The questionnaire is to be prepared over a digital platform for distribution and preliminary analysis of the collected survey data.

VII. TARGET AUDIENCE

The target audience of this research study would be the managers and executives of the company from where the data would be collected. The findings of this report could be useful for the decision makers of the selected organization to help them take more informed decisions with regards to the method of operations in the company. However, the report would also be of interest to academics and those wishing to understand how trust impacts knowledge sharing.

VIII. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This section aims to focus on the previous research performed by various researchers on the selected topic i.e. knowledge sharing in teams and thus discuss and elaborate on the same to build the foundation for further discussion of the topic.

Knowledge Sharing: Defining the Terms

Knowledge sharing is an essential part of life; people share knowledge every day in various ways and means. It forms the basis for development; when people and minds come together, they can share their experiences which are often unique and relate the same with bits of information or useful inputs that when synthesized could help them vastly. As per (Dyer &Nobeoka, 2000), knowledge sharing can be defined as the transfer between two or more individuals, groups, organizations, parties, communities, societies, nations, or entities simply of information in any form whether that be sensory or non-sensory, visual or audible, written or verbal, in a group or one-to-one that may benefit them. However, this definition is quite narrow as it only considers the idea of usefulness or utility as knowledge sharing and there is a possibility that in many cases the information thus shared by one individual with another may not be of much or any utility to the latter as per (Chiu, 2006). Thus, in this case, it is necessary to broaden the definition slightly further; for example, when 2 individuals share information that may or may not be useful to them or either it would still be classified as knowledge if at all it is helpful intrinsically. For example, an engineer may learn a new recipe from one of their friends, this is classified as knowledge sharing even if that engineer may never ever cook that recipe. Technically in this case, that information is of no use to the engineer who heard it (Bock, 2001). However, this information would still be considered as knowledge sharing. As per (McDermott, 2001), knowledge sharing does not happen if neither the listener nor the speaker is sharing something that is intrinsically meaningless or has no worth or value. For example, when 2 girls gossip among each other, they do not share or receive any useful information and therefore this kind of informal conversation does not classify as knowledge sharing. Thus, as long as there is enough reason to believe that the information being shared has at least some relevance or value in nature, the process classifies as knowledge sharing (Bartol, 2002). Therefore, there could be several definitions of knowledge sharing but this one explains it all the best way possible given the broad sense of thinking and conceptualization (Hsu, 2008).

Determinants of Knowledge Sharing

Now it is necessary to understand the reasons for which people might share knowledge or the factors that can make it effortless and easy; in other words, when certain factors are present, knowledge sharing is easy and transparent (Hansen, 2002). As per (Seba, 2012), knowledge sharing can be made efficient only when certain factors that aid to their efficiency exist. Those involve tangible as well as intangible factors. For example, it might be that the working environment of an organization is responsible for deciding how the people of the company behave and

interact with each other. Knowledge sharing is a process that instead depends on several other processes, so when they work together only then the whole process happens and takes place correctly. In competitive environments, for example, the idea of knowledge sharing may not be suitable or supported, because when done correctly, knowledge sharing makes individuals more competitive and that is the last thing someone would want in a competitive environment as everyone is trying to reach the top. Hence, that is one factor; another factor is the infrastructure. Employees may not be able to share knowledge if they do not have the latest technologies to collaborate suitably with each other. Some other cases included would be too technical infrastructure or equipment which has not been familiarized with the employees. Even in this case, they are not likely to be able to contribute successfully towards knowledge sharing (Jason, 2009).

Hence, depending on the situation there could be various factors that affect the process of knowledge sharing. Finally, knowledge sharing happens on the main factor or premise of trust. Employees will not share knowledge with anyone they do not completely trust, and this goes back to one of the previous points about the case of having competitive organizations that do not trust each other (among the employees) as everyone may be looking for opportunities or ways to seize the information and monetize the same or use it for their own benefit. So, for knowledge sharing all those factors need to be present as well. Employees need to ensure that they understand what is expected of them and what they may expect (Reece, 2011).

Trust

The main element for knowledge sharing is trust as was previously mentioned; there is no way that an organization can get its groups or teams of suspicious employees to share knowledge with each other. Essentially though, the factors of successful growth for an organization are based on how well the employees trust their colleagues and the management of the whole organization; employees that do not trust the management will not want to convert their implicit knowledge to explicit knowledge or in other words will not share their knowledge with their organization even if they happen to be masters at what they know. This may be because they are not comfortable with sharing what they consider valuable; perhaps they do not trust their organizations to give them a just reward for their contribution or perhaps they simply believe that their companies do not value their skills and talents and are just treating them as expendables; either case can be quite harmful for the organization. Now, trust may also be for the team and the team leader; not in every case does an employee work alone in their respective roles; sometimes, they work in teams and each team would be most certainly led by a leader (of some sort, unless it is a laissez-faire team in which case no leadership would exist).

Team Identification

The second factor responsible for effective knowledge sharing is team identification; team identification here refers to the selection and identification of a team by the individual in the sense that they prefer to live, work, and collaborate with them. When team identification works well, the person or employee will automatically identify how their own skills and talents complement those of the team and how they can work together to succeed. As previously mentioned, knowledge sharing happens only when there is trust, and team identification can simply help boost that by ensuring that; individuals that connect with teams of other individuals are often the first ones to contribute to corporate development through knowledge sharing. For all others, it takes longer to get used to their work settings and hence even longer to engage or participate in knowledge sharing (Brock, 2001).

Hypothesis 1: Team identification will be positively related to knowledge sharing within teams.

Research by (Alavi & Leider, 2001) suggests that knowledge management and knowledge sharing (which is a part of knowledge management anyway) are both concepts that cannot happen unless there is a strong interpersonal relationship between the individuals or the individuals and the organization. For this reason, it is necessary that employees learn to trust their teams and develop strong bonds through which they can gain mutual benefit. As such in this case, higher the feelings of being “one with the team”, more the chances of knowledge sharing. Hence, previous research supports this idea and in effect, the hypothesis.

Hypothesis 2: Trust in team members will be positively related to team identification.

Research by (Monamer & Jason, 2015) suggests that trust is the primary element in team building and thus team identification too is no exception to this. People are much more likely to trust someone they know well and can relate to; team identification is an important aspect but that is only possible if team members trust each other. Without trust there would be no possibility of teaming up and therefore team identification would be nearly impossible. There are two scenarios here: one is where the team is given to the employee to join and the other is where the employee gets to select or choose their team. In the second case, they need to trust or else there will be no progress. Now, in this case here, the main scenario is that team identification needs to be consistent or at some point the trust will wear off. The same can be said for trust: it goes off over time unless expectations are met.

Hypothesis 3: Trust in team leader will be positively related to team identification.
(Gabriel, 2010) identifies that it is quite possible that team leaders play a major role when it comes to team identification. For the same count, (Samson, 2014) agrees that the team leaders are responsible for representing everything their groups or teams stand for. Good team leaders help bring in new talent to the team and as such help it grow; however, uncharismatic team members might be the very reason due to which good members lose their trust in the team and eventually go out of the company. Therefore, team identification works well if a newcomer interacts with the team leader and finds them trustworthy. In most cases, it's also going to be the team leader that is the first person to interact with any newcomer in the team or project group so for those reasons it is quite necessary that trust between them is established.

Hypothesis 4: Trust in team members will be positively related to knowledge sharing.
This is certainly nothing to be doubted. As mentioned by (John & Sierra, 2011), trust among individuals sets the basics for sharing anything valuable including knowledge. Knowledge sharing too depends on trust because in any because it is something of value that is still intangible. So, when people trust each other, they would be willing to share their knowledge or something they already consider important. On a more superficial level, trust between individuals helps identify their similarities and differences; therefore, previous research supports this idea as well.

Hypothesis 5: Trust in team leader will be positively related to knowledge sharing.
Finally, the issue of trust is also a determinant of how seamless the process of knowledge sharing is. When there is trust between the members of the team, then there is likely to be better sharing of knowledge than as opposed to when there isn't any. Knowledge sharing comes also when the trust is with the team leader because members of a team are much likely to trust their leader to give them the right environment in which they can live and grow in; therefore, in those cases, it's necessary that the team leader can earn the respect and trust of their subordinates because failing that they would not be able to create an environment fit for knowledge sharing even if they try to do so.

IX. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Hypothesis

The study primarily considers the concepts of team and individual knowledge sharing and their respective effects on their performance. There are 5 hypotheses in this case including that team identification will be positively related to the knowledge sharing within teams, trust in team members will be positively related to team identification, trust in team leader will be positively related to team identification, trust in team members will be positively related to knowledge sharing, and finally, trust in team leader will be positively related to knowledge sharing

Research Population

The research population for this report was the company of the student from where the data was collected by the fulfillment of the questionnaires' requirements by them. The data has been selected after considering the previous studies in the field and the specifications of the study (including the considerations of the hypotheses therein). The main form of data collection happened through the quantitative means wherein the people (participants) were requested to fill out a survey or questionnaire through an online anonymous portal. The reason for the selection of the survey method of data acquisition being that they could respond to the

questions in an unbiased manner as they would not be judged based on their responses given the premise of anonymity. This study included participants from groups as well as their team leaders; there were about 44 different employees in the organization who were tasked with the process of knowledge sharing practiced and a total of 40 questionnaires were filled.

Data Sampling

The data sampling was done based on convenience of the researcher; in other words, convenience sampling was applied wherein the author of the research report shared the questionnaire with their contacts and colleagues (in the company) who then forwarded it to their known contacts and so on and so forth. Based on the sample size calculator, the population size of 44 individuals in the company along with a confidence level of 95% and a 5% margin of error, the sample size came out to be 40 individuals. This has been done assuming a normal distribution of 50%, for that is the standard or average.

Data Collection Procedure and Instruments

As previously mentioned, the format for the collection of data has been quantitative means of data collection. However, the questionnaire could not be shared with the participants directly as they would have been likely to give biased responses. Thus, the link for the survey was e-mailed to them over one of the more popular online knowledge sharing and collaboration platforms while specifying that their participation is 100% voluntary and if they choose to do so, it would be completely anonymous. There were about 2 sections in the questionnaire; section 1 included the demographic details for the employees to fill in and respond to including their age, gender, and work experience levels (in years). Section 2 on the other hand was about the 5 sections including trust in team, trust in team leader, team identification, value diversity, and knowledge sharing. Section 1

here had 5 statements, Section 2 had 7 statements, Section 3 had 6 statements, Section 4 had 6 statements, and finally, Section 5 had 8 statements. Therefore, in total the respondents were required to provide their opinion on 32 statements. This could be done using the Likert 5-point scale wherein 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree; among the sections, Section 4 was reverse coded.

X. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The section includes two distinct sections; the first sub-section includes responses of questions on demographic details and research-based details. Given that the respondents were required to answer both the demographic questions for the purpose of profiling the survey samples collected; data analysis was performed through the method of least squares. The second section is about the analyses of the hypotheses which are used to verify them; this has been done using regression models with the method of least squares.

Analyses and Implications

This section applies the linear regression models and uses the least squares method to verify the hypotheses based on the data collected.

Hypothesis 1: Team identification will be positively related to knowledge sharing within teams.

Dependent Variable: KS				
Method: Least Squares				
Date: 12/08/17 Time: 13:35				
Sample: 1 40				
Included observations: 40				
Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	0.486711	0.166127	2.929754	0.0057
TI	0.736231	0.087573	8.407018	0.0000
R-squared	0.650343	Mean dependent var		1.781250
Adjusted R-squared	0.641142	S.D. dependent var		0.658250
S.E. of regression	0.394323	Akaike info criterion		1.025416
Sum squared resid	5.908656	Schwarz criterion		1.109860
Log likelihood	-18.50832	Hannan-Quinn criter.		1.055948
F-statistic	70.67795	Durbin-Watson stat		1.845297
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

Table1: Hypothesis 1 Analysis

The results obtained from the regression show that the Adjusted R-squared value is 0.64 and the F-statistic value is 70.67. Since the t-statistic is 8.40, this hypothesis is accepted and since the Probability of F-statistic is less than 0.05, this model is valid. The result indicates that Team identification will be positively related to knowledge sharing within teams.
Hypothesis 2: Trust in team members will be positively related to team identification.

Dependent Variable: TI				
Method: Least Squares				
Date: 12/08/17 Time: 13:37				
Sample: 1 40				
Included observations: 40				
Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	0.479957	0.314091	1.528084	0.1348
TT	0.767794	0.179818	4.269830	0.0001
R-squared	0.324222	Mean dependent var		1.758333
Adjusted R-squared	0.306438	S.D. dependent var		0.721021
S.E. of regression	0.600469	Akaike info criterion		1.866496
Sum squared resid	13.70141	Schwarz criterion		1.950940
Log likelihood	-35.32992	Hannan-Quinn criter.		1.897028
F-statistic	18.23145	Durbin-Watson stat		2.174146
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000126			

Table2: Hypothesis 2 Analysis

The results obtained from the regression show that the Adjusted R-squared value is 0.30 and the F-statistic value is 18.23. Since the t-statistic is 4.26, this hypothesis is accepted and since the Probability of F-statistic is less than 0.05, this model is valid. The result indicates that Trust in team members will be positively related to team identification.
Hypothesis 3: Trust in team leader will be positively related to team identification.

Dependent Variable: TI				
Method: Least Squares				
Date: 12/08/17 Time: 13:37				
Sample: 1 40				
Included observations: 40				
Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	0.288214	0.265616	1.085081	0.2847
TTL	0.864776	0.148247	5.833327	0.0000
R-squared	0.472425	Mean dependent var		1.758333
Adjusted R-squared	0.458542	S.D. dependent var		0.721021
S.E. of regression	0.530555	Akaike info criterion		1.618921
Sum squared resid	10.69658	Schwarz criterion		1.703365
Log likelihood	-30.37843	Hannan-Quinn criter.		1.649454
F-statistic	34.02771	Durbin-Watson stat		1.898817
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000001			

Table 3: Hypothesis 3 Analysis

The results obtained from the regression show that the Adjusted R-squared value is 0.45 and the F-statistic value is 34.02. Since the t-statistic is 5.83, this hypothesis is accepted and since the Probability of F-statistic is less than 0.05, this model is valid.

The result indicates that Trust in team leader will be positively related to team identification.

Hypothesis 4: Trust in team members will be positively related to knowledge sharing.

Dependent Variable: KS				
Method: Least Squares				
Date: 12/08/17 Time: 13:38				
Sample: 1 40				
Included observations: 40				
Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	0.307708	0.242458	1.269117	0.2121
TT	0.885010	0.138808	6.375767	0.0000
R-squared	0.516849	Mean dependent var		1.781250
Adjusted R-squared	0.504135	S.D. dependent var		0.658250
S.E. of regression	0.463525	Akaike info criterion		1.348792
Sum squared resid	8.164492	Schwarz criterion		1.433236
Log likelihood	-24.97584	Hannan-Quinn criter.		1.379324
F-statistic	40.65041	Durbin-Watson stat		2.011037
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

Table 4: Hypothesis 4 Analysis

The results obtained from the regression show that the Adjusted R-squared value is 0.50 and the F-statistic value is 40.65. Since the t-statistic is 6.37, this hypothesis is accepted and since the Probability of F-statistic is less than 0.05, this model is valid. The result indicates that Trust in team members will be positively related to knowledge sharing.

Hypothesis 5: Trust in team leader will be positively related to knowledge sharing.

Dependent Variable: KS				
Method: Least Squares				
Date: 12/08/17 Time: 13:39				
Sample: 1 40				
Included observations: 40				
Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	0.404199	0.236699	1.707646	0.0959
TTL	0.810030	0.132108	6.131557	0.0000
R-squared	0.497328	Mean dependent var		1.781250
Adjusted R-squared	0.484100	S.D. dependent var		0.658250
S.E. of regression	0.472796	Akaike info criterion		1.388402
Sum squared resid	8.494373	Schwarz criterion		1.472846
Log likelihood	-25.76803	Hannan-Quinn criter.		1.418934
F-statistic	37.59600	Durbin-Watson stat		1.446978
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

Table 5: Hypothesis 5 Analysis

The results obtained from the regression show that the Adjusted R-squared value is 0.48 and the F-statistic value is 37.59. Since the t-statistic is 6.13, this hypothesis is accepted and since the Probability of F-statistic is less than 0.05, this model is valid. The result indicates that Trust in team leader will be positively related to knowledge sharing.

Findings Summary

From the study, it was identified that most of the participants were female employees who were mainly from the age group of 35 – 44 years and most of the respondents had about work experience of 5 – 10 years. Trust among the co-members of the teams was not a problem as 72.5% agreed that they would trust their co-workers in their teams; their co-workers perhaps kept their promise as well, because 47.50% strongly agreed while 42.50% agreed that their colleagues in their teams would honor their promises. Also, the teams were quite sincere, because 47.50% agreed and 42.5% strongly agreed that their co-workers would bring any important concerns to their notice immediately without fail. 42.50% agreed that they could count on their team members if they needed help and 50% strongly agreed to this. 52.50% strongly agreed that their team members would take the interests of their co-workers in their teams into consideration when decisions were made. As for the trust and interaction with their team leaders, 80% agreed that their team leaders would offer them guidance and support to help them improve their performance. Also, 60% agreed while 35% strongly agreed that their team leader would deal with them in an open and frank manner thus giving them unbiased advice. At the same time, team leaders were reported to be honest and fair while assessing their employees' performance because 45% strongly agreed and 47.5% agreed to it being so. As for problem solving, 50% agreed and 47.5% strongly agreed that their leaders solved their problems and those of the team adequately well. When it came to external issues, 57.5% agreed and 35% strongly agreed that their leaders would support their team members in matters concerning those even outside the teams. With regards to constructive criticism, the participants' team leaders were open to receiving constructive criticism and there were 50% participants agreeing and other 50% strongly agreeing. Trust was something not given easily because only 35% agreed to being able to trust their managers though 57.5% strongly agreed that they could. If the name of the school were to be criticized, about 67.50% felt insulted and were personally affected and at the same time 25% strongly agreed to feeling as such. About 60% were interested to know what others thought about their school and 25% were quite eager to hear more thus indicating their interest in their own schools or institutions. Even better, they did not differentiate between their own and that of the school's successes when it came to that with 50%

agreeing to this and 50% strongly agreeing. Also, 50% strongly agreed while 40% agreed that when someone praised their school, they believed it to be as important as a personal compliment. Also, 45% strongly agreed while 45% agreed to feeling embarrassed when and/or if their school was criticized in the media, this shows that they were quite serious about the way their institutions were regarded as. 75% believed (while 17.5% strongly believed) that all of them in their respective teams had the same values while 65% agreed (and 30% strongly agreed) that they all had similar goals at their work. Therefore, it could be said that there was impressive cohesiveness between the employees at work in the teams of the organization. 50% strongly agreed while 42.5% agreed that they all had their beliefs about whatever they believed was important in the work team (and thus they knew what was important for them). There was no lack of teamwork or synergy in the teams as about 42.5% strongly agreed and 50% agreed that their teams were committed to reaching all the same objectives. Moreover, 47.5% strongly agreed and 45% agreed that they all (as a team) agree on what is necessary or of importance to the school. Finally, when decision making is concerned, there is still doubt or lack of unity in the participants' groups, because about 52.5% strongly agreed and 40% agreed to having a sense of conviction of belief among what they all thought was important in their team. Finally, knowledge sharing was also prevalent in the team, because 75% agreed and 20% strongly agreed that when they have learned something new, they tell their colleagues about it (in their team). At the same time, similar figures existed for those sharing information when their colleagues ask them about the same. Also, the participants appeared to have important consensus for their own field of knowledge because 52.5% strongly believed that they would need to have specific knowledge in their own areas while 40% agreed. 45% told their colleagues the ins and outs of their work and 57.5% agreed to their colleagues telling them when they wanted to know something. Finally, about 65% agreed to being able to use their colleagues' knowledge as a source when they wanted to learn something new, and ultimately it is proven that knowledge sharing is no big deal at the selected organization because 47.5% believed that knowledge sharing is a regular part of their work lives and 45% more supported them in this case.

XI. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The last chapter of the dissertation provides the author's suggestions and comments on how the situation could be improved; in other words, they include their closing comments and statements based on the data analyzed. Therefore, this section includes the main recommendations of the author, challenges faced by the author while performing the research, and finally, the conclusion for the future research endeavors.

Research-Specific Recommendations

This research was aimed at understanding the nuances of knowledge sharing at the selected organization; it also focused on numerous factors that were directly or indirectly related to knowledge sharing at the said organization.

There seem to be many disagreements in the cases where the employees feel that their colleagues would share knowledge when they learnt it themselves and (vice versa). This indicates a problem that those who have acquired knowledge newly may not know the best ways to share it. Hence, the management needs to pay special attention to those who tend to learn new skills fast, but they may not be comfortable sharing the same with others. In other words, the company's managers need to find those adept at gaining new skills and knowledge and then converting that knowledge from implicit to explicit. It may not be possible for a person who is quite good at grasping concepts quickly to share the same with their team. This does not mean that they do not want to, but it simply means that they may not be the most comfortable doing that perhaps due to external factors (competitive environment, less room for errors, etc.) or internal (personality traits, etc.) So, managers need ways to counsel them and find ways to make them comfortable with sharing what they already know. Also, about 5% do not feel knowledge sharing in the company is a regular thing (graph 31); this is a problem that should be addressed as soon as possible.

With regards to responses, there were certain cases where several people chose to reply as "neither agree nor disagree" this seems to have been consistent with every question. In some cases which are related to diversity for example, it may not be as important, but when asked about trust, at least 5% of the individuals are not sure whether their managers can be trusted or not, or whether their colleagues will keep their word or not, and in those cases, it can be quite a problem for the company because knowledge sharing cannot happen where there is lack of trust or presence of doubt. The same effect seems to have come up for the issue of knowledge sharing where people are not sure telling their colleagues what they have learnt. Hence, with this kind of hesitation, knowledge sharing may be restricted to only a few individuals or among the close friends of the individuals. This is not optimal for the organization. Therefore, managers need to talk to their employees and try to understand the main reasons for which they do not prefer to share what they have learnt with others.

Research Conclusion

This research was primarily focused on understanding the concept of knowledge sharing in teams and across teams (in different departments) in the selected

organization. As such, it revealed several issues and factors that proved that knowledge sharing itself is not a simple concept but something more complicated that depends on numerous other factors including trust, previous experience, personality of employees, consensus, and unity (or diversity) in the teams, feelings of belonging, etc. It did find out that while most of the participants and their teams were comfortable with sharing knowledge and trusting their co-workers as well as their supervisors, there were many that did not. Several others simply took up the idea that it was better to be unbiased or not have a definite opinion as the nearly constant %s seemed to be true for the option (among the answer choices) that was to neither agree nor disagree. Furthermore, out of the 5 hypotheses thus presented, all the 5 hypotheses have been accepted. Therefore, it was found that team identification was positively related to knowledge sharing between teams, trust among team members also was positively related to team identification and so was trust in the team leader; finally, trust in the team members and the team leader were both positively related to knowledge sharing. Therefore, this study successfully establishes trust as the main concept of knowledge sharing and team identification. Some of the challenges faced by the researcher during this period included –

a) Lack of time to collect data from enough samples. The original sample size was planned to be larger, but given the constraint of time, it was not easy to collect sufficient data from a greater number of individuals.
b) Acquiring fully filled questionnaires was also a challenge, because it did not form a straightforward process to convince people to completely answer so many statements in the questionnaire. Moreover, to preserve anonymity, the survey form was sent over the internet or through non – verbal means which made it harder.

Suggestions for Future Research

This study has uncovered a great deal about the details of knowledge sharing in organizations. Given the results of this study, it could be thus determined that knowledge sharing, and team identification are the factors that have to do with the trust of the individuals on their team members as well as the team leader. However, what is not figured here (as it was outside the scope of this study) is the reasons due to which the problems related to knowledge sharing may have arisen. For example, knowledge sharing is restricted by the lack of trust; however, what can be done to overcome this lack of trust? What are the possible ways managers can get their employees to trust them? Those are some of the areas the future researchers could focus on.

REFERENCES

[1] Alavi, M., & Leidner, D. E. (2001). Knowledge management and knowledge management systems: Conceptual foundations and research issues. MIS Quarterly, 107(136).

[2] Bartol, K. M., & Srivastava, A. (2002). Encouraging knowledge sharing: The role of organizational reward systems. Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 9(1), 64-76.

[3] Bock, G. W., & Kim, Y. G. (2001). Breaking the myths of rewards: An exploratory study of attitudes about knowledge sharing. Pacis 2001 proceedings, 78.

[4] Chiu, C. M., Hsu, M. H., & Wang, E. T. (2006). Understanding knowledge sharing in virtual communities: An integration of social capital and social cognitive theories. Decision Support Systems, 42(3), 1872-1888.

[5] Dyer, J. H., &Nobeoka, K. (2000). Creating and managing a high-performance knowledge-sharing network: the Toyota case. Strategic management journal, 345-367.

[6] Hansen, M. T. (2002). Knowledge networks: Explaining effective knowledge sharing in multiunit companies. Organization science, 13(3), 232-248.

[7] Hsu, C. L., & Lin, J. C. C. (2008). Acceptance of blog usage: The roles of technology acceptance, social influence and knowledge sharing motivation. Information & management, 45(1), 65-74.

[8] McDermott, R., & O'Dell, C. (2001). Overcoming cultural barriers to sharing knowledge. Journal of knowledge management, 5(1), 76-85.

[9] Seba, I., Rowley, J., & Delbridge, R. (2012). Knowledge sharing in the Dubai police force. Journal of Knowledge Management, 16(1), 114-128.

★★★