

 <p>ISSN NO. 2320-5407</p>	<p>Journal Homepage: -www.journalijar.com</p> <h2>INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH (IJAR)</h2> <p>Article DOI:10.21474/IJAR01/3112 DOI URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.21474/IJAR01/3112</p>	 <p>INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH (IJAR) ISSN 2320-5407 Journal Homepage: http://www.journalijar.com Journal DOI:10.21474/IJAR01</p>
---	--	---

RESEARCH ARTICLE

MULTI FOCI OF COMMITMENT'S IMPACT ON KNOWLEDGE SHARING IN PAKISTAN'S ADVERTISING AGENCIES.

Sadaf Ishaque and Ambreen Harris.

Manuscript Info

Abstract

Manuscript History

Received: 01 Decmber 2016
Final Accepted: 02 January 2017
Published: February 2017

Copy Right, IJAR, 2017,. All rights reserved.

Introduction:-

“Knowledge” and “Knowledge Management” is considered as key ingredient of success in today’s business organizations such as Professional Service Firms (PSF) (Alvesson 2004). If a PSF wants to flourish it has to work upon the mantra of knowledge acquisition and sharing among the people of an organization. Knowledge-intensive organizations should influence their separate knowledge assets through knowledge distribution to generate shared knowledge possessions. Knowledgeable employees have the power to control Knowledge sharing. Knowledge economies are emerging phenomenon, in this scenario attaining and sustaining knowledge is key to gain a competitive edge (Neuman, 2000). Regrettably, knowledge management is difficult job due to multi-faceted form of the borders, cultures, procedures and firm structures involved (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995).

A knowledge resource is explained by “know-what” or “know how”. Knowledge should be shared at collective level instead of individual to benefit the firm. The practice of knowledge sharing is, nonetheless, governed by the members of staff. Prior research indicates employee attitudes/behavior, i.e. their commitment level, is vital to this employee govern and their successive knowledge obtaining and knowledge providing (Lin, 2007; Hislop, 2003).

Commitment of employee plays a vital role in knowledge sharing among them and ultimately effect success of any project. Employee Commitment to firm, team members, occupation and Client has the impact on knowledge sharing. The effect of worker commitment on know-how distribution behavior is specifically vital in modern organizations, such as Professional Service Firms (PSFs). Employee’s willingness plays its role in knowledge sharing; willingness is driven by the level of commitment with external and internal institutions with which an employee interacts. Prior research expose the higher client commitment may limit employee’s team and organization commitment. (Swart et al,2014)

This editorial pulls on observed data from PSF (Advertising Agencies across Pakistan) to ask: ‘How do multi foci of commitment; including organization, profession, team and Client commitment of employee may influence their knowledge distribution behavior within their firm?’ thus, it creates two offerings to present works:

1. It inspects the numerous kinds and multi centers/foci of worker loyalty to the firm
 2. It studies “2” kinds of knowledge distribution: knowledge giving and knowledge gaining within the firm.
- In order to deliver a successful project, commitment of a team member/employee is very important, whether it is an organizational commitment, professional commitment, team commitment or client commitment. Higher the

commitment is higher will be the positive results. Advertising agencies cannot deliver a successful project to its client unless its project team is committed. No idea will be successful until or unless it is shared by its team members. No research has been done on the influence of different kinds and multi foci of commitment on knowledge sharing and project success in Pakistan.

It is to express here this study is previously conducted by Swart et al in 2014 in different work setting where this study is conducted in Pakistan which will assist in generalizing the findings of previous study.

There is no work or literature or industrial analysis of advertising agencies has been done before by any researcher in Pakistan. This research has been done on above mentioned phenomenon on advertising agencies.

Literature Review:-

There are numerous definitions of project, in 2012 Schwalbe defined project as a temporary endeavor undertaken to create a unique product or service. Whereas, number of researches being conducted on the subject of "Project success". Baccarini (1999) emphasized the subsequent features of project success as under:

- a) The success of project management is a measure of time; cost and quality are secondary to the higher product success objectives of goal and purpose. Therefore, a project that is a project management disappointment is supposed as a successful project because the greater-level goal of product accomplishment is happened.
- b) Project management success can affect the accomplishment of victory of the project. Worthy project management promise project success and is capable stop project failure. Good project management techniques find out the loopholes and try to fix it as they occur. However, poor project management cost a lot by decrease market shares, profitability etc.
- c) Success of the project can also be affected by time. We can only get to know about this when project final product has been utilized after numerous years of completion of the project. We can get to know about the project management success on longtime basis.

Professional Service Firms are defined as Knowledge concentrated firms (Alvesson,2004). Whereas, knowledge could be defined as "know-how" based on surrounded experiences, standards, info and professional instinct that offers an outline for assessing and combining new know-how and information. In organizations, it commonly goes into inserted in papers or warehouse and also in firm's agendas, schedules, and duties" (Davenport, 1998). Knowledge could be classified into two main categories a) explicit knowledge; that could be readily codified and expressed in words and b) tacit knowledge; it is based on experience that cannot be readily translated into words. PSFs' competitive advantage is based on tacit knowledge and knowledge workers of firm (Sewart, 2011). Tacit knowledge of knowledge workers assists PSFs in client services and solution. Knowledge exists at both individual and collective level of the firm; it is only beneficial for the firm if it being shared among the members of the firm (Davenport, 1998).

Knowledge sharing plays a crucial role in planned management arena, where know-how is considered for example "the supreme strategically-important resource which [organizations] possess," and a primary basis of worth making, (Spender, 1996; Teece, 1997). A phenomenon of knowledge sharing is directed by the employees; which makes it interpersonal communication trend (Empson,2011).

Various investigators propose that the present economic scenery is surely finest well-defined as a 'knowledge economy'. In today's economy, Knowledge, or know-how, is the foundation of acquisition and upholding a competitive advantage. Knowledge resources have been extensively known to be the main carters of organization reasonable benefit. Specialists have proposed that the capability to continuously form, abolish, and reconstruct new resource mixtures that are cherished by clients/Clients and secure against definite competitors is serious and critical. This capability has been well-defined as a dynamic competency/capability (Teece, 1994).

Previous researches suggest employee commitment towards the organization plays a substantial role in willingness to share tacit knowledge with team members (Hislop, 2003). This attitude of willingness is dependent on element of trust among the members and commitment of an employee. It is interpreted that lower level of trust and commitment may lead to the reluctance to share tacit knowledge (Lin,2007). "Organizational commitment may significantly impact the enthusiasm of employees to share their know-how"(Scarborough, 2000). It is repetitively stated that organization's biggest asset is "Knowledge" it possess but it's not individual level based collective level know-how creates a difference (Alvesson, 2005).

Knowledge sharing is bi-directional phenomenon; knowledge gaining and providing. This transition of providing and gaining is based on interpersonal activity; in this transition shared knowledge could be interpreted differently by the receiver and provider as per their own knowledge and context in which knowledge is shared (Watzlawick,1976). An individual integrates his new knowledge with the one he already has, this process of integration is referred to as representational re-description (Karmiloff-Smith,1992).

Previous research suggests that when knowledge is shared within the firm it triggers synergy among the resources which assist in gaining competitive advantage and maximizing human capital of the firm. Firm is dependent on human capital; knowledge workers in delighting firm's clients and it helps firm in securing success (Swart,2014). Recent studies have revealed that employee commitment is not within the organization attitude it could go beyond boundaries of organization. Previous researches have classified employees' commitment into two levels; micro and macro level. Micro level of commitment's foci includes; commitment towards management, team and customers (Becker, 2009). Whereas, macro level's foci include organization, profession, unions and employees' career (Vandenberghe, 2009).

Organizational Commitment (OC) is not a latest subject of study; excessive research has been done in this area. There are three types of organizational commitment;

- a) Affective commitment; where employee's feelings are attached with an organization and there is an emotional bond.
- b) Continuance commitment; employee is attached with the organization because of economic reasons as organization is paying him well.
- c) Normative Commitment; in this case employee feels his moral obligation to stay with the organization and perform his chores (Meyer & Allen, 1991).
- d)

The second significant focus of commitment is Team commitment (TC). Research suggests that team commitment plays an adequate role in PSFs context, by creating synergy among the members in order to transfer and integrate up to date knowledge to satisfy clients at its best (Swart,2007). There is no doubt in an organization employees interact more with their team members in comparison to the other colleagues (Redman and Snape, 2005).

Past research has examined the correlated relationship between commitment and employees' profession. Employees having high professional commitment are the one who invest more on their knowledge base and career development to stay competitive (Greenwood & Empson, 2003). In PSFs, employees have to share knowledge to polish their skills and maintaining the external professional networks.

In relevance to the other foci of commitments a little less is done in the field of client commitment (Vandenberghe, 2009). In PSFs context employees' interaction with clients is frequent and they have to satisfy them through knowledge they possess.

An individual who is having high commitment towards any particular focus, there is possibility his willingness to knowledge sharing towards other focus may decrease; if he has high commitment towards clients he could be unwilling to share knowledge within the organization.

This study explores how employee commitment towards different foci has impact on the willingness of knowledge sharing at work? Previous research suggests that organizational commitment is positively correlated to the willingness attitude to share knowledge (Hislop,2003). It leads to first hypothesis of the study:

H1: Different types of employee commitment to the firm/organization are positively associated to knowledge sharing with coworkers in the organization (in Projects).

An employee who is devoted to their professional development and committed towards that is likely to be reluctant to share their knowledge with members of the organization (Alvesson, 2004).

H2: Different types of employee commitment to the Occupation/Profession are positively associated to knowledge sharing with coworkers in the organization (in Projects).

Prior research states that trust and commitment among the team members leveraged the willingness behavior of members to share knowledge with each other but limit it to share with rest of the members of the organization (Newell & Swan, 2000), it leads to third hypothesis of the study;

H3: Different types of employee commitment to the project team are positively associated to knowledge sharing with coworkers in the organization (in Projects).

In general, prior research in this domain says that synergy between all foci of commitment; organization, profession, team and client can play a positive role to share knowledge and in gaining a competitive edge (Vandenbergh, 2009). This prompt to the last hypothesis of the study;

H4: Different types of employee commitment to the Client are negatively associated to knowledge sharing with coworkers in the organization (in Projects).

Research Methodology:-

This is a hypothesis testing based correlation study. The research is designed with an aim to study the impact of employee commitment with the organization, team, profession and client to knowledge sharing, as they apply in the Advertising Agencies of Pakistan. To gather the data survey methodology was used on the basis of questionnaire. Details of questionnaire adaptation are mentioned in a table 1 below. 223 respondents were surveyed from different advertising agencies' project teams in the three major cities of Pakistan which include; Islamabad, Lahore and Karachi. This paper has used SPSS and applies (frequency, alpha, correlation, and regression).

Table 1:- Questionnaire Adaptation

Variables	Adaptation
Kind of Commitment	Meyer and Allen's (1991)
Foci of Commitment	Klein (2009)
Dimension of continuance employee commitment	Stinglhamber (2002)
Knowledge Distribution	Wilkesmann (2009)

Results and Analysis:-

In this study 22.4% respondents were female and 77.6% were male. Among the respondents 48.4% were having 0-5 years' experience, 40.4% were of 6-10 years and 11.2% were those who were having 11 years above experience. Position based classification of respondents is: 17.9% were Project Managers, 9% were Project Coordinator, 57.4% were Project team members and 15.7% falls in the support staff category. Following table describing correlation among the variable under study;

Table 2: Correlation among all the study variables

		OC	PC	TC	CC	KS
OC	Pearson Correlation	1				
	Sig. (2-tailed)					
PC	Pearson Correlation	.863**	1			
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000				
TC	Pearson Correlation	.760**	.762**	1		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000			
CC	Pearson Correlation	.799**	.804**	.745**	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		
KS	Pearson Correlation	.764**	.722**	.792**	.663**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

OC (Organizational Commitment) PC (Professional Commitment) TC (Team Commitment) CC (Client Commitment) KS (Knowledge Sharing).

Hypothesis testing and finding

Result against the H1; different types of employee commitment to the firm/organization are negatively associated to knowledge sharing with coworkers in the organization (in Projects) is depicted in the table below:

Table 3: Hypothesis 1; Regression Model

Model	R	R Square	F	Std. Error of the Estimate	Sig.	β Value
1	.764 ^a	.584	310.477	.661	.000	0.787
a. Predictors: (Constant): OC						
b. Dependent Variable: KS						

Correlation is abbreviated as “R” which is 0.764 in the above table which shows there is a positive relationship between organizational commitment and Knowledge sharing. The table above shows that R Square (Regression) is 0.584 (F=310.477, $p < .000$).

The regression results show that the explained variation in the knowledge sharing is 58.4% explained by the given variables i.e. R square is 0.584

Unstandardized β value .787 ($p < 0.000$) signifies that for every unit change in the independent variables (Organizational Commitment), the dependent variable is positively affected by .787 units. Hence we will reject the null hypothesis. H1 is accepted; organization commitment affects the Knowledge Sharing and ultimately affects project success

Result against the H2; Different types of employee commitment to the Occupation/Profession are positively associated to knowledge sharing with coworkers in the organization (in Projects) is depicted below:

Table 4: Hypothesis 2; Regression Model

Model	R	R Square	F	Std. Error of the Estimate	Sig.	β Value
1	.722 ^a	.521	240.280	.710	.000	.746
a. Predictors: (Constant): PC						
b. Dependent Variable: KS						

Correlation is abbreviated as “R” which is 0.722 in the above table which shows there is a positive relationship between Professional commitment and Knowledge sharing and is significant at the 0.01 level. The table above shows that R Square (Regression) is 0.521 (F=240.280 $p < .000$).

The regression results show that the explained variation in the knowledge sharing is 52.1% explained by the given variables i.e. R square is 0.521

Unstandardized β value .746 ($p < 0.000$) signifies that for every unit change in the independent variables (Professional Commitment), the dependent variable is positively affected by .746 units. Hence H2 is accepted; Professional commitment affects the Knowledge Sharing and ultimately affects project success.

Result against the H3; Different types of employee commitment to the project team are positively associated to knowledge sharing with coworkers in the organization (in Projects).

Table 5: Hypothesis 3; Regression Model

Model	R	R Square	F	Std. Error of the Estimate	Sig.	β Value
1	.792 ^a	.627	371.324	.626	.000	.936
a. Predictors: (Constant): TC						
b. Dependent Variable: KS						

Correlation is abbreviated as “R” which is 0.792 in the above table which shows there is a positive relationship between team commitment and Knowledge sharing. The table above shows that R Square (Regression) is 0.627 (F=371.324 $p < .000$).

The regression results show that the explained variation in the knowledge sharing is 62.7% explained by the given variables i.e. R square is 0.627

Unstandardized β value .936 ($p < 0.000$) signifies that for every unit change in the independent variables (Team Commitment), the dependent variable is positively affected by .936 units. Hence H3 is accepted; team commitment affects the Knowledge Sharing and ultimately affects project success.

Results of H4; Different types of employee commitment to the Client are negatively associated to knowledge sharing with coworkers in the organization (in Projects) are depicted in table below;

Table 6: Hypothesis 4; Regression Model

Model	R	R Square	F	Std. Error of the Estimate	Sig.	β Value
1	.433 ^a	.188	51.058	.924	.000	.714
a. Predictors: (Constant): CC						
b. Dependent Variable: KS						

Correlation is abbreviated as "R" which is 0.433 in the above table which shows there is a weak relationship between client commitment and Knowledge sharing. The table above shows that R Square (Regression) is 0.188 ($F=51.058$ $p < .000$).

The regression results show that the explained variation in the knowledge sharing is 18.8% explained by the given variables i.e. R square is 0.188

Unstandardized β value .714 ($p < 0.000$) signifies that for every unit change in the independent variables (Client Commitment), the dependent variable is affected by .714 units. Hence we will reject H4; which is resulted in client commitment affects the Knowledge Sharing within the organization.

Discussion:-

Employee motivation and commitment derives success and failure of Knowledge management. (Galletta, 2003) states that inspiration and obligation plays a vital role in fruitfully implementing Knowledge Management Systems (as antecedents).

Above results and answers have significant implications for concept and for exercise. Study investigation has donated to the inadequate but increasing investigation on relationship among worker commitment and knowledge distribution (Hislop, 2003; Lin, 2007). This research has established on the various kinds (Meyer and Allen, 1991) and foci of worker commitment to comprehend the impact on know-how sharing behavior

Table 7: Hypothesis summary

HYPOTHESES	DECISION
H1: Different types of employee commitment to the firm/organization are positively associated to knowledge sharing with coworkers in the organization (in Projects).	Accepted
H2: Different types of employee commitment to the Occupation/Profession are positively associated to knowledge sharing with coworkers in the organization (in Projects).	Accepted
H3: Different types of employee commitment to the project team are positively associated to knowledge sharing with coworkers in the organization (in Projects).	Accepted
H4: Different types of employee commitment to the Client are negatively associated to knowledge sharing with coworkers in the organization (in Projects).	Rejected

Affective employee commitment to the project team and its members and the occupation is positively associated to knowledge sharing behavior. This shows emotive commitment with team-and-professional working (Becker, 2009) enlightens the know-how distribution behavior.

Normative employee commitment (i.e.; a feeling of obligation to the organization) is a further vital impact on knowledge distribution behavior. This behavior can be enhancing by rewards and other mediums of motivation.

Continuance employee loyalty to the customer is weakly associated to knowledge distribution or sharing behavior. Team members are less expected to part their know-how with project colleagues when they pursue to become customer and business experts and want to endure to work with a certain customer/client. These experts have established highly customer focused know-how that may be hard to share with other experts in the project.

Conclusion & Implications:-

The goal of this study is to examine the impact of different kinds of employee commitment (affective, normative and continuance commitment) and foci of commitment (organization, professional, customer and project team) on knowledge sharing. This study has examined organization affective commitment, organization normative commitment and organization continuance commitment, same goes with other foci of commitment. An investigation result evidently shows that the numerous kinds and foci of worker commitment are connected to organizational knowledge distribution behavior.

Project managers should try to motivate their team members in order to increase their commitment to organization, profession and team particularly so that they share their specialized knowledge within the organization. This will ultimately give competitive advantage and will result in greater chances of project success.

This investigation has been able to inspect the types of employee loyalty and also various foci of commitment within the project. This delivers that there is a link among each kind and foci of commitment and two directional know-how distribution behaviors. Research showed that foci that are proximal (i.e. team and profession) generate emotive commitment, which impacts on know-how distribution, while more distal foci, such as the firm, will tend to rely on normative to support know-how distribution behavior.

Lastly, it has showed that firms will be confronted with strategic knowledge management challenges when inspiring very robust customer commitment that indications to the growth of customer oriented knowledge, which desires to be stable with the ability to leverage this know-how inside the firm. This will eventually influence on the competitive ability of the firm, which consequences from the combined effects of knowledge distribution.

Results of analysis revealed that almost all different types and multi-foci of commitment have an influence on knowledge distribution behavior with colleagues in the firm. As knowledge sharing increases chances for project success increases. Knowledge is vital and beneficial on the collective level. Therefore, the analysis leads to interpretation that, knowledge is a vital resource as we are living in a knowledge economy. Commitment on various levels increases knowledge sharing behavior that will ultimately lead to project or organization success.

In future this study could be done with the higher sample size; Future investigator could do comparative analysis in terms of different industries as this study is based on the Advertising Agencies projects only. Future studies can also study some moderating and mediating effect on the relation of commitment and knowledge sharing. Potential researchers can also check the impact of different variables from a new perspective or different perspective that differentiate the more successful organization than the less one. This perspective could be leadership quality, rewards, and likewise impact on a knowledge sharing or other management practices impact.

References:-

1. Alvesson, M. (2004). Knowledge work and Knowledge-Intensive Firms. *Oxford University Press*.
2. Alvesson. (2005). Knowledge work: Ambiguity, image and identity. *Human Relations*, 54, 863-886.
3. Baccarini, D. (1999). The Logical Framework Method of Defining Project Success. *Project Management Journal*, 30(4), 25-32.
4. Becker, T.E. (2009) 'Interpersonal commitments', in H.J. Klein, T.E. Becker and J.P. Meyer (Eds.), *Commitment in Organizations*, New York, NY: Routledge.
5. Davenport, T. (1998). *Working Knowledge: How Organizations Manage What They Know*. MA: Harvard School Press.
6. Davenport, T. (1998). *Working Knowledge: How Organizations Manage What They Know*. MA: *Harvard School Press*.
7. Empson, L. (2001) 'Fear of exploitation and fear of contamination: Impediments to knowledge transfer in mergers between professional services firms.' *Human Relations*, 54 (7): 839 – 862

8. Galletta, M. a. (2003). Role of commitment and motivations in knowledge management systems implementation: Theory, conceptualization, and measurement of antecedents of success. *In the Proceedings of the 36th Hawaii International Conference on system sciences.*
9. Greenwood, R., & Empson, L. (2003). 'The professional partnership: relic or exemplary form of governance?' *Organization Studies*, 24(6): 909-933.
10. Hislop, D. (2003). Linking human resource management and knowledge management via commitment: a review and research agenda. *Employee Relations*, 25(2), 182-202.
11. Karmiloff-Smith, A., Beyond modularity. Developmental perspective on cognitive
12. Lin, Chieh-Peng. (2007). 'To share or not to share: modelling tacit knowledge sharing, its mediators and antecedents' *Journal of Business Ethics*, 70(4): 411 – 428
13. Lin, H. (2007). Effects of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation on employee knowledge sharing intention. *Journal of Information Science*, 33(2), 135-149.
14. Meyer, J.P. and Allen, N.J. (1991) 'A Three Component Conceptualization of Organizational Commitment', *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1): 61-89.
15. Neuman, L. (2000). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative & Quantitative Approches*. (4th, Ed.) *Allyn & Bacon*.
16. Newell, S., and Swan, J. (2000) Trust and inter-organizational networking. *Human Relations*. 53 (10): 1287-1328
17. Nonaka, I. (1995). *The Knowledge creating company*. *Oxford University*.
18. Redman, T. and Snape, E. (2005) 'Unpacking Commitment: Multiple Loyalties and Employee Behaviour', *Journal of Management Studies*, 42(2): 301-328.
19. Scarbrough, H. &. (2000). *Investing knowledge management*. *London: Chartered Institute of Personal Development*.
20. Schwalbe, K. (2012). *Information Technology Project Management* (7th ed.). Sydney: CENGAGE Learning.
21. science. 1992, London: MIT Press.
22. Spender, J. a. (1996). Knowledge of the firm: Overview. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17, 5-9.
23. Swart, J. (2007) 'Human resource management and knowledge workers', in P. Boxall et al. (eds) *Oxford Handbook of Human Resource Management*, pp. 450 – 468. OUP Handbooks.
24. Swart, J. (2011). That's why it matters. The value generating properties of knowledge. *Management Learning*, 49(3), 319-332.
25. Swart, J., Kinnie, N., Van Rossenberg, Y. and Yalabik, Z. Y. (2014). Why should I share my knowledge? A multiple foci of commitment perspective, *Human Resource Management Journal*, 24(3), 269-289.
26. Teece, D. P. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18, 509-533.
27. Teece, D. (1994). The dynamic capabilities of firms: An Introduction. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 537-556.
28. Vandenberghe, C. (2009) *Organizational Commitments*, in Klein, H., Becker, T., & Meyer, J. (Eds.). (2009). *Commitment in organizations: Accumulated wisdom and new directions*. Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
29. Watzlawik, P. (1976) *How real is real? Confusion, disinformation, communication*. Random House, New York