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# ABSTRACT

The current study in hand focused on determining the relationship between team efficiency and knowledge sharing as well as with a mediation effect of employee autonomy. Linear regression modeling has been used for analysing relationships among variables. Results of the study suggest that there is a significant causal relationship among knowledge sharing and team effectiveness, with mediating the role of employee autonomy. In future research the role research the role of various moderators can be explored. This research could be a source of knowledge for scholars and project managers in future.
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# CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

## Background of the study

The process of Project Management can be compared to managing a circus, in which every member needs to perform their own acts but as well as to match the timings with other acts. The synergy mentioned above will leave the audience stunning and saying wow. It can be said that project management is the acknowledgement of knowledge being disseminated with well-defined actions and execution time frames. Correspondingly, sharing and management of knowledge is a significant part in project management, and to form a synergy among all the actions performed within a business or organization to achieve that wow from the audience of that project.

In the mist of several concerns, it is usual that organizations fail to realize the significance of the experience and the knowledge gained on similar projects and environments. Cooke-Davis, (2002) has emphasized on factors leading to consistent success and mentioned that organizations need an effective mechanism to learn from past experiences as well as combine explicit and tacit knowledge and implement this into practice and processes to successfully complete the project and continuously progress in the right direction. Knowledge provider is the party that makes knowledge available for the benefit of others both within and outside of the organization to attain common goals (Ipe, 2008; Mooradian et al., 2012; Szulanski, 2005). As Szulanski (2005) stated about the source of the knowledge base theory that knowledge distribution is not about exchange of knowledge amongst awareness suppliers or beneficiaries but it depends on the actions of the knowledge distributor.

Teng and Song (2011) showed two natures of information sharing, solicited or voluntary. In keeping with them once information sharing happened as a result of sending the information as well as receiving requests for information is termed as solicited knowledge sharing, however when it comes to voluntary

knowledge sharing is an exchange there is no previous requests for knowledge. This stance of Teng and Song (2011) is not in agreement with the viewpoint of Davenport (1997), he branded knowledge sharing strictly as a controlled act and argued that the term knowledge sharing itself is when someone of information presents it voluntarily for the benefit of others with no obligation or pressure on them.

There are three different kinds of information shared by stakeholders, the subjective information gained through expertise and experience, knowhow about objective information regarding activities, jobs, etc. associated dispositional information consists upon an individual’s abilities and capabilities (Lowendahl, Revang, & Fosstenlokken, 2001).

It is typical for a stakeholders to assess the shared information among them and mostly dispersed stakeholders assume that information shared among them is unable to explain the common interests or objectives of the tasks reachable in an exceedingly uncomplicated manner yet rather focuses on the processes that are adopted and overall common goals (Leinonen & Bluemink, 2008).

New information construction collaboratively needs the clarification of mutual joint mount of state of affairs to all or any concerned stakeholders resulting in the eminent knowledge sharing by conveying and interacting with all stakeholders (Leinonen & Bluemink, 2008; Cohen & Bailey, 1997). Faraj and Sproull (2000) proposed that it is significant for stakeholders to possess the skill to manage the knowledge interdependencies effectively i.e. from where they can find the required information, where can it be found, authenticity of that information, through expert coordination.

The major aim of understanding sharing is to combine the current interdependencies and information within the agency to extend new dimensions of knowledge and to get to the bottom of issues and specific matters with a lot of success (Christensen, 2007). Exchange of assignment records and

connected professional data so as to form new and novel ideas and innovations within the venture are immediately related to the information sharing and innovation (Kim & Park, 2017). Information sharing is viewed essential component of data management machine and it additionally affects structure overall performance (Alavi & Leidner, 2001)

Employee autonomy is referred as “the diploma to which the job presents vast freedom, independence, and discretion to the character in scheduling the work and in figuring out the methods to be used in carrying it out” (Burcharth, Knudsen & Sndergaard, 2017). Employee autonomy is a complicated notion consisting of many distinctive characteristics (Chen & Zheng,2018). Eventually, individuals with a higher stage of work-related self-efficacy turn out to be in a position to make positive guidelines to improve the operation of their work unit and to talk up about problems that might purpose the unit to trip serious loss (Dedahanov, Rhee & Gapurjanova, 2018). Men and women who skilled high stages of employee autonomy considered their place of job and provider local weather in a greater positive manner (Dhar, 2017).

Employee autonomy is referred as “the diploma to which the job presents vast freedom, independence, and discretion to the character in scheduling the work and in figuring out the methods to be used in carrying it out” (Burcharth, Knudsen & Sndergaard, 2017).

Employee autonomy could be a sophisticated notion consisting of the many distinctive characteristics (Chen & Zheng, 2018). Eventually, people with the next stage of work-related self-efficacy prove to be during a position to create positive pointers to enhance the operation of their labor unit and to speak up about concerning issues which may lead to the unit to trip serious loss (Dedahanov, Rhee & Gapurjanova, 2018). Male and female workers both practiced high stages of employee autonomy, measured their place of job and provided local weather in a greater positive manner (Dhar, 2017).

Managers who take self-sufficiency strengthening practices urge their

subordinates to make their own inclinations (individual commencement); provide their representatives with important, valued, and intellectual information about the tasks to be completed and the rules to be followed; and capture representatives’ sentiments with the help of communicating compassion (St-Hilaire, 2017).

It is located that the team's standard “collective mood” influenced singular level burnout, showing that the group setting can be vital for character prosperity. Differenti- ating healthy and unfortunate group contact prole demonstrates that team part burnout ought to be much extra likely in the last mentioned. While groups with the TC-overwhelming prole ought to be occupied with information sharing, critical thinking and analyzation of presumptions, groups with the useless conflict parole ought to be restrained from such connections because of their need to address or stay away from relational pressures and technique errors (McLarnon, & Rosehart, 2018).

The mission and relationship elements of conflict are systematically particular from one another, and proposed a possibility structure to arrange the quantity of results of intra-group conflict on individual and group execution (Flores, Jiang, & Manz, 2018). It is recommended that with acknowledge to vital basic leadership, the determination technique is essential in that it can help to limit the level of gathering strife (Lefley, 2018).

By distinction, at the group level, exclusively the coordination issue of transactive memory completely arbitrates team performance and group member satisfaction; team identification and transactive reminiscence did no longer directly have an effect on team effectiveness (Michinov & Juhel, 2018). Team effectiveness was operationalized because the overall routine of the people on their allotted tasks (Church, Elliot, & Gable, 2001). Effective groups have active work associated support (Barua, 2016).

Pleasure is important to team effectiveness, thanks to the actual fact it impacts crewmembers’ self-efficacy, venture skills, level of effort, and their pleasure in

relation to their work (James, Anthony & Ferris, 2013). One strategy to the current conundrum has been to adopt that at a similar time as assignment battle (also named intellectual clash, or mental clash) will improve group adequacy, association, fighting is dependably inconvenient to that (Kuvaas, 2017).

## Gap Analysis

Alsharo, Gregg, and Ramirez (2013) have stated that future researchers might conduct research on the association of team building and team effectiveness. This created the necessity to conduct study of knowledge sharing and team effectiveness. With the assistance of this literature and other studies on team building techniques a new link or study was created. Additionally, mediating relationships of employee autonomy was concieved between information sharing and team effectiveness. Alsharo Saint George, G., & Salter, A. J. (2017) states little or no research has been conducted on these linkages.

## Problem Statement

Success of any Venture depends on how effective its project team is. Effectiveness of the project team is determined by the information sharing and employee autonomy. Group conflict can also be considered as an important aspect to judge the effectiveness of projects. Similarly, employee autonomy can also be considered to impact project success.

It is so basic that the project groups build up a good relationship and comprehension among each other and are attentive to the program of undertaking accomplishment and therefore the manner that they have to complete the task targets along by enjoying the slightest conceivable measure of contentions and inconsistencies. Group care, as disclosed previously is by all

accounts the upgrade to accomplish team execution through some noteworthy group union. Likewise, team effectiveness is key to the accomplishment of the venture because it can guarantee that the project team is protected from both inside and outside. Still these, the enterprise team leader ought to likewise guarantee that the project team remains targeting the task objectives, work to their 100 percent potential and are properly rewarded and perceived for their activities. This research will try to establish the impression of knowledge sharing on team effectiveness- ness with the arbitrating role of employee autonomy.

## Research Questions

The current study will help to look for the answers of the following questions:

Does Knowledge Sharing impact team effectiveness in projects?

Does Employee Autonomy impact Knowledge Sharing in projects?

Does Employee Autonomy impact team effectiveness in projects?

Does Employee Autonomy mediate the relationship between knowledge sharing and team effectiveness in projects?

## Objective of the Study

The reason for this learning is to find the influence of knowledge sharing on team effectiveness with mediating the role of employee autonomy and moderating role of team conflict.

* + - To test the relationship between Knowledge Sharing and team effectiveness.
		- To check the relationship between Employee Autonomy impact Knowledge Sharing in projects
		- To identify the relationship between Employee Autonomy impact team effectiveness in projects.
		- To identify the mediating role of Employee autonomy between Knowledge Sharing and team effectiveness.

## Significance of the Study

This research intends to test through empirical observation a model to see direct relationship of information sharing and its impact on team effectiveness. it's important for the organizations to effectively manage information however it will solely be achieved once staff are able to share their knowledge. Information sharing subsidizes heaps of modernizations in individual groups but also as a whole organization (Wang & Wang, 2012). Sharing of information has become the most basic need for the success of assignment (Park & Lee, 2013).

This analysis additionally subsidizes within the current literature of information sharing or team effectiveness. The humans with excessive self-efficacy are believed to be more inventive than the low self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is known as the sureness of a person in his/her potential to develop original ideas and convey innovation within the agency (Yang & Chu, 2012). Additionally, this study aims at enhancing the knowledge sharing and team efficiency literature by examining the chief effect of knowledge sharing on team effectiveness, mediating the role of ‘Employee Autonomy’ among the association of knowledge Sharing and Team Effectiveness.

# CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

## Theory

The Knowledge Based Theory of the Firm positions a firm as a learning producing element (Nonaka, Toyama, & Nagata,2000;Nonaka & Konno,1998).

Award (1996) highlights the capability of the people inside the partnership in creating statistics and implies that it is the job of the corporation to integrate, store, and observe the learnings made by its people. Associations accumulate teams of capable and expert those are foretold to use their information to figure hierarchic undertakings. Team’s capability improved after they comprehended staff with information necessary to this task (Manhotra and Majcnrzak 2014; Gartner 2014; Pangilk and Chank, 2016).

The dependent variable that is studied is a character’s knowledge-sharing behavior. Knowledge base theory (Blau,1964) is one of generally applied theoretical

Base for such study. As specified by this hypothesis, individuals institutionalize their associations with a diverse group of people reliant on a self-intrigued study of the expenses and advantages of such a collaboration. People try to augment their benefits and decrease their costs while trading assets with others (Molm, 2001). These benefits need not be huge since many may take part in a cooperation with the prospect of trade (Gouldner,1960).

In such trades, people facilitate others with a general need for some profit in future, as an example, increasing needed assets with the help of social correspondence. Consequently, to increase the assets picked up, they could establish social associations with others by sharing their insight. Davenport, Prusak, et al. (1998) have divided knowledge sharing behavior and have categorized benefits that will direct the conduct; these incorporate future

communication, status, owner stability, and special prospects.

From this point of view, data sharing is emphatically influenced once associates separate hopes to accumulate some benefit presently terminated in response (Cabrera & Cabrera, 2005). Knowledge base hypothesis has been effective in illuminating information distribution practices among individuals. Kankanhalli et al. (2005) accepted that an individual’s benefit is one of the main points that urge workforces to transfer learning to electronic media.

As perMa (2007), the added learning people augment a VC depends upon the amount of fulfillment they receive as an individual of the network. Chiu et al. (2006) thought of the impact of relative factors, for instance, social cooperation, trust, and degree of correspondence on learning partaking in VCs.

Past researches have similarly examined authoritative settings for informative learning sharing (Kim and Lee, 2006).Pai (2006) used the assistance from the highest level of administration to research the affiliation between learning sharing and therefore the utilization of IS/IT vital arranging.

Further, Watson and Hewett (2006) anticipated the influence of prolonged data commitment within the organization. In spite of the fact that info based hypotheses might explain the behavior of teach donors, the models used in past studies were numerous and on some occasions results were different entirely. Analysts generally study the impact of authoritative benefits on knowledge sharing conduct. Still, the investigations on the impact of hierarchical benefits have created integrated outcomes. Kim and Lee (2006) presumed that reward frameworks are decisive factors that influence employee learning sharing capacities.

However, according to Lin (2007), authoritative benefits don’t have an effect on a person's capacity to communicate knowledge to their associates. This study examines the factors associated with knowledge base theory that supports three dimensions, namely, information sharing (exchange information, skills or

expertise), worker autonomy (freedom staff have whereas working), and Team Effectiveness (ability a team needs to reach the objectives or purposes). Besides, this study additionally tests the alleviatory impact of Team conflict.

This experience change is often seen through the lens of Knowledge base Theory wherever human conduct is complete as taking region in a very social change (Blah, 2005). People within a social framework exchange errands with a desire to earn in future, yet hazy, arrival. Long-term acquaintances acquire wherever individuals have tolerable opportunity to form synergies and trade Favors (Blah 2005; Molm et al., 2002). With these suspicions, information sharing is often seen as a state of summed up database; the spot people share their mastery expecting anything in return for an arrival apart from the guarantee of an extended common relationship (Fulk et al., 1996).

To motivate appropriate behavior, agencies are implementing benefit structures to motivate team participants to make, encourage and share expertise although in some establishments, exhausting employees if they decline to segment the information they hold (Bartol & Srivastava, 2002).

### Knowledge Sharing and Team Effectiveness

Organizations are disseminated experience organizations and also the perspective of the leader to become tuned in to proof possessions, influence them, and build them to be had for its staff will followed to a particular aggressive gain (Tsonkas, 2006; Davesport & Prusark, 2011; Alavik & Tiwanah, 2008). As established by our hypothetical model (2.1), it is projected that knowledge sharing has a significant positive association with Job autonomy, conflict amongst project teams and effectiveness of a team. Furthermore, Employee autonomy arbitrates the association between knowledge sharing and team effectiveness, with conflict amongst teams having a negative influence on

the impact of job autonomy on team effectiveness.

Even with its importance, learning combined within teams could be testing. Colleagues are habitually tentative to share significant learning amongst themselves (Basaglia, Caporarello, Magni, & Pennarola,2010), and it’s impossible to do so (Staples and Webster, 2008; He et al., 2014). Given that learning connection essentially includes mix and amalgamation, group supervisors regularly discover information combination testing for the reason colleagues’ are hesitant to merge their distinct mastery.

Knowledge sharing authors have numerous views on implicit or unambiguous learning sharing aims since person’s may modify their insight sharing expectations as specified by the various quality stipulations of implicit and specific info sharing exercises (Haua Kim, Lee & Kim, 2012). Sharing information results totally different edges, as an example, an excellent execution assessment additional, pay from the association, for communicating learning to team members, in conjunction with facilitating the organization, help building and maintaining essential systems within an association, that are likewise a bit of auxiliary open doors for knowledge sharing (Chen, Chuang, & Chen,2012). Information sharing is that the element which might likewise delineates the satisfaction of the employees by sleek progression of knowledge and vital information throughout the association (Isfahani, Nilipour, Aghababapour, & Tanhaei, 2013).

Knowledge sharing is that the simple procedures over that agents will augment information application, improvement, and eventually the viable good thing about the organization (Jason, Chuank, Hargen, Jiang, & Joseph, 2007).

Information sharing among representatives and within and inclined over teams permits organizations to misuse and get advantage from most knowledge-based assets (Cabrera & Cabrera, 2005; Davenport et al., 1998).

Study has established that data sharing and mix is absolutely associated with

diminishes ongoing prices, snappier summit of original factor improvement adventures, bunch execution, organizational headway limits, and organizational execution as well as deals, development and pay from unique things and organizations (e.g., Mesmer-Magnus & DeChurch, 2008; Lin, 2009; Collins & Smith, 2007; Arthur & Huntley, 2006.

Knowledge sharing indicates the arrangement of enterprise information and capability to support colleagues and to work with others to handle problems, grow new contemplations or execute methodologies or systems (Cummings, 2004; Pulakos, Dorsey, & Borman, 2003). Learning sharing is formed by strategies for creating correspondence or very close exchanges through frameworks organization with numerous authorities, or may be by proclaiming, coping with and obtaining information for colleagues (Cummings, 2004; Pulakos et al., 2003).

Although the detail that the term knowledge sharing is by and large developed more frequently than information sharing, scientists will in general utilize the expression “knowledge sharing” to allude to offering to others that happens in exploratory examinations in which members are given arrangements of data, man- uals, or programs. Taylor and Wright (2005) establish that an environment that authorized new thoughts and focused on gaining from disappointment was recognized with powerful knowledge sharing.

People’s needs for the assessment of their awareness through sharing they'll develop relationships with others are confirmed to be known with positive information sharing characters that therefore were identified with knowledge sharing possibilities and follows (Bock, Zmud, Kim, Lee, et al., 2005). Lin and Lee (2005) investigated ranking directors’ permitting information sharing between employees as different to those of the individual sharers. They think that the manager's intention of inspiration was completely joined with characteristic sharing performances. Furthermore, scholars have revealed that level frames of mind together with work satisfaction and imposing

responsibility in addition encourage information sharing (De Dreu, 2007).

Commonly speaking, it creates the impression that actions and authoritative frames of mind impact information sharing. Knowledge sharing is important for organizations to own the choice to make abilities and skills, raise esteem, and continue upper hands (see for example Grant, 1996; Spender, 1996b)in light of the very fact that development happens once people provide and consolidate their own learning with others. As per Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) data sharing is predicted to alter over general thoughts and ideas into things and administrations and therefore for development. In this manner the capability of moving information from one person to a different one fundamentally adds to the authoritative execution of companies (Argote, Ingram, Levine, & Moreland, 2000).

The capability to share knowledge depends on the characteristics of information, which influence how efficiently information can be shared and collected, how considerable and where it is held and put away, and how efficiently it streams inside and over an organization (Argote, McEvily, & Reagans, 2003).

Knowledge sharing in teams has been found to swift team execution (Srivastaka et al., 2008). This has appeared in diverse locations, for instance, fresh item improvement groups (Madhcvan & merchandiser, 1999), innovative workgroups (Baik et al., 2015) and programming improvement groups (Farak & Sprogll, 2010). within the course of recent years, examination into information sharing in teams has distinguished associate assortment of components containing character characteristics (Kuft et al., 2014), team correspondence designs and data sharing mentalities (deVrics et al., 2011), relative recognition (Grucnfeld et al., 2001), basic good variety (Cummings, 2004) and diverse style of colleague ability (Stasser, Vaughan, & Stewart, 2000), and some team measure (Stassek & Stewart, 1998).

Knowledge sharing within the team prompts higher group execution for three

reasons: better basic leadership (Davenport et al., 1998), improved essential thinking (Koguth & Zander 1993; Salicbury, 2001) and upgraded originality (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995). Distended data sharing helps colleagues to consider additional alternatives, to realize from the encounters of others and to apply someone else's experience with the team, prompting higher basic leadership. Knowledge sharing will facilitate essential thinking in light of the very fact that this issue is well detained, probable subjects are rough before and progressively different choices in distinction to the difficulty can be investigated (Lee, Gillespie, Maln & carrying, 2011).

Inferred information could incorporate bits of data into consumer desires, hunches concerning what could fix a recalcitrant issue, exercises gained from past expertise, and however others have touched toward comparative problems and information concerning new advances. Sharing such data makes a progression of clever thoughts that boost effective results, for instance, new items, procedures and licenses. Numerous investigations bolster the assessment that information sharing is basic for team execution (Anlona & Erskine Preston Caldwell, 1992; Farak & Sproll, 2001; Hongk et al., 2005; Hopes & Poiktrel, 2004).

As group effectiveness needs expanded information to be suitably shared and built-in via team suppliers (Xie & Luan,2014;Pinjani & Palvia,2013). Then effectiveness of a team will decrease, grief greater costs linked with information search, statement failure, statistics confusion and misconception, and insufficient choice making due to missing records (Gray, 2001; Pinjani & Palvia, 2013). Information sharing by way of associate professionals’ consents fine crew consequences by guaranteeing all pieces of a statistics puzzle are on hand for determining overall performance and terrific selection making. This permits the group, paying little mind to the area, to achieve its work prerequisites and add to an association’s objectives. It is thus, hypothesized as:

H1: Knowledge sharing has a positive influence on team effectiveness

## Employee Autonomy as Mediator

Team effectiveness has an impact on the way teams’ individuals work together and have the conceivable to avoid team success and effectiveness. for instance, instead of the addition of eye to eye communication teams can normally take longer to reach regular floor and to team expeditiously (Holtkn, 2004; Pottes and Balthazark, 2010; Kikman et al., 2014; DeOrtentiis et al., 2014; Pangil and Chan, 2014). Self-determination assumes an essential job within the social adjustment method since it encourages individuals to specifically absorb outer social weights so it eventually strengthens self-guideline (Ryan, Kuhl, & Deci, 1997). Self-governance is taken into account in a “basic formative direction” (Ryan et al., 1997) that encourages individuals to possess their totally different wants met and to act as indicated by and by supported qualities and aims. At the purpose once independence is deficient with regards to, people ``can't get to the all-encompassing learning necessary to discriminate what they need '' (Ryan et al., 1997).

Concerning development, autonomy is linked to thoughts, as a self-governance direction in and of itself implies that one accomplishes one thing else, with less worry for what's regular. All things thought of, advancement could be unnatural once autonomy is that the essential objective (Gelderen et al., 2006). These bifurcation limits for investigation those that worked while not anyone else and would be destined to own autonomy/freedom grapple severally from proprietors who would possibly nearly bound have innovative imagination even as autonomy (Prottas et al., 2008).

Furnishing staff with occupation independence flag that the association honors representatives’ info and perceives their commitments to the association’s objectives (Park et al., 2016).Langfred (2004) found that worker autonomy affected cluster execution relying upon perceptive frameworks and trust within self- overseeing teams. Until now, be that because it might, no experimental examination has centered on which type of authoritative technique fortifies or debilitates the connections between worker autonomy and individual

representative results.

Further analysis is predicted to explore the vertical work between occupation self-government and authoritative technique whereas specializing in individual representative results. Autonomy refers to what proportion the activity provides the individual considerable opportunity, freedom and considerateness once coming up with work and deciding the ways to be utilized when finishing that job (Hacqman & Oldham, 2002).

Autonomy progresses work execution since it pushes representatives to venture additional prominent exertion. Past analysis reports that autonomy is basic for characteristic encounters, as an example, creating self-assurance (Deci and Ryan, 2000). Worker Autonomy is by all odds known with a scope of valuable results, as well as work fulfillment, work execution, duty, inborn inspiration and occupation inclusion (Humphrey et al., 2007). Worker autonomy was decidedly connected with data sharing since it upgraded the inward motivation to share information (Foess et al., 2009). Autonomy is classified as “how a lot of the trip provides generous chance, autonomy, and circumspection in designing the work and choosing the techniques to be used in finishing it” (Hackman & Oldham, 1980).

When the worker role is said to be an abnormal state of self-government, there's often both a likelihood for and a need for powerful exhibition. The combination of independence and sharing capability might build work execution (Nesheim et al., 2016). Team viability was operationalized because the introduction of the individuals on their allotted undertakings. This life was grasped from the work execution scale (Hu & Bentler, 1999). This investigation upheld the interceding job of representative autonomy within the affiliation between info sharing and cluster adequacy. Equally as social character hypothesis projected, adherent’s identification with representative autonomy can urge the desire to conciliate, copy, or vicariously gain the powerful execution (Bandura, 1997).

Acknowledgment of the importance of worker autonomy in advancing team efficiency may be followed back to crafted by socio technical frameworks researchers, whose mediations oftentimes enclosed the formation of freelance or self- overseeing work gatherings (Clekh, 2004; Mank & Stewart, 2005; Pasmoreh, Fran- cisk, & Haldman, 2009; Trist & Baforth, 2001). improved autonomy acts to reduce unneeded administrative additionally, official limitations on the employment of information and power living within the cluster, empowering its people to any or all a lot of adequately distinguish and react to specialized ‘changes’.

In principle, the rise in team effectiveness occurs on the grounds that there are less deferrals whereas decisions are mentioned to further level of power, or as a result of operative-level employee’s representatives each currently and once more have definite (frequently inferred) learning regarding the framework’s operating qualities, and are during this manner higher able to detail and apply a robust reaction within the event that they need the essential professional to try and do it (Wall, Jacson, & Davids, 2013). Researchers keen on designation the mental result of labor have likewise distinguished autonomy (at each the individual and group level) as a necessary supporter of team effectiveness.

Reviewers of research around the globe, over numerous decades, usually show simple modest and conflicting associations between autonomy and team effectiveness (Goodman, Devadas, & Hughson, 1988; Guzzo & Dickson, 1996). Associate current meta-scientific investigation mentioned comparable objective facts, inferring that upgraded independence ’has all the opportunities of being helpful for teams.

Wall et al. (2002) constructed a gradual kind of this chance argument, recommending that any administration work on as well as the strengthening of representatives through the devolution of basic leadership obligation, as an example, work sweetening or the creation of autonomous (self-overseeing) workgroups, can elevate improved team effectiveness simply to the degree that laborers face ’changeability and absence of consistency in work assignments

and wants, as well as what should be done and also the simplest technique to try to ensure it’(Wallck et al., 2002). They suggested that, wherever this sort of defenselessness is high, improved team autonomy would progress team effectiveness, with the top product that low basic team autonomy can result in imperfect team presentation in akin circumstances.

As said by Guzzo and Dickson (2009) team is comprised of individuals that see themselves and who are understood by others as a team member, that are connected on reason of the undertakings they perform as individuals from a gathering,that are ingrained in a one larger social frameworks (for example network, association and then on.), and those that perform assignments that affect others (for example purchasers or collaborators). One association may be thought of as a cluster of operating officers seen as a social ingredient cooperating and cooperating for accomplishment of shared objectives with best endeavors.

However, independent workers are in a position to overthrow such complications. As counseled by mutuality hypothesis, individuals within a team can typically work supportively therefore on delivering the goods a standard detached, ultimately persuading team capability (Del Giudice & Maggioni, 2014). Team members tend to express their feelings unreservedly and directly giving slight reference to any social or social control compels (Duarte and Snyder, 1999). Gathering individuals are in a very scenario to ascertain one another additionally, mainly enthusiastic about execution and commitment. Team people in addition show less inclination compared with those in conservative gatherings once assessing every other’s general presentation and commitment (Weisband and Atwater, 1999).

Statistics based staff watches out for self-rule, underline on self-administration and self-interest in the common leadership process (Weiers, 2014). The outcome is an employee autonomy instead of having conquered problems associated with dissimilar areas, bunches trade more prominent thoughts, share additional information, and effectively organize errands between one

another (Berry, 2011; Mathieu et al., 2008). It is, thus, hypothesized as:

**H2**: Employee autonomy plays a mediating role between knowledge sharing and team effectiveness.

***Source: Author Developed***

## Research Hypotheses

H1: Knowledge sharing has a significant influence on team effectiveness. H2: Knowledge sharing has a significant influence on Employee autonomy. H3: Employee autonomy has a significant influence on team effectiveness.

H4: Employee autonomy plays a mediating role between knowledge sharing and team effectiveness.

# CHAPTER 3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

It is vital to differentiate between research methods and research methodology are completely different terms. Research method contains every procedure/strategy being used for direction of research. Research strategies or measures indicate the conducts in which scientists use in search of alternatives. As such, all of those procedures, which are used by the specialist while anticipating research issues, are known as research methods.

Interestingly, inquiry regarding philosophy is a tactic to tackle issues with efficiency. The investigation of research procedures is more intensive than that of research methodology. afterward, whenever procedure is mentioned it doesn’t mean simply the methods nevertheless the principle behind the procedures used with regards thereto review and clarify the utilization of a procedure or technique over another, with the goal that results are prepared for being surveyed either by an alternative or specialist himself.

This chapter explicitly indicates the methodology to study the impact of information sharing on team effectiveness with the mediating role of worker autonomy and weakening role of team conflict. The discussion during this chapter are associated with study design, population and sampling techniques, characteristics of the sample and instruments of all the variables and items present in every variable.

## Research Design

A good research configuration assists researchers to get outstanding outcomes, also it assists in understanding the value of the study. Prevalently, in sociologies two research configuration methodologies are there known as”quantitative methodology” and”subjective methodology”. Dominant part of analysts hold conviction that quan- titative research is progressively dependable and successful when contrasted with subjective research structure (de Vaus, 2001).

Scientists can verify validated and dependable outcomes with the help of quantitative research configuration (Chase et al., 2016). Research configuration is characterized as the show of conditions for information gathering and examination in such a way, that goal is to mix congruity to the exploration point with economy in strategy (Selltiz et al., 1960).

For this investigation, support is assembled from quantitative design with the help of institutionalized systems and apparatuses. Because it encourages solid info with the change of noticeable reality into numbers, that is converted into observing affiliations, connections, circumstances and final results. It’s indispensable to require note of that by quantitative and discernible implies that people demonstrate their level of acknowledgment with articulation, which works on their character or conduct.

Additionally, a survey procedure was done to gather information that involves the kind of employment comprising demographics like age, gender, qualification and knowledge. Different types of surveys are there that are performed on-line surveys, phone interviews, self-administered questionnaires etc. (Ary et al., 2006). A self-administered form was used for information gathering for investigation. According to (Cavana et al., 2001; Bowling, 2005), form usage is efficacious in terms of your time and value and it's straightforward to punch and analyze information. Also, for managing the method of the analysis, it's an in depth method and enclosed the study details with relevance of study, study settings, unit analysis and time prospect explained intimately below.

### Type of Study

The present study is explanatory in nature. Consistent with Baxter and Jack (2008) researchers used a similar method once they explore the answer to the question and therefore the objective is to debate the causative relation between the interventions. This can be a causal/relational study during which the impact of learning sharing on team viability has evaluated relying on

respondent self-announced discernment about these factors. The study may be a technique for gathering quantitative info in pre-characterized and patterned configuration to form less complicated information. Information is accumulated from examples and sentiment created on the entire population (Kerlinger and Lee, 2000). Despite the fact that examples need to be with agreement to logical analysis systems.

Surveys have two types; relative and descriptive (Rungtusanatham, Salvador, Forza, & Choi, 2003). Relative surveys are used to review through empirical observation the links among dependent and independent variables whereas descriptive surveys utilized the setting state of affairs. For this study, relative survey style was used, the rationale is that the research worker tries to find the link among knowledge sharing and team effectiveness incivility. During this research, Pakistani public and personal project primarily based organizations have targeted to accumulate the required knowledge to get the real results. Within the initial section, the target was to get 350 questionnaires however 302 authentic responses were gathered. The sample selected for this study has been estimated to represent the general population of Pakistan. This may aid to generalize the results acquired from samples on the whole population.

### Unit of Analysis

For every research study, the most important characteristic is the unit of analysis. The unit of analysis denotes persons or objects selected for study’s characteristics and features are to be investigated in the study. It may be distinct, dyad, group, industry, country, society or a culture from where the researcher collects the data. The current study is planned to see the influence of knowledge sharing on team effectiveness therefore, the unit of analysis was individual because the supervisors of project-based organizations were studied and as the hypothesized variable indicates project role overload.

## Population and Sample

### Population

National highway authority, defense housing authority, Nescom, and Bahria town are some of the prime project-based organizations running different projects in Pakistan. For this particular study, the population is supervisors and employees of project based organizations currently operating in different cities of Pakistan. Data was collected from project-based organizations working in Rawalpindi and Islamabad. These involve both national and international level project based organizations running different projects.

### Sample

According to Krejice and Morgan (1970) if the population is more than 100,000,0 so the minimum required sample must be 384. Still being a researcher 400 questionnaires were distributed in which 300 were returned back and in those 300, 250 were accurate so the final sample size was 250 and analysis was done on those 250.

### Data Collection Procedure

Data was put together from project based organizations. Hence, to approach the participants each possible action was used. The participants were declared to help and give acceptance in data collection. For assuring privacy of data given by the participants an introductory letter was joined to the poll. The introductory proposed that the study is being done for academic purposes. Participants were promised of the protection of their names and selection all together so that the respondents don’t feel faltering to fill the survey conclusively.

Data was put together entirely from project-based organizations for all variables. Data on both independent variable (i.e. Knowledge sharing), mediating variable (i.e. Employee autonomy) was provided by the staff of different projects, as the present research chief objective is to study the

supervisors. The reason behind collecting data from subordinates on this specific variable is to eliminate biases. Similarly, subordinates are asked to rate their supervisors. Lastly, many steps were taken to ensure the responses anonymity and accuracy (exmal et al., 2014; Taylor et al., 2011).

For data collection purposes 250+ employees and their subordinates were approached. Ensuing data consolidation, the eventual sample accommodated 250 workable responses. The ratio used for data collection was 1:1, as different studies have adopted this approach for similar studies.

### Handling of Received Questionnaire

The questionnaires received were inspected for missing information. The questionnaires received were having issues of missing values that indicates there are some queries in selected form that weren't answered by the respondents. In quantitative study, a crucial task is to handle missing information, as a result of it generating some serious issues. One it constitutes the authenticity of the information and analytical ability to find any important impact in our study (Roth & Switzer III, 1995). Secondly, missing information influences the accuracy of our anticipated variables.

Guidelines are available within the literature for handling of missing information. The dominant techniques for misplaced information handling according to (Rothe and Switzerh III, (2002) are mean substitution, regression imputation and list wise deletion. In mean substitution, mean is entered for missing response. In regression imputation, regression of y on x is devised to support connected variables for attributing and approximating missing values. In list wise deletion, if there's any missing information, all the data is deleted concerning their respondent. All the ways have their own advantages and disadvantages.

This study adopted mean substitution.

## Instrumentation

Mainly this questionnaire consists of 3 parts team effectiveness, knowledge sharing, and employee autonomy. Responses of objects in the questionnaire were filled using a 5 point Likert scale.

### Measures

The data was put together through appropriate questionnaires from various authentic sources. Almost 50-60 questionnaires were circulated in every selected project based organization and every organization was visited while distribution of questionnaires. Questionnaires were also distributed online to some of project based organizations for the quick response. Previously researches specified that, online collection of data is one of the most convenient way of data collection, as participants find it easier to fill the questionnaires instead of the process of filling questionnaires manually and regardless of data collection approach, there is no substantial effect on the quality of data while utilizing any of the two aforementioned methods.

According to the nature of research, objects encompassed in the questionnaire that is (Knowledge sharing), were reported by the projects employees and mediators of this study (Employee autonomy) were reported by project managers. All the items in the questionnaire were responded using a 5-points Likert-scale where 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), unless otherwise stated. Questionnaires also cover demographic variables like Gender, Age, Qualification and Experience. 250 questionnaires were distributed in total but only 250 were received. But the actual numbers of questionnaires used for the analysis of data for demonstrating the results were 250.

### Knowledge Sharing

Knowledge sharing was measured on a 5 item Likert scale. Park and Lee (2014) developed this scale. Sample items include: “We shared the minutes of meetings or discussion records in an effective way”; “We always provided technical documents, including manuals, books, training materials to each

other”; “We shared project plans and the project status in an effective way”; “We always pro- vided know-where or know-whom information to each other in an effective way”; “We tried to share expertise from education or training in an effective way”; “We always shared experience or know-how from work in a responsive and effective way”.

### Table 3.5 Instruments

### No. Variable Source Items

* + - 1. Knowledge Sharing (IV)Park and Lee(2014) 6
			2. Employee Autonomy (Med)Morris and Venkatesh(2010) 5
			3. Team Effectiveness (DV)De Dreu(2007) 3

**5.6 Sample Characteristics**

To recognize characteristics of a sample in your survey, there are many aspects to reflect on your samples. The first four characteristics you need to focus on are gender, age, experience, and education level. All four of these characteristics must be comparative to that of the population. An important characteristic of the survey is the sample size.

### Gender

Gender is an important element of demographics. The reason is it distinguishes between male and female in a given sample. In current study, it has been tried to make sure gender equality but still it has been seen that male respondent ratio is much greater than female respondents are.

### Table 3.6.1 Gender

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Valid Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Male** | 139 | 55.6 | 55.6 | 55.6 |
| **Female** | 111 | 44.4 | 44.4 | 100.0 |
| **Total** | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Table 3.6.1 shows the distribution of the information about gender. Table shows that the more respondents were male respondents comprising 55.6% and the remaining 44.4% were female respondents.

### Age

Age is considered as one of the demographics, to which respondents sometimes feel uncomfortable to reveal openly. So, for the suitability of respondents, scale/range was used to collect information regarding their age.

Table 3.6.2 shows the arrangement of the sample with orientation to age group. 22% of respondents were having age between the ranges of 18-25 years. 34% of plaintiffs were having age between the ranges of 26-33 years. 44.8% of respondents were having age between the ranges of 34-41 years. 21.6% is of age group 42 to 49 and above 50 is just 11.2 %.In this study, most of the respondents lie in the range of 34-41 years.

**Table 3.6.2 Age**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Age | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| 18-25 | 22 | 8.8 | 8.8 | 8.8 |
| 26-33 | 34 | 13.6 | 13.6 | 22.4 |
| 34-41 | 112 | 44.8 | 44.8 | 67.2 |
| 42-49 | 54 | 21.6 | 21.6 | 88.8 |
| 50 AND ABOVE | 28 | 11.2 | 11.2 | 100.0 |
| Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

### Qualification

Education is the major element which contributes towards the prosperity of the whole Nation and it is also the basic need of the time to compete globally. Hence after gender, qualification/education is another dynamic dimension of the demo- graphics. Education opens up many new and unique paths for success and creativity in order to gain reasonable advantage amongst all the other countries around the world. Probably education plays an important role in demonstrating creativity and innovation in project tasks.

### Table 3.6.3 Qualification

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Qualification | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| MATRIC | 33 | 13.2 | 13.2 | 13.2 |
| BACHELOR | 19 | 7.6 | 7.6 | 20.8 |
| MASTER | 54 | 21.6 | 21.6 | 42.4 |
| Ms/M.Phil. | 115 | 46.0 | 46.0 | 88.4 |
| Ph.D. | 29 | 11.6 | 11.6 | 100.0 |
| Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Table 3.6.3 represents the qualification of the respondents, 7.6% were Bachelors qualified, and 21.6% were Masters qualified. The large number of respondents were having a MS/M.Phil. That is 46% while a PhD is only 11.6%.

### Experience

Again to collect information regarding the experience of the respondents, different ranges of experience time period were developed so that every respondent can easily indicate the specific occupation of their experience in the relevant field of projects. As experience includes gaining knowledge about concerns of projected organizations toward adopting new strategies for safety and protection of the environment.

### Table 3.6.4 Experience

**Experienc e**

**Frequenc y**

**Percent Valid Percent**

**Cumulati ve Percent**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **5 AND** | 53 | 21.2 | 21.2 | 21.2 |
| **LESS** |  |  |  |  |
| **6-13** | 67 | 26.8 | 26.8 | 48.0 |
| **14-21** | 103 | 41.2 | 41.2 | 89.2 |
| **22-29** | 27 | 10.8 | 10.8 | 100.0 |
| Total | 250 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Table3.3.4 represents that 21.2% of the persons were having job expertise ranging from (5 and less) years, 26.8% of persons were having job expertise ranging from (6 - 13) years, 10.8% of persons were having job expertise ranging from (22-29) years. Most of the respondents were lying in the work expertise of (14 and 21) years.

## 3.5 Data Analysis

To check the links between variables different tests were conducted like correlation, reliability. To study the role of mediation and moderation Preacher and Hayes process macros are used. To check the impact of independent variable on dependent variable simple regression was conducted. Frequencies, Reliability, Regression and Mediation test was conducted on SPSS. Link between observed and latent variable. This helps in analyzing whether the model is consistent with the data or not.

Demographic variables such as age, gender, qualification and experience were measured. Reliabilities of variables like knowledge sharing, team effectiveness, and employee autonomy and team conflict were measured. According to researchers the reliability of Cronbach’s alpha should be greater than 0.7. In this research all the variables have reliability greater than 0.7. Descriptive statistics, frequencies, reliability and correlation was measured using SPSS.

**Econometric Modeling and specification:**

**Mediation steps are as under to be followed**

1. Intellectual capital predicts innovation which is Path c.
2. Intellectual capital predicts organizational capital that is Path a.
3. Intellectual capital and organizational capital together predicting innovation.

3a. Organizational capital predicts innovation

3b. Intellectual capital no longer predicts innovation in case of full mediation OR intellectual capital is lessened in predicting innovation in case of partial mediation which will be path c(prime).

$$Y=αy+βX+e (1)$$

$$M=αm+βX+em (2)$$

$$Y=αy+c'X+ΩM+ey (3)$$

$$Y=αy+c'X+Ω\left(αm+βX+em\right)+ey (4)$$

$$Y=\left(αy+αm\right)+Ωβ+c'X+\left(ey+Ω\left(em\right)\right) (5) $$

The first equation is a simple regression which shows the direct path c coefficient. While in 2 equation the path a coefficient is estimated through simple ordinary least square method which is from independent to mediator. Similarly, equation 3 estimate the multiple regression coefficient both for path b by controlling for independent variable and c(prime) which is tested for further existence of full, partial or no mediation claims.

# CHAPTER 4 RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

For the analysis of the data the statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) version 20 is used. The frequency distribution and descriptive statistics were utilized to analyse the respondent’s demographics characteristics in a simple manner. After that the reliability through Cronbach alpha is checked. For the investigation of the relationships the Barron & Kenny (1986) procedure is followed.

## 4.1 Descriptive statistics

The descriptive statistics for all the variables under study is given in the table

4.1 below. These variables are knowledge sharing, employee autonomy, and team effectiveness. The arithmetic mean along with sample size, minimum, maximum and standard deviation is shown. The average value indicates the participant’s agreement and disagreement with the question asked regarding a specific construct. The high value of the mean for the variable shows high agreement of the respondents while low value shows lower responses for the agreements. Similarly, high value of standard deviation shows more variability in the respondent’s selection of the item choices while low value shows low variability in the responses.

### Table 4.1 Descriptive statistics

**Variables observati**

**on**

**Minimu m**

**Maximu m**

**Mean Std.**

**Deviati on**

**Knowledg e Sharing**

250 1.00 5.00 3.3333 .85677

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Employee** 250 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 3.2920 | .97685 |
| **Autonomy** |  |  |  |  |
| **Team** 250**Effectiven ess** | 1.00 | 5.00 | 3.3173 | 1.04888 |
| **Valid N** **250** |  |  |  |  |

### (listwise)

The total sample size is 250 with minimum value of 1 and maximum value of 5. The highest mean is for the knowledge sharing which is 3.33 with a lowest value of standard deviation 0. 856. Similarly for employee anatomy the mean value is

3.29 and its standard deviation is 0.976 which means that dispersion in the respondents’ agreement is higher in employee autonomy than knowledge sharing. Similarly, the mean value for the team effectiveness is 3.31 with a standard deviation of 1.04 which is highest among all the variables. Which means the dispersion is higher in team effectiveness than all other variables?

## Reliability Analysis

Reliability is basically carried out to analyse the consistency of the scales for variables. According to Carlson *et.al* (2004) scale will be considered reliable if it gives the same value in different situations. To investigate the internal consistency within a variable items reliability is employed. The Cronbach alpha value varies from 0 to 1. The value near to 0 is considered low reliable while near to 1 is considered as highly reliable. The threshold value is 0.7 if it holds then those variables will be considered reliable for further analysis.

### Table 4.2 Reliability Test

**Variables Cronbach’s Alpha Items**

**Team Effectiveness (DV)**

**Knowledge Sharing (IV)**

.710 3

.731 6

### Employee Autonomy (Med)

.807 5

In table 4.3 the information about the scale reliability is shown. All the values are greater from threshold value of 0.7 which shows that it can be used for further analysis. The reliability of team effectiveness is 0.710 while that of knowledge sharing is 0.731. Similarly, for the employee autonomy the reliability value is 0.807.

## Regression Analysis

To investigate the causal relationship between variable regression analysis is conducted. For bi variate variable simple regression and for multivariate variables multiple regression tool is employed.

### Simple Regression

**Step 1**

**Independent variable Knowledge Sharing**

**Simple Regression Table 4.3.1 Team Effectiveness**

**Β R2 Sig**

.828 .685 .000

\*P < 0.05, \*\*p < 0.01, \*\*\*p < .001 N=250 Standardized regression coefficient reported

From table 4.3.1. Hypothesis 1 is supported which claims a positive relationship between knowledge sharing and team effectiveness. The result indicates that knowledge sharing positively and significantly influences the team effectiveness. The standardized beta or coefficient value is 0.828 which means that if the independent variable (knowledge sharing) increases by one standard deviation the dependent variable (team effectiveness) on average is increased by 0.828 standard deviation units. The coefficient of determination value is 0.68 approximately which means that about 68 % of variation results in team effectiveness due to knowledge sharing.

### Step2

**Independent variable Knowledge Sharing**

**Simple regression table 4.3.2 Employee Autonomy**

***Β R*2 Sig**

.905 .894 .000

*\*P < 0.05, \*\*p < 0.01, \*\*\*p < .001* N=250 Standardized regression coefficient reported

From table 4.3.2 hypothesis 2 is supported which claims a positive relationship between knowledge sharing and employee autonomy. The result indicates that knowledge sharing positively and significantly influences employee autonomy. The standardized beta or coefficient value is 0.905 which means that if the independent variable (knowledge sharing) increases by one standard deviation the dependent variable (employee autonomy) on average is increased by 0.905 standard deviation units. The coefficient of determination value is 0.89 approximately which means that about 89% of variation results in team effectiveness due to knowledge sharing.

### Independent variable Employee Autonomy

**Step 3**

**Simple regression table 4.3.3 Team Effectiveness**

***Β R*2 Sig**

.943 .890 .000

*\*P < 0.05, \*\*p < 0.01, \*\*\*p < .001* N=250 Standardized regression coefficient reported

From table 4.3.3 hypothesis 3 is supported which claims a positive relationship between team effectiveness and employee autonomy. The result indicates that employee autonomy positively and significantly influences the team effectiveness. The standardized beta or coefficient value is 0.943 which means that if the independent variable (employee autonomy) increases by one standard deviation the dependent variable (team effectiveness) on average is increased by 0.943 standard deviation units. The coefficient of determination value is 0.89 approximately which means that about 89% of variation results in team effectiveness due to employee autonomy.

### Step 4

**Multiple regression Multiple regression table 4.3.4**

**Test of mediation Team Effectiveness**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Independent variables** | ***Β*** | ***T value*** | **Sig** |
| **Knowledge** | .072 | 2.026 | .000 |
| **sharing****Employee** | .142 | 2.918 | .004 |
| **Autonomy** |  |  |  |

*\*P < 0.05, \*\*p < 0.01, \*\*\*p < .001* N=250 Standardized regression coefficient reported

According to Baron and Kenny (1986) to investigate the mediating role of a variable, there should be a significant relationship among the variables given in the above steps. As shown in table 4.3.1, table 4.3.2 and table 4.3.3 all the three simple relationship regressions are highly significant which fulfill the condition for the mediating analysis of a variable. In the mediation table 4.3.4 as shown the mediating variable employee autonomy along with the predictor variable knowledge sharing effect on the dependent variable team effectiveness is analyzed. In table 4.3.4 knowledge sharing and employee autonomy is regressed on the dependent variable which is both significant at 1% of significance level. For the mediation to exist the direct path value from simple regression of table 4.3.1 is to be reduced in the indirect path regression in table 4.3.4 in which the mediator employee autonomy is introduced. As shown in table 4.3.1 the direct path value of standardized beta is 0.828 in step 1. After introducing mediator employee autonomy in step 4 the standardized beta for knowledge sharing became 0.072.

The total amount of the relationship between knowledge sharing and team effectiveness through mediation (0.905-0.072=0.833). The indirect path of knowledge sharing to employee autonomy and from employee autonomy to team effectiveness is (0.905\*0.142=0.128). This whole process conforms a partial mediation between knowledge sharing and team effectiveness.

## Summary of Accepted/ Rejected Hypothesis

### TABLE 4.4.1: Summary about Accepted hypothesis

**Hypothesis Statements Outcome**

H1 Knowledge sharing has a positive influence on team effectiveness

H2 Knowledge sharing has a positive influence on employee autonomy

H3 Employee autonomy has a positive significant influence on team effectiveness

H4 Employee autonomy plays a mediating role between the knowledge sharing and team

### Supported

**Supported**

**Supported**

**Supported**

 effectiveness

## Result and Discussion

According to Nonaka et al., (2000) the utilization of knowledge based theory for the purpose of testing and recommendation to the project based organizations is checked through the effect of knowledge sharing on team effectiveness. The effect of knowledge sharing was found significant on team effectiveness in project based organization. The results are consistent with the knowledge based theories mentioned in literature. Similarly studies of (Xie & Luan, 2014; Pinjani & Palvia, 2013; Panteli & Sockalingam, 2005) also claimed that knowledge should be shared appropriately to the team for effectiveness.

Similarly, for the effect of employee autonomy the role of employee autonomy on team participants has a large tendency to concentrate or emphasize their thoughts more openly and freely for the administrators (Snyder & Duarte 1999). Group individuals are in a position to check each other extra accurately primarily built on performance and involvement in the project based organizations mostly.

Therefore, it can be accepted that employee autonomy is also positively connected with team effectiveness. Similarly, the partial mediation exists between the knowledge sharing and team effectiveness.

**CHAPTER 5**

# CONCLUSIONS

## Conclusion

The main purpose of the research is to analyse the impact of knowledge sharing on team effectiveness in projects with the intervening role of employee autonomy. To fulfil the gap in the area 250 sample is selected. This sample then further explored through different statistical tools and inferences were drawn. For the mediation analysis Barron and Kenny (1986) four steps procedure is employed. First three hypotheses were tested through a simple regression tool and are found supported. The fourth step conforms to the mediation process and inferences is drawn that partial mediation exists. The employee autonomy partially mediates the relationship or association between the knowledge sharing and team effectiveness in case of Pakistani projects in organizations.

The findings of the research demonstrate that managers of the projects are required to share their knowledge with the employees in the documented form to boost the team effectiveness. This procedure or act will increase the collaboration and access to information of the lower rank employees. Hence whenever managers need any change or change is required, they can with the access to their information about the employees. Beside that if managers respect their ideas.it will boost and empower the efficiency of the employees. This all needs training and skill development programs which will enable employees to perform efficiently, confidently and effectively.

## Research implication

The study will improve the literature by adding its findings based on inferences drawn from the whole mediation process. As the effect of knowledge sharing is found positively significant on the team effectiveness. Therefore, knowledge sharing should be seen and focused on an organizational strength which can be

produced and used at the upper hand for the two associations and people. According to (Gold *et al.,* 2001; Alavi et.al, 2001) the resource that can possibly affect the economic value and prosperity, maximize economic value, and improve effectiveness of the employees.

## Practical implications

The present research can be utilized in a number of ways to take benefit for managerial inferences. From the finding it has been analyzed that knowledge sharing boosts the effectiveness of the team. Therefore, it can be claimed that project managers in different project based organizations should share knowledge with their team members. And make it sure that this shared knowledge should not be manipulated by misusing it. Besides that, employees in lower level or subordinates need to ensure the proper use of this knowledge shared to them from upper top managers. This whole process of knowledge sharing behavior eventually improves the efficiency and effectiveness of the team. Which will ultimately be in position to achieve the targets of the organizations.

## Limitations

Every research has some kind of limitations and this research also has. This research has also some limitations, which is faced while conducting this research. Like, as the current study foundation was to analyze the knowledge base theory, which bestows support for the series of links represented in the study (knowledge sharing to employee autonomy to team effectiveness). Secondly, the data collection for the current study is cross sectional due to time and resources limitations, as this does not permit for making deduction regarding causality between variables studied as shown in hypothesized model.

Besides that, the present is carried out only on organization where projects were in practice. Therefore the generalizability issue arises due to limited data sets and specific organizations. To get a clearer picture of the scenario different

organizations should be checked. Beside that comparisons can be done between and within the organization at different hierarchy levels.

## Recomendation fi future research

For future research mediators like selective hiring, conflict management, relationship building and job involvement with dichotomous and continuous scale can be checked. Beside that moderator can also be incorporated to extend the model and check in more complex and detailed versions. The sample size could be increased to get a more efficient and consistent result for the elaborated model of mediator plus moderators. Besides that, other forms or traits of knowledge like knowledge management, knowledge transfers and implicit or explicit knowledge impact on team effectiveness with mediators and moderators can be analyzed.
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# APPENDIX

### Survey Questionnaire

### Demographics

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |
| **Gender** | Male | Female |  |  |  |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| **Age** | 18-25 | 26-33 | 34-41 | 42-49 | 50 and Above |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| **Qualification** | Matric | Bachelor | Master | MS/M.Phil. | PhD |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| **Experience** | 5 and Less | 6-13 | 14-21 | 22-29 | 30 and Above |

Please insert a check mark in the appropriate column to indicate whether you agree or disagree with each of the following statements:

**1= Strongly Disagree 2= Disagree 3= Neither Agree/nor Disagree 4= Agree**

**5= Strongly Agree**

### Knowledge Sharing

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | We share the minutes of meetings or discussion recordsIn an effective way. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2 | We always provided technical documents, includingManuals, Books, training materials to each other. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3 | We shared project plans and the project status inAn effective way. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4 | We always provided know-where or know-whomInformation to each other in an effective way. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 | We tried to share expertise from educationOr training in an effective way. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6 | We always shared experience or know-how fromWork in a responsive and effective way. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

**Employee Autonomy**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | My manager makes it more efficient for my team toDo our job by keeping the rules and regulations simple. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2 | My manager allows my team to do ourJob our way. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3 | My manager allows our team to make important decisionsQuickly to satisfy customer needs. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4 | My manager allows my team to determineWhat needs to be done? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 | My manager allows our team to make itsOwn choices. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

**Team Effectiveness**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | This team is good in coming up with ways to complete | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|  | Their tasks. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | This team effectively deals with uncertainty andUnexpected events. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3 | At times, this team fails to approach its task adequately. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Thank you for your time and cooperation