



Impact of Knowledge Sharing Culture on Organizational Citizenship Behavior Mediating Role of Organizational Commitment

Naveed Farooq, Assistant Professor, Institute of Business Studies and leadership, Abdul Wali Khan University Mardan, naveedfarooq151@gmail.com

Muhammad Waseem, Assistant Professor, Department of Management Sciences, Hazara University, mwaseem@hu.edu.pk

Badshah Hussain, Lecturer, Center for Management and Commerce, University of Swat, badshah12@gmail.com

Naveed Iqbal, Department of Management Sciences, COMSATS University Islamabad, Abbottabad Campus, naveed@cuiatd.edu.pk (Corresponding Author).

Akhtar Nawaz, Lecturer/PhD Scholar, Department of Management Sciences, Hazara University, akhtar_nawaz@hu.edu.pk

Azhar Khan, Assistant Professor, SRH Campus Abdul Wali Khan University, Mardan, azhar5896081@gmail.com

Abstract- Universities are considered places, where knowledge is created and shared among the faculty members. In developing countries, academic institutions, especially universities in the private sector are facing the problem of qualified and committed faculty to disperse knowledge and expertise. Therefore, this investigation intends to analyze the role of organizational commitment (OC) in the connection between knowledge sharing (KS) and organizational citizenship behavior (Lau et al.) among the faculty of universities based in the north of Pakistan. A knowledge-sharing culture simplifies the exchange of information, OC enhances the level of attachment and OCBs stimulate extra-role behaviors. Data is gathered from 215 faculty members serving in private sector universities, findings reveal that organizational commitment exerts a mediating influence in the association between knowledge sharing and OCBs. Results confirm that if knowledge-sharing culture is provided, academic staffs are likely to achieve a higher level of OC, subsequently enhances the level of OCBs. The study is pivotal for policymakers and has precise directions for the administration of universities.

Keywords: Knowledge Sharing, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Private Sector, North Region; Random sampling Techniques

I. INTRODUCTION

Researchers in the area of the human resource has significantly highlighted the importance of knowledge sharing in improving the organizational culture and other key outcomes, for instance, turn over the intention, citizenship behavior, employees' performance, and employees' job satisfaction. In today's globalized context, the competitive environment, economic crisis, and progression in communication technology significantly contribute to the emergence of a knowledge-driven economy. It triggers institutions to proceed from traditional perspectives on dealing with human resources and accept a KM approach. Knowledge sharing emphasis identifying, recognize and hoarding knowledge in the chase of institutional learning (Rowley, 2000). Akturan and Çekmecelioğlu (2016) argue that knowledge sharing is one of the most key factors and a source of competitive edge for organizations. Tiwana (2000) elaborates knowledge as

..."knowledge is a fluid mix of framed experience, values, contextual information, expert insight and grounded intuition that provides an environment and framework for evaluating and incorporating new experiences and information".

Knowledge sharing vitally improves the employees in understanding their formal duties and brings individual recognition to the institution. Once it is accumulated in the organization, then it becomes a source of competitive gain (Ming Yu, 2002). Nonaka (1991) earlier elaborated on two different sorts of knowledge sharing, including explicit and implicit. Explicit knowledge shared in written form or either in oral and implicit knowledge is intangible and intrinsic. R. S.-J. Lin and Hsiao (2014) conjure that knowledge sharing is a form of OCB. (Lau et al.) the literature demonstrates a series of experiential investigations, recognizing the influences of knowledge sharing (KS) on the effective enactment of knowledge Management (KM) and institutional administration (Yang, 2007). In a similar study, King (2007) explains that KS is concerned to create tacit knowledge among faculty, which are related to their jobs and

encourage knowledge-sharing behavior to exchange related information with each other across the institution. Bartol and Srivastava (2002), argue that knowledge-sharing behaviors express in different forms like motivation, organizational commitment, interpersonal relations, and organizational culture.

Knowledge transmission and exchange enable the emergence of new learning and improve individual competencies (Sveiby & Simons, 2002), which might stimulate the level of OC and OCBs among faculty. Studies have explored the impact of KS at the organizational level, however, few studies have focused at the individual level and particularly to investigate the mediating mechanism of OC in the relationship of KS-OCBs. This research intends to know that how knowledge sharing influences the level of OCBs. In addition to exploring the mediating impact of OC in the context of private sector universities, which is not yet been explored in the existing literature.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

2.1 Knowledge Sharing

C. L. Wang, Ahmed, and Rafiq (2008) argued that knowledge sharing at the workplace is the diffusion and sharing of tacit or explicit, skills, thoughts, experiences, and technology among each other in organizations. While in a similar study, Mom, Van Den Bosch, and Volberda (2007) documented that knowledge moves across the organization either bottom-up, top-down or exchange horizontally. Behnke (2010) elaborated that knowledge sharing occurs through interaction either face to face, in written documentation, or virtually. It requires the transfer of ideas from individual to individual or group. Blumentritt and Johnston (1999) found that knowledge sharing in a job entails know-how, know-what or know-why. Luet (2006) further elaborated that it includes working procedures, organizational rules, individual experience and job related documents.

Fang, Jiang, Makino, and Beamish (2010) asserted that knowledge demonstrates as a source of competitive advantage and gathering of collective capital for an institution. If an organization suffers from adequate social capital, then it is recommended to share knowledge among employees. Knowledge sharing is concerned with the willingness of the workforce, depending on institutional structure and social relations of members (Islam et al., 2012). Bock, Zmud, Kim, and Lee (2005) found that the significance of institutional knowledge has promoted diverse KS activities, which are intended to comprehend knowledge formation, retention, and spreading. Shang, Lin, and Wu (2009) identified that KS is concerned with the customer, process, and innovation with managerial intellectual capital. Bock *et al.* (2005) have elaborated that transformation of knowledge among the workforce and within the boundaries of institutions relies on the employee's knowledge-sharing behaviors. When employees are psychologically affiliated, attached, and recognized with an institution known as OC (Farooq & Zia, 2013). The cooperation and collaboration with other institutional members, make it comfortable to disperse knowledge with each other (Islam et al., 2012). KS is involved to share complex and sensitive information regarding production, cost, financial strength, and the performance of personnel (Scott *et al.*, 2004). Bock *et al.* (2005) emphasize that social factors play a deterministic role in knowledge sharing behavior than extrinsic benefits. Bandura (1982) argued that through KS, managers are intended to strengthen groups for taking their own decision. This element creates a situation for employees to know their work, to recognize their capabilities and have influences on organizational decisions. Simply, it explains that KS provides basis for empowerment. Sharing of important and sensitive information will let workers to comprehend their duties, responsibilities and to judge the behavior of supervisors. Mutual understanding, trust and open communication will give a probable ability to the member to administer themselves (Si & Wei, 2012). Demirel (2008) found that generating and sharing of knowledge emerge as strategic activities. They further added that KS is not restricted to communicating and sharing thoughts, but extend to cover sharing of success, needs, and problems (Davenport & Prusak, 1998).

As higher education commission emphasis to endorse higher studies to support knowledge intensive society, hence, it is derived from the literature that knowledge is valuable resource. This is specifically factual in universities, which have a clear goal to generate and disseminate knowledge to develop human being. Universities are assumed to stimulate citizenship behaviors among the faculty which eventually transform among students and it is a step toward the society building. Therefore, a need was felt to test a conceptual model of KS, OCB and OC.

2.2 Organizational Citizenship Behavior(Lau et al.)

The notion of OCB has been derived from the idea of Katz's (1964), which entails the extra role behavior. Schappe (1998) defined OCB as individual conduct that is optional and not directly recognized by the firm compensation system. He further, elaborated that OCB promotes the aggregate performance of institution. Discretionary referred to optional behavior, not enforceable by the formal job description, however, job description clearly specify individual employment contract with institution. So, OCB is somewhat a matter of individual own choice, not punishable if employees do not perform (Organ (1988, p.4). Helping coworkers, avoiding complaints, behaving politely with colleagues and speaking positively about the institution to outsiders are few examples of OCB. Smith, Organ, and Near (1983) previously, proposed a two dimensional framework for OCB including altruism (behaviors concern to employees) and generalized obedience (behaviors reflecting the obedience of rules and regulations). Organ (1988) also defined OCB as individual discretionary behavior and identified five dimensions of citizenship behaviors including courtesy, civic virtue, conscientiousness, altruism and sportsmanship. Such discretionary behaviors promote the efficiency of organizations. Committed employees who have common vision without expecting personal benefits are more motivated and engaged in OCBs. Employees performed OCBs because of intrinsic motivation and commitment (Gaa, 2010).

2.3 Relationship between KS and OCB

Bolino, Turnley, and Bloodgood (2002) found that OCBs exhibit an important role to create social capital in institutions. They conjured that OCBs contain loyalty, refer to (OC), obedience and participation explained (Lau et al.) which contribute toward the structure development, interpersonal relation and cognitive aspects of social capital. Employee's level of OCBs grows because of the supportive environment in organizations (Islam et al., 2012). Knowledge sharing conduct is viewed as the notch to which workers contribute their learning with their peers (Ryu S., Ho S.H., and Han I., 2003). Knowledge sharing among employees or departments contributes to institutional performance (Argote, et al., 2000). Knowledge sharing is a difficult task, requires the willingness of members to share their learning with a colleague. Hence, knowledge sharing is related to OCB (Lam & Lambermont-Ford, 2010). Ipe (2003) found that knowledge sharing is reciprocity and institutional structure plays an important role in knowledge sharing. Yulianti (2014) argued that creative attitudes and knowledge sharing have occurred when learning is shared and OCB is encouraged in the organization.

2.4 Knowledge Sharing and OC

OC refers to the strength, devotion, and involvement of an employee's with the organizational goals (Li, Zhang, Zhang, & Zhou, 2017). It is considered a psychological attachment and has been widely regarded as a multidimensional concept (Jo & Joo, 2011). Since, it has positive linkages with diverse organizational outcomes for instance OCB (C.-P. Lin, 2007) and with OC (Curtis & Taylor, 2018). Previously, Scholl (1981) and Weiner (1982) also found a positive association of commitment with OCB (Schappe, 1998). They found that OC maintained behavioral direction in case of minimum expected compensation and contributed to the organizational knowledge pool. Li et al. (2017) conjured that convincing employees to share their capability is the most effective technique for the self-improvement of employees and sharing knowledge with supervisors and with colleague is an effective method to improve the whole organization. Previous studies revealed that OC is an important antecedent of KS (Van Den Hooff & De Ridder, 2004; S. Wang & Noe, 2010). Hence, it is assumed that OC affects both willingness of employees to contribute their knowledge in the institution where they serve and their interest to consult other employees regarding their expertise and experiences. Organizational literature disclosed little empirical investigations regarding knowledge sharing and job satisfaction (Stumpf, 2010), which leads toward organizational commitment and OCB. Du, Ai, and Ren (2007) elaborated that limited studies have investigated the association of KS and OC at the effectiveness of organizational level and recommend more studies. Similarly, (Li et al., 2017) also suggested more investigation in different settings. So, this research intends to check the direct and mediating impact of KS, OCB, and OC in the north region of Pakistan and develop the following hypotheses.

2.5 Hypothesis

H1: Knowledge sharing has a significant impact on OCB.

H2: Knowledge sharing has a significant impact on OC.

H3: OC has a significant impact on OCB.

H4: OC meditates on the relationship between Knowledge sharing and OCB.

III. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Sampling

There are nine private sector universities in the vicinity of Peshawar, which are imparting higher education. These include Gandhara University, Cecos University, City University of Science & Information Technology, Iqra National University, Fast University, Sarhad University, Abasyn University, Preston University, and Qurtaba University. All the faculty members of these universities represent the population of this study. A random sampling method was applied to collect data from the respondents for analysis.

3.2 Participants and Response Rate

A total of 250 questionnaires were circulated among the faculty, among 215 were returned, indicating a response rate of 86%. In the selected sample 85% were male participants and 15% were female, in terms of education 30% were master degree holders, 65% were M.Phil. and only 5% were Ph.D. degree holders, however, 69% were below 45 years of age.

3.3 Research Instrument

Instruments for the present investigation were planned questionnaires acquired from literature, based on a Likert-scale to judge KS, OC, and OCB. Knowledge sharing was measured through a scale developed by Simons and Sveiby (2002). To measure the level of OCB Williams and Anderson (1991) scale of 14-items was used. This scale measures both individual and organizational levels OCBs, consisting of 7&7 items for both. This questionnaire is filled by the chairman of the concerned department. OC was measured through the questionnaire design by (Meyer & Allen, 1991). This tool consists of 18 items, which measure affective, normative, and continuous commitment respectively. A 5-point Likert scale was used to get the required data.

IV. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Table 1. Means, Standard deviations, Coefficient Alphas, and Correlations between Variables

	Variables	M	SD	1	2	3
1	KS	4.71	0.71	(0.73)		
2	OC	3.81	0.51	0.56**	(0.81)	
3	OCB	4.57	0.53	0.53**	0.61**	(0.77)

N=215; Cronbach Alpha in parenthesis

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

Table 1 proves the correlations, standard deviations, means, and coefficient alphas of variables. KS is significantly linked with OC ($r = 0.56, p < 0.01$) and by OCB ($r = 0.53, p < 0.01$) and the correlation of OC and OCB is ($r = 0.61, p < 0.01$). These numbers give initial support to the predicted hypotheses. The table further enlightens the Cronbach. Alpha values. All values are above 0.7, suggesting the internal consistency (Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, & Tatham, 1998). However, Flynn, Sakakibara, Schroeder, Bates, and Flynn (1990) used 0.895 to 0.946 values.

All sub-scale let outfit and above 0.7.

Table 2. Regression Investigations

β	t	sig
KS → OC	11.43	0.001
OC → OCB	10.22	0.000
KS → OCB	7.09	0.000

KS (knowledge sharing), OC (organizational commitment), OCB (organization citizenship behavior)

Regression analysis runsto find the linkages of variables. Table 2 elaborates that KS has a remarkableeffect on OC ($\beta=0.51, p<0.05$) and OC has a positive significant influence on OCB were, ($\beta=0.60, p<0.05$). Likewise, KS also has a positive significant effect on the employee's level of OCB ($\beta=0.50, p<0.05$). These values are in an acceptable range and support the hypotheses.

V. MEDIATING REGRESSION ANALYSIS

Preacher and Hayes (2004) well-validated bootstrapping procedures were conducted for investigating the mediating reaction of OC between KS and OCB. It is considered a superior test to measure the mediating effects as compare to Barron and Kenny (1986) and Sobel test. Preacher & Hayes, (2004) conjured if 0is not incorporated in the 95% C.I for the indirect outcome, mediation is intent. Table 3below shows the mediation analysis results.

Table3. Mediating Regression Analysis

Path	Total effect	Direct effect	Indirect effect	95% CI	
				Lower level	High level
KS \rightarrow OC \rightarrow OCB	0.65	0.11	0.54	0.37	0.63

The above table explains that the direct effect of KS on OCB is (.11, $p < .01$) and the indirect effect via OC is significant (.54, $p < .01$, 95% CI=0.37, 0.63). The direct and indirect results of KS and OC on OCB measure as 0.65, that is because of both direct (unmediated) and indirect (mediated) effects of KS on OCB. It means that when OC increases by 1 standard deviation, OCB increases by 0.65 standard deviations. The current results indicate that H3 of the research study is supported and confirm that OC mediates the relationship between KS and OCB.

VI. DISCUSSION

Based on regression and mediation modeling testing, all the hypotheses were supported. Collecting data from a sample of 215 employees from the private sector universities confirmed the direct and mediation relation between KS, OC and OCB. The study confirms a positive significant association of KS with OCB. The results justified the findings of Akturan and Çekmecelioğlu (2016) who asserted significant linkages of KS with OCB among higher educational institution in Turkey. In the same line, Ramasamy and Thamaraiselvan (2011)also found that KS influences OCBs. E. F. Cabrera and Cabrera (2005)documented that KS is one antecedent of OCB.The study explores a positive relationship of KS with OC. A. Cabrera, Collins, and Salgado (2006)also found the same connection of KS and OC.Latest studies confirmed the same positive relationship of KS with OC (Curtis & Taylor, 2018; Rafique, Hameed, & Agha, 2018).

Furthermore, the study confirmed the mediating role of OC between KS and OCB, which might be the novelty of this paper. It hasenlarged our thinking that OC combined with KS influences the level of OCBs and open avenues for future studies.Having shared values, ethics, norms and accepting organizational goals, KS evolves as knowledge-centered philosophy, shapes individual OCBs(King, 2007; King and Marks, 2008). Stimulating knowledge sharing culture in universities bring numerous changes and enable faculty to bring new ideas, develop competencies, reduce communication gape, enhance social interaction and boost team working as KS behavior is a kind of OCB (R. S.-J. Lin & Hsiao, 2014). Therefore, progression towards KS improve the capabilities, energies individual effectiveness expressed by organizational commitment.

Recently, the federal government has approved 68 billion rupees to HEC, however, HEC has demanded 85 billion rupees, leaving a gap of 17 billion. It is difficult for universities to enhance the level of OCBs through monetary incentive, hence, knowledge sharing culture and OC is imperative to enhance the level of OCBs.

VII. MANAGERIAL IMPLICATION AND SCOPE OF RESEARCH

Recently private sector universities are mainly facing hindrances due to the establishment of public sector universities in the last two decades. In the recent decade, openness and flexibility are the two major factors that are vital to overcoming the face of the challenges of academia. In addition diversity in the faculty is considered to be one of the important resources that matter a lot when it comes to a competitive edge among the universities. The academia advocating the non-profit motive is not meant for any employment hub rather, reinforcing the R & D activities and nexus with industries.

Universities are the places where knowledge is shared by the seniors' faculty and will develop the level of OCBs. Thus sharing of knowledge enhances the learning environment, as well as the commitment of junior faculty, will be higher. The study recommends the establishment of incubation centers, which will provide a base for knowledge-sharing behavior. The expertise can only be retained by facilitating the academician in such an environment that faster KS among the faculty. Future studies covering the role of organizational culture, leadership, motivation, emotional intelligence, and innovativeness within the public and private higher education sector of Pakistan would be fruitful avenues for further research.

REFERENCES

1. Akturan, A., & Çekmecelioğlu, H. G. (2016). The Effects of Knowledge Sharing and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors on Creative Behaviors in Educational Institutions. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 235, 342-350.
2. Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American psychologist*, 37(2), 122.
3. Bartol, K. M., & Srivastava, A. (2002). Encouraging knowledge sharing: The role of organizational reward systems. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 9(1), 64-76.
4. Behnke, T. M. (2010). *Knowledge sharing at work: An examination of organizational antecedents*: St. Ambrose University.
5. Blumentritt, R., & Johnston, R. (1999). Towards a strategy for knowledge management. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, 11(3), 287-300.
6. Bock, G.-W., Zmud, R. W., Kim, Y.-G., & Lee, J.-N. (2005). Behavioral intention formation in knowledge sharing: Examining the roles of extrinsic motivators, social-psychological forces, and organizational climate. *MIS quarterly*, 87-111.
7. Bolino, M. C., Turnley, W. H., & Bloodgood, J. M. (2002). Citizenship behavior and the creation of social capital in organizations. *Academy of management review*, 27(4), 505-522.
8. Cabrera, A., Collins, W. C., & Salgado, J. F. (2006). Determinants of individual engagement in knowledge sharing. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 17(2), 245-264.
9. Cabrera, E. F., & Cabrera, A. (2005). Fostering knowledge sharing through people management practices. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16(5), 720-735.
10. Curtis, M. B., & Taylor, E. Z. (2018). Developmental mentoring, affective organizational commitment, and knowledge sharing in public accounting firms. *Journal of knowledge management*, 22(1), 142-161.
11. Du, R., Ai, S., & Ren, Y. (2007). Relationship between knowledge sharing and performance: A survey in Xi'an, China. *Expert systems with Applications*, 32(1), 38-46.
12. Fang, Y., Jiang, G. L. F., Makino, S., & Beamish, P. W. (2010). Multinational firm knowledge, use of expatriates, and foreign subsidiary performance. *Journal of management studies*, 47(1), 27-54.
13. Farooq, N., & Zia, Y. A. (2013). Gender and Organizational Commitment. *Putaj Humanities & Social Sciences*, 20.
14. Flynn, B. B., Sakakibara, S., Schroeder, R. G., Bates, K. A., & Flynn, E. J. (1990). Empirical research methods in operations management. *Journal of operations management*, 9(2), 250-284.
15. Ipe, M. (2003). Knowledge sharing in organizations: A conceptual framework. *Human resource development review*, 2(4), 337-359.
16. Islam, T., Anwar, F., Khan, S. U. R., Rasli, A., Ahmad, U. N. B. U., & Ahmed, I. (2012). Investigating the mediating role of organizational citizenship behavior between organizational learning culture and knowledge sharing. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 19(6), 795-799.
17. Jo, S. J., & Joo, B.-K. (2011). Knowledge sharing: The influences of learning organization culture, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 18(3), 353-364.
18. King, W. R. (2007). A research agenda for the relationships between culture and knowledge management. *Knowledge and process management*, 14(3), 226-236.

19. Lam, A., & Lambermont-Ford, J.-P. (2010). Knowledge sharing in organisational contexts: a motivation-based perspective. *Journal of knowledge management*, 14(1), 51-66.
20. Lau, H., Khosrawipour, V., Kocbach, P., Mikolajczyk, A., Schubert, J., Bania, J., & Khosrawipour, T. (2020). The positive impact of lockdown in Wuhan on containing the COVID-19 outbreak in China. *Journal of travel medicine*, 27(3), taaa037.
21. Li, X., Zhang, J., Zhang, S., & Zhou, M. (2017). A multilevel analysis of the role of interactional justice in promoting knowledge-sharing behavior: The mediated role of organizational commitment. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 62, 226-233.
22. Lin, C.-P. (2007). To share or not to share: Modeling tacit knowledge sharing, its mediators and antecedents. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 70(4), 411-428.
23. Lin, R. S.-J., & Hsiao, J.-K. (2014). The relationships between transformational leadership, knowledge sharing, trust and organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology*, 5(3), 171.
24. Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human resource management review*, 1(1), 61-89.
25. Ming Yu, C. (2002). Socialising knowledge management: The influence of the opinion leader. *Journal of Knowledge Management Practice*, 3(3), 76-83.
26. Mom, T. J., Van Den Bosch, F. A., & Volberda, H. W. (2007). Investigating managers' exploration and exploitation activities: The influence of top-down, bottom-up, and horizontal knowledge inflows. *Journal of management studies*, 44(6), 910-931.
27. Nonaka, I. (1991). The Knowledge-Creating Company Harvard Business Review November-December. *Google Scholar*.
28. Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2004). SPSS and SAS procedures for estimating indirect effects in simple mediation models. *Behavior research methods*, 36(4), 717-731.
29. Rafique, M., Hameed, S., & Agha, M. H. (2018). Impact of knowledge sharing, learning adaptability and organizational commitment on absorptive capacity in pharmaceutical firms based in Pakistan. *Journal of knowledge management*, 22(1), 44-56.
30. Ramasamy, M., & Thamaraiselvan, N. (2011). Knowledge sharing and organizational citizenship behavior. *Knowledge and process management*, 18(4), 278-284.
31. Rowley, J. (2000). From learning organisation to knowledge entrepreneur. *Journal of knowledge management*, 4(1), 7-15.
32. Schappe, S. P. (1998). The influence of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and fairness perceptions on organizational citizenship behavior. *The journal of Psychology*, 132(3), 277-290.
33. Shang, S. S., Lin, S.-F., & Wu, Y.-L. (2009). Service innovation through dynamic knowledge management. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 109(3), 322-337.
34. Simons, R., & Sveiby, K. (2002). Collaborative climate and effectiveness of knowledge work. *Journal of knowledge management*, 6(5), 420-433.
35. Smith, C., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of applied psychology*, 68(4), 653.
36. Stumpf, S. A. (2010). Stakeholder competency assessments as predictors of career success. *Career Development International*, 15(5), 459-478.
37. Sveiby, K.-E., & Simons, R. (2002). Collaborative climate and effectiveness of knowledge work—an empirical study. *Journal of knowledge management*, 6(5), 420-433.
38. Tiwana, A. (2000). *The knowledge management toolkit: practical techniques for building a knowledge management system*: Prentice Hall PTR.
39. Van Den Hooff, B., & De Ridder, J. A. (2004). Knowledge sharing in context: the influence of organizational commitment, communication climate and CMC use on knowledge sharing. *Journal of knowledge management*, 8(6), 117-130.
40. Wang, C. L., Ahmed, P. K., & Rafiq, M. (2008). Knowledge management orientation: construct development and empirical validation. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 17(3), 219-235.
41. Wang, S., & Noe, R. A. (2010). Knowledge sharing: A review and directions for future research. *Human resource management review*, 20(2), 115-131.
42. Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17(3), 601-617.
43. Yang, J.-t. (2007). The impact of knowledge sharing on organizational learning and effectiveness. *Journal of knowledge management*, 11(2), 83-90.

44. Yulianti, P. (2014). Building Organizational Citizenship Behavior with creative Organizational Climate Support: A Conceptual Framework In Higher Education. *International Research Journals*, 5(3), 98-106.